



WFP EVALUATION



World Food Programme

**SAVING
LIVES
CHANGING
LIVES**

Evaluation of Mozambique WFP Country Strategic Plan 2017-2021

Centralized Evaluation Report – Volume II Annexes

OEV/2020/006
Office of Evaluation

May 2022

Disclaimer

The opinions expressed are those of the evaluation team, and do not necessarily reflect those of the World Food Programme. Responsibility for the opinions expressed in this report rests solely with the authors. Publication of this document does not imply endorsement by WFP of the opinions expressed.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in the maps do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of WFP concerning the legal or constitutional status of any country, territory or sea area, or concerning the delimitation of frontiers.

Photocredits

Cover photo: WFP/Falume Bachir

Key personnel for the evaluation

EVALUATION OFFICE

| | |
|--------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Andrea Cook | Director of Evaluation |
| Sergio Lenci | Senior Evaluation Officer and Evaluation Manager |
| Lia Carboni | Research Analyst |

EXTERNAL EVALUATION TEAM

| | |
|----------------|------------------------------------|
| João N. Pinto | Team Leader |
| Muriel Visser | Co-Team Leader and Evaluator |
| Ian Pinault | Evaluator |
| Javier Pereira | Evaluator and Research Coordinator |
| Zuber Ahmed | Evaluator |

Contents

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Annex 1: Terms of Reference | 1 |
| Annex 2: Evaluation Timeline | 4 |
| Annex 3: Methodology | 6 |
| Annex 4: Evaluation Matrix..... | 10 |
| Annex 5: E-Survey Report | 31 |
| Annex 6: List of People Interviewed..... | 50 |
| Annex 7: Bibliography..... | 58 |
| Annex 8: Agenda of the In-Country Mission | 67 |
| Annex 9: Evaluability Assessment..... | 69 |
| Annex 10: Country Strategic Plan Strategic Outcomes, Outputs and Activities | 73 |
| Annex 11: Country Strategic Plan Alignment with National Policies and Strategies | 76 |
| Annex 12: Country Strategic Plan Alignment with the National Sustainable Development Goal Framework..... | 81 |
| Annex 13: Country Strategic Plan Alignment with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework | 84 |
| Annex 14: Financial Overview (2016-2021)..... | 87 |
| Annex 15: Outcome and Output Performance Data | 98 |
| Annex 16: Human Resources WFP Mozambique | 137 |
| Annex 17: Findings-Conclusions-Recommendations Mapping | 139 |
| Acronyms | 141 |

List of figures

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Figure 1. Summary graph for category 'all' | 33 |
| Figure 2. Internal factors hindering country strategic plan implementation..... | 39 |
| Figure 3. Budget revisions and beneficiary changes in the Mozambique country strategic plan | 87 |
| Figure 4. Top donors of the Mozambique country strategic plan, USD (millions) and percentage of total funding..... | 89 |
| Figure 5. Breakdown of contributions by type of contribution and expenditure, USD | 89 |
| Figure 6. Funding sources by type (left) and grant earmarking level (right), USD (millions)..... | 90 |
| Figure 7. Total needs by activity (inside) and funded received by activity (outside), USD (millions) * | 91 |
| Figure 8. Activity spending compared to needs-based plan as of end of July 2021 (percentage).. | 91 |
| Figure 9. Country strategic plan confirmed contributions per year and needs-based plan (USD millions) | 92 |
| Figure 10. Country programme 200286 resource situation | 94 |
| Figure 11. Country programme 200286 donors in percent of total contributions | 95 |
| Figure 12. Country programme 200286 earmarking excluding non-direct multilateral grants, USD (millions) | 95 |
| Figure 13. Protracted relief and recovery operation 200355 resource situation | 96 |
| Figure 14. Protracted relief and recovery operation 200355 donors in percent of total contributions..... | 97 |
| Figure 15. Protracted relief and recovery operation 200355 earmarking excluding non-direct multilateral grants, USD (millions) | 97 |
| Figure 16. Country strategic plan actual and planned beneficiaries 2017-2021 as of 31 July | 99 |
| Figure 17. Country strategic plan actual and planned beneficiaries 2020-2021 by programme area | 99 |
| Figure 18. WFP Mozambique staff by functional area and office | 137 |

List of tables

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 1: Evaluation timeline..... | 4 |
| Table 2: OECD DAC criteria | 8 |
| Table 3. Evaluation matrix..... | 10 |
| Table 4. Type of organization/institution | 31 |
| Table 5. Geographical scope of your work | 31 |
| Table 6. Gender of e-survey respondents | 31 |
| Table 7. Main area(s) of work in relation to WFP in 2020 and 2021 | 32 |
| Table 8. WFP expertise and role in the following thematic areas compared to other actors | 33 |
| Table 9. WFP adaptation to changes in external context | 34 |
| Table 10. Views from WFP respondents..... | 35 |
| Table 11. Views from external stakeholders | 38 |
| Table 12. Main factors hindering WFP performance | 38 |
| Table 13. Internal factors hindering country strategic plan implementation | 40 |
| Table 14. Perceptions on sustainability of WFP interventions | 40 |
| Table 15. Perceptions on cost-effectiveness | 41 |
| Table 16. Perception on effectiveness of WFP training..... | 41 |
| Table 17. Recommendations to increase the impact of WFP training/capacity building activities | 41 |
| Table 18. Perceptions on WFP contribution to coherence and coordination | 42 |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Table 19. WFP respondents' recommendations to increase WFP contribution to coherence and coordination..... | 42 |
| Table 20. External stakeholders' recommendations to increase WFP contribution to coherence and coordination..... | 44 |
| Table 21. Perceptions on performance in cross-cutting areas | 45 |
| Table 22. Perceptions on WFP capacity to respond to emerging needs and opportunities..... | 46 |
| Table 23. WFP respondents' perceptions on emerging needs and opportunities | 46 |
| Table 24. External stakeholders' perceptions on emerging needs and opportunities..... | 49 |
| Table 25: Field work agenda | 67 |
| Table 26. Country strategic plan outcome indicators per activity | 70 |
| Table 27. Country strategic plan output indicators per activity..... | 71 |
| Table 28. Country strategic plan cross-cutting indicators per activity | 71 |
| Table 29: Country strategic plan strategic outcomes, outputs and activities | 73 |
| Table 30. Country strategic plan alignment with national policies and strategies..... | 76 |
| Table 31. Country strategic plan alignment with national Sustainable Development Goal priorities | 81 |
| Table 32. Country strategic plan alignment with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (2017-2020) | 84 |
| Table 33 – Country strategic plan budget revisions | 88 |
| Table 34. Country portfolio budget implementation plan and actual expenditure, cumulative 2017-July 2021, USD million | 92 |
| Table 35. Country portfolio budget implementation plan and actual expenditure, per year, USD93 | |
| Table 36. Country strategic plan actual versus planned beneficiaries 2019-2020 per age group and gender | 100 |
| Table 37. Pre-country strategic plan operations: actual versus planned beneficiaries 2016-2017 per operation, activity, modality and sex (percentage)..... | 100 |
| Table 38. Food: actual versus planned distribution per strategic outcome/activity and year (percentage and metric ton) | 102 |
| Table 39. Cash-based transfer/voucher: actual versus planned distribution per strategic outcome/activity and year (percentage and USD)..... | 103 |
| Table 40. Country strategic plan strategic outcome 1 outcome indicators per activity | 104 |
| Table 41. Country strategic plan strategic outcome 2 outcome indicators per activity | 106 |
| Table 42. Country strategic plan strategic outcome 3 outcome indicators per activity | 108 |
| Table 43. Country strategic plan strategic outcome 4 outcome indicators per activity | 109 |
| Table 44. Country strategic plan strategic outcome 5 outcome indicators per activity | 110 |
| Table 45. Country strategic plan strategic outcome 6 and strategic outcome 7 outcome indicators per activity | 111 |
| Table 46. Country strategic plan strategic outcome 1 output indicators per activity | 113 |
| Table 47. Country strategic plan strategic outcome 2 output indicators per activity | 116 |
| Table 48. Country strategic plan strategic outcome 3 output indicators per activity | 125 |
| Table 49. Country strategic plan strategic outcome 4 output indicators per activity | 127 |
| Table 50. Country strategic plan strategic outcome 5 output indicators per activity | 129 |
| Table 51. Country strategic plan strategic outcome 6 output indicators per activity | 131 |
| Table 52. Country strategic plan strategic outcome 7 output indicators per activity | 132 |
| Table 53. Country strategic plan cross-cutting indicators per activity | 133 |
| Table 54. Cross-cutting indicators for pre-country strategic plan operations | 134 |
| Table 55. Evolution of human resources in WFP Mozambique | 137 |
| Table 56. WFP Mozambique staff by type of contract and function, 2021 | 137 |

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

Summary of ToR is present below. Full version is available [here](#).

MOZAMBIQUE: AN EVALUATION OF WFP'S COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN (2017-2021)

Country Strategic Plan Evaluations (CSPEs) encompass the entirety of WFP activities during a specific period. Their purpose is twofold: 1) to provide evaluation evidence and learning on WFP's performance for country-level strategic decisions, specifically for developing the next Country Strategic Plan and 2) to provide accountability for results to WFP stakeholders.

SUBJECT OF THE EVALUATION

The Mozambique CSP 2017-2021 places emphasis on WFP's engagement in capacity strengthening at national and local level, while continuing to play a lead role in humanitarian response. In so doing, the CSP also shifts from food transfer to cash-based transfer. The results framework is focused on resilience building, root causes of food and nutrition insecurity and crises response; it was originally articulated in 6 strategic outcomes, but in March 2019 a budget revision introduced a new strategic outcome and related activities for the provision of humanitarian services in response to the emergency generated by cyclone Idai. WFP also collaborates with UNHCR in assisting refugees and asylum seekers in Nampula with food rations, and coordinates implementation of a refugee livelihoods programme in the camp.

As of January 2021, Mozambique CSP is 64% funded, against a Needs Based Plan of approximately USD 528 millions.

The evaluation will assess WFP contributions to CSP strategic outcomes, establishing plausible causal relations between the outputs of WFP activities, the implementation process, the operational environment and changes observed at the outcome level, including any unintended consequences. It will also focus on adherence to humanitarian principles, gender equality, protection and accountability to affected populations.

The evaluation will adopt standard UNEG and OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence and sustainability as well as connectedness and coverage as applicable.

OBJECTIVES AND STAKEHOLDERS OF THE EVALUATION

WFP evaluations serve the dual objectives of accountability and learning.

The evaluation will seek the views of, and be useful to, a range of WFP's internal and external stakeholders and presents an opportunity for national, regional and corporate learning. The primary user of the evaluation findings and recommendations will be the WFP Country Office and its stakeholders to inform the design of the new Country Strategic Plan.

The evaluation report will be presented at the Executive Board session in June 2022

KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation will address the following four key questions:

Question 1: To what extent is WFP's strategic position, role and specific contribution based on country priorities and people's needs as well as WFP's strengths?

The evaluation will assess the extent to which the CSP is relevant to national policies, plans, strategies and goals, including achievement of the national Sustainable Development Goals. It will further assess the extent to which the CSP addresses the needs of the most vulnerable people in the country to ensure that no one is left behind; whether WFP's strategic positioning has remained relevant throughout the implementation of the CSP in light of changing context, national capacities and needs; and to what extent the CSP is coherent and aligned with the wider UN cooperation framework and includes appropriate strategic partnerships based on the comparative advantage of WFP in the country.

Question 2: What is the extent and quality of WFP's specific contribution to CSP strategic outcomes in Mozambique?

The evaluation will assess the extent to which WFP delivered the expected outputs and contributed to the expected strategic outcomes of the CSP, including the achievement of cross-cutting aims (humanitarian principles, protection, accountability to affected populations, gender equality and other equity considerations). It will also assess the extent to which the achievements of the CSP are likely to be sustainable; and whether the CSP facilitated more strategic linkages between humanitarian, development and, where appropriate, peace work.

Question 3: To what extent has WFP's used its resources efficiently in contributing to CSP outputs and strategic outcomes?

The evaluation will assess whether outputs were delivered within the intended timeframe; the appropriateness of coverage and targeting of interventions; cost-efficient delivery of assistance; and whether alternative, more cost-effective measures were considered.

Question 4: What are the factors that explain WFP performance and the extent to which it has made the strategic shift expected by the CSP?

The evaluation will assess the extent to which WFP analyzed and used existing evidence on hunger challenges, food security and nutrition issues in the country to develop the CSP. It will also assess the extent to which the CSP led to: the mobilization of adequate, predictable and flexible resources; to the development of appropriate partnerships and collaboration with other actors; greater flexibility in dynamic operational contexts; and how these factors affect results. Finally, the evaluation will seek to identify any other organizational and contextual factors influencing WFP performance and the strategic shift expected by the CSP.

SCOPE, METHODOLOGY AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The unit of analysis is the Country Strategic Plan, approved by the WFP Executive Board in June 2017, as well as any subsequent approved budget revisions.

The evaluation will cover all of WFP's activities (including cross cutting results) for the period 2016 to the second quarter of 2021¹. Covering from one year before the beginning of the CSP cycle will enable the evaluation to better understand and assess the quality of the CSP design process and any strategic shift and changes in approach that it introduced. Within this timeframe, the evaluation will look at how the CSP builds on, or departs from, previous activities and assess the extent to which the strategic shift that was foreseen has taken place and what are the consequences.

The evaluation will adopt a mixed methods approach using a mix of methods and a variety of primary and secondary sources, including desk review, key informant interviews, surveys, and focus groups discussions. Systematic triangulation across different sources and methods will be carried out to validate findings and avoid bias in the evaluative judgement. In light of the COVID19 pandemic, the evaluation will be conducted remotely. Depending on how the situation evolves, the final Learning Workshop will be held remotely or in the Country.

The evaluation conforms to WFP and 2020 UNEG ethical guidelines. This includes, but is not limited to, ensuring informed consent, protecting privacy, confidentiality and anonymity of participants, ensuring cultural sensitivity, respecting the autonomy of participants, ensuring fair recruitment of participants (including women and socially excluded groups) and ensuring that the evaluation results in no harm to participants or their communities.

¹ The current CSP cycle has been extended in order to align to the UNSDCF and the new CSP will be presented to WFP Ex. Board in June 2022 instead of November 2021 as originally planned.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Evaluation Team: The evaluation will be conducted by a team of independent consultants combining experience in humanitarian and development contexts and knowledge of the WFP food and cash transfer modalities, technical assistance modalities and regional experience.

OEV Evaluation Manager: The evaluation will be managed by Sergio Lenci, Senior Evaluation Officer in the WFP Office of Evaluation. He will be the main interlocutor between the evaluation team, represented by the team leader, and WFP counterparts, to ensure a smooth implementation process and compliance with OEV quality standards for process and content. Second level quality assurance will be provided by Andrea Cook, Director of Evaluation.

An **Internal Reference Group** of a cross-section of WFP stakeholders from relevant business areas at different WFP levels will be consulted throughout the evaluation process to review and provide feedback on evaluation products. The Director of Evaluation will approve the final versions of all evaluation products.

Stakeholders: WFP stakeholders at country, regional and HQ level are expected to engage throughout the evaluation process to ensure a high degree of utility and transparency. External stakeholders, such as beneficiaries, government, donors, implementing partners and other UN agencies will be consulted during the evaluation process.

COMMUNICATION

Preliminary findings will be shared with WFP stakeholders in the Country Office, the Regional Bureau and Headquarters during a debriefing session at the end of the data collection phase. A more in-depth debrief will be organized in August 2021 to inform the new CSP design process. A country learning workshop will be held in November 2021 to ensure a transparent evaluation process and promote ownership of the findings and preliminary recommendations by country stakeholders.

Evaluation findings will be actively disseminated and the final evaluation report will be publicly available on WFP's website.

TIMING AND KEY MILESTONES

Inception Phase: January - March 2021

Remote Data collection: June July 2021

Remote Debriefing: August 2021

Reporting: September – December 2021

Learning Workshop: November 2021

Executive Board: June 2022

Annex 2: Evaluation Timeline

TABLE 1: EVALUATION TIMELINE

| Phase 2 - Inception | | January - June 2021 | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Team preparation, literature review prior to HQ briefing | Team | January |
| | Headquarters (HQ) & regional bureau (RB) inception briefing | Evaluation manager (EM) + team leader (TL) | January |
| | Inception mission to Mozambique (<i>Remote</i>) | EM + Team | February |
| | Inception workshop with the country office (<i>Remote</i>) | EM + Team | 10 March |
| | Submit draft inception report (IR) | TL | 12 April to OEV 12 May to CO |
| | OEV quality assurance and feedback | EM | 21 May |
| | Submit revised IR | TL | 28 May |
| | IR review and clearance | EM Office of Evaluation (OEV)/ Director of Evaluation (DOE) | 7 June |
| | EM circulates final IR to WFP key stakeholders for their information + posts a copy on intranet. | EM | 10 June |
| Phase 3 - Evaluation Phase | | June - July 2021 | |
| | E-survey preparation, administration and analysis | Team | June |
| | Field data collection (remote interviews + in-country mission) | Team | June - July |
| | Exit debriefing with country office (CO) + EM (<i>Remote</i>) | Team | 10 August |
| | In-depth debriefing with CO (<i>Remote</i>) | Team | 09 September |
| Phase 4 - Reporting | | September - November 2021 | |
| Draft 0 | Submit high quality draft evaluation report (ER) to OEV (after the company's quality check) | TL | 17 September |
| | OEV quality feedback sent to TL | EM | 24 September |
| Draft 1 | Submit revised draft ER to OEV | TL | 1 October |
| | OEV quality check | EM | 6 October |
| | Seek OEV/D clearance prior to circulating the ER to WFP stakeholders | OEV/DoE | 12 October |
| | OEV shares draft evaluation report with WFP stakeholders for their feedback | EM stakeholders | 12-17 October |
| | Learning workshop | EM/TL | 17-20 October |
| | Consolidate WFP comments and share with team | EM | 21 October |
| | Submit revised draft ER to OEV based on WFP comments, with ET responses on the matrix of comments | TL | 28 October |
| Draft 2 | Review draft 2 | EM | 04 November |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| | Submit draft 2 ER to OEV | TL | 5 November |
| Draft 3 | Review draft 3 | EM | 18 November |
| | Submit final draft 3 ER to OEV | TL | 19 November |
| Phase 5 - Executive Board (EB) and follow-up | | February - June 2022 | |
| | Submit SER/recommendations to Corporate Planning and Performance Division (CPP) for management response + summary evaluation report (SER) to EB Secretariat for editing and translation | EM | February |
| | Tail end actions, OEV websites posting, EB round table etc. | EM | February - March |
| | Presentation of summary evaluation report to the EB | DoE/Depute DoE | June |
| | Presentation of management response to the EB | Director/CPP | June |

Annex 3: Methodology

Thematic focus

1. The evaluation covered all WFP activities for the period 2016 to the second quarter of 2021. Covering from one year before the beginning of the country strategic plan cycle enabled the evaluation to better understand and assess the quality of the country strategic plan design process and any strategic shift and changes in approach that it introduced. Within this timeframe, the evaluation looked at how the country strategic plan builds on, or departs from, previous activities and assessed the extent to which the strategic shift that was foreseen has taken place and its consequences. The evaluation team has identified the following key themes and areas of special interest for learning purposes: i) capacity strengthening; ii) humanitarian-development-peace (triple) nexus; iii) organizational readiness; iv) debt swap and international financial institution (IFI) funding leading to WFP implementing on behalf of Government.

Methodological approach

2. The methodology developed for this evaluation was a theory-based approach, allowing the team to develop a strategic understanding of the country strategic plan design and its performance, the direction that WFP contribution has taken so far throughout the implementation, as well as the prospects for the future, particularly with a view to formulating the new country strategic plan. The team has built a theory of change (ToC) to assist in clarifying its understanding and to ensure that key assumptions underlying the theory of change could be identified and tested during the evaluation exercise.² The theory of change guided the interrogation of the retrospective elements of the work of WFP and helped inform and identify priorities for the future. An evaluation matrix was prepared (see Annex 4) around four standard evaluation questions (EQs) set in the terms of reference (ToR): i) EQ 1 related to the strategic alignment and positioning of the WFP portfolio and activities with regards to the strategies of the Government, the needs of the population, and the strengths and comparative advantages of WFP; ii) EQ 2 related to the WFP contribution to the strategic outcomes of the country strategic plan in Mozambique; iii) EQ 3 aims at assessing the efficiency of the WFP portfolio; and iv) EQ 4 aims at exploring the various factors that explain WFP performance and the extent to which it has made the strategic shift expected by the country strategic plan. A series of subquestions, specified dimensions of analysis and lines of inquiry, indicators, data sources, and data collection techniques were proposed and included in the evaluation matrix. A detailed stakeholder analysis helped to identify the key external and internal stakeholders to the country strategic plan, their particular interests and how they could be better involved in the evaluation.

Methods and tools

3. A mixed methods approach was applied with the methods and tools to gather data from different sources and informants presented. Following a preliminary review of key documentation during the inception phase, a systematic documentary review continued throughout the exercise. Specific thematic areas of the country strategic plan have been assigned to the different team members, based on their experience and specific expertise. This allowed analysing secondary quantitative and qualitative information, including recent evaluations conducted in Mozambique, not only restricted to WFP, but also conducted by other stakeholders.

4. An e-survey was conducted as part of the data collection (see Annex 5). The e-survey focused on providing further evidence on selected preliminary findings emerging from the desk review and inception interviews. The survey design and questions were tailored to obtain the views/perspectives from main stakeholder groups: i) WFP staff (country office (CO) and field office), government counterparts, implementing partners, United Nations organizations and donors. The survey was tested and administrated as soon as the inception report was cleared (i.e. between the inception and data collection phases). This allowed the team to start getting inputs at the beginning of the data collection phase, which were then further developed and triangulated during the interviews.

² The preliminary version of the ToC, particularly its key assumptions, was presented and discussed with the country office during the inception workshop

5. The documentary review and the results of the e-survey were complemented by semi-structured interviews carried out with key informants as identified in the stakeholder matrix. All interviews were confidential, but interview notes were collated in a team-shared internal data base.
6. Focus groups were conducted during the in-country mission to get beneficiary perspectives on service delivery and outcome level change at individual, household and community level, including any evidence of behaviour change. These focus groups were carefully managed to ensure respect of the rules in place in terms of social distancing and meetings between individuals in the COVID-19 context.

Process

7. Taking into account the context of uncertainty posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, the team, in coordination with the evaluation manager (EM) and the country office, decided that the data collection phase would be mainly carried out remotely, through documentary review; remote interviews and the e-survey. However, they also considered it pertinent to maintain fieldwork in Mozambique, which was carried out through an in-country mission (see Annex 8). During the in-country mission face to face interviews were conducted, particularly with government counterparts, to complement the interviews carried out remotely. Bilateral work with country office staff was also conducted during the in-country mission, as well as field visits to activities' sites, including focus groups with beneficiaries where possible and interviews with local authorities.
8. Considering the wide scope of the country strategic plan, the vast area covered and the different weight of country strategic plan activities, it was considered opportune to make a purposive sample of the regions to be visited. The sampling criteria included: 1) regions most affected by the cyclones where the humanitarian response can be observed and assessed more systematically; 2) regions where capacity strengthening to prepare for, respond and recover from climate-related shocks have been address; 3) regions where the capacity of government for the national home-grown school feeding can be observed and assessed more systematically. In this connection, the proposed methodology envisaged visits to the provinces of Gaza, Tete and Sofala. However, due to the evolution of the COVID-19 pandemic, the "visit" to the province of Tete was conducted remotely through interviews with key stakeholders.
9. An interactive and participatory process was maintained with the country office throughout the evaluation which included an operational debriefing with the country office (August 2021), an in-depth debriefing (September 2021) and a learning workshop (October 2021).

Data analysis and standards

10. The evaluation adopted the standard United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence and sustainability as well as connectedness and coverage as applicable.

TABLE 2: OECD DAC CRITERIA

| Criteria | Definition | Evaluation Question |
|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Relevance | The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries', country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change | EQ 1 |
| Coherence | The extent to which other interventions support or undermine the intervention, and <i>vice versa</i> . Includes internal coherence (i.e. synergies and interlinkages between the intervention and other interventions as well as the consistency of the intervention with the relevant international norms and standards) and external coherence (i.e. consistency of the intervention with other actors' interventions in the same context) | EQ 1 EQ 2 |
| Effectiveness | The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups | EQ 2 EQ 4 |
| Efficiency | The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way | EQ 3 EQ 4 |
| Sustainability | The extent to which the intervention results are likely to continue | EQ 2 |

Source: Adapted from OECD DAC, 2019

11. Following the data collection phase, an evidence matrix was compiled in order to provide a cross-referenced analysis for the different subquestions and indicators using a specific template. This ensured that the information was cross-checked and triangulated (i.e. the cross-confirmation of findings and conclusions through the various sources – documentary review, interviews, focus groups, e-survey, etc.).

12. The UNEG guidance on gender has been used to shape the evaluation approach³ and the team used it as a basis for ensuring that the gender aspects of the programme were integrated in the evaluation. During data collection, the team ensured that all stakeholders were asked about gender issues related to the different activities to ensure an adequate gender focus in the report. The team conducted gender-disaggregated data analysis where available, and assessed the extent to which the different needs, priorities, voices and vulnerabilities of women and men, boys and girls are considered in the design, selection, implementation and monitoring of the country strategic plan.

13. The principle of equality, inclusion, participation, and non-discrimination were considered in the evaluation process by assessing adherence to humanitarian principles, protection issues and accountability to affected populations (AAP) in relation to WFP emergency response activities. The evaluation examined to what extent the needs of persons with disability were taken into account in the planning and delivery of specific interventions across the different parts of the portfolio, including in access to food distribution sites and cash-based transfer (CBT) points, livelihood interventions, education and school feeding programmes and in gender and emergency response programmes.

Ethical considerations

14. The evaluation was conducted in coherence with the 2020 UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct and Guidance on Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation. Accordingly, the evaluation team and IRAM were responsible for safeguarding and ensuring ethics at all stages of the evaluation. The protocol included ensuring that respondent participation is voluntary and informing all participants of the pros and cons of participating in the interviews and surveys. It was made clear to respondents that no personally identifiable information was collected, and that all responses were anonymous so that findings cannot be attributed to specific respondents. Informants were invited to speak in the language they felt comfortable with.

³ United Nations Evaluation Group; Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation -- Towards UNEG Guidance; 2011.

15. The evaluation team was gender-balanced and composed of a mix of local and international consultants. The gender, cultural and linguistic diversity within the evaluation team facilitated communication with both men and women who were consulted during data collection.

Limitations

16. The evaluation faced a number of limitations and challenges:

- Regarding data availability, the country strategic plan experienced substantial changes in the number and type of indicators, which made it difficult to track progress over time. The limited data available before 2019, affected the capacity of the evaluation team to assess performance for 2017 and 2018 for most type of indicators. The baseline for most indicators was recorded for the first time only in 2019. In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic affected data collection by the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) teams in 2020 and 2021 with repercussion for information related to those years (see a detailed assessment in Annex 9).
- The context of the COVID-19 pandemic and the escalation of the conflict in the northern region prevented more programme sites from being visited. To overcome this barrier, the evaluation team prioritized comprehensive interviews with country office staff at the central level, all WFP field office, implementing partners, donors, government counterparts and other local stakeholders.
- The e-survey received only a limited number of responses from government counterparts, and therefore predominantly reflects the views of non-government stakeholders. The distribution list sent by the country office contained outdated contacts because of the recurring high turnover in government staff. However, this limitation was overcome by increasing the number of interviews with government counterparts, which reached almost 50 percent of the total external stakeholders interviewed.
- Another limitation refers to the remote mode applied for interviews, which was a learning experience for all involved. With important support from the country office and also with the flexibility of the evaluation team, almost all interviews foreseen were completed, despite logistical challenges associated with the remote nature of the interviews. Nonetheless, two important interviews were missing at the time of submission of the draft report, despite successive efforts by the evaluation team and country office, which was with the Russian Federation and the Ministry of Finance regarding the debt swap agreement. Triangulation measures for addressing these limitations were applied to ensure findings were valid, impartial, independent and credible.

Annex 4: Evaluation Matrix

TABLE 3. EVALUATION MATRIX

| Dimensions of analysis | Lines of inquiry | Indicators | Data sources | Data collection techniques | Data analysis |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Evaluation Question 1: To what extent is the strategic position, role, and specific contribution of WFP based on country priorities and people's needs as well as WFP strengths? | | | | | |
| 1.1 To what extent is the country strategic plan relevant to national policies, plans, strategies, and goals, including achievement of the national Sustainable Development Goals? | | | | | |
| 1.1.1 Alignment of strategic objectives and activities to national policies, strategies and plans | <p>The extent to which the strategic outcomes and proposed activities outlined in the CSP contribute to national priorities as expressed in national policies, strategies and plans</p> <p>The extent to which government officials were involved in the CSP design, in the definition of priorities and its alignment to national policies, strategies and plans</p> | <p>17. Evidence of matching between CSP (strategic outcomes and activities) and national priorities/objectives outlined in government policies, strategies and plans</p> <p>18. Level of participation and involvement of government stakeholders in the CSP (and previous operations) design and consecutive revisions, namely contributing to the priorities set</p> <p>19. Perception of stakeholders on the degree of alignment of WFP objectives and interventions with national policies, strategies and plans</p> | <p>20. WFP Strategic Plan (2017-2021)</p> <p>21. CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget revisions; annual country reports (ACR) (2017-2020)</p> <p>22. Previous operations design documents</p> <p>23. Government policies, plans and programmes including, among others: Agenda 2025; National Development Strategy (2015-2035); PQG (2015-2019); PAMRDC; National Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) Strategy; Strategic Plan for the Health Sector (2014-2019); National Basic Social</p> | <p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> | <p>Content analysis</p> <p>Thematic coding from interview notes and evidence matrices to identify passages that are linked by common themes or ideas</p> <p>Triangulation across data collection methods and sources</p> |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | <p>Security Strategy; ESAN II and ESAN III</p> <p>24. Zero Hunger Strategic Review (ZHSR), CSP mid-term review, evaluation of WFP pre-operations</p> <p>25. Government officials, UN officials, implementing partners, CO and RB staff and other external stakeholders</p> | | |
| 1.1.2 Alignment of CSP to SDGs prioritized by Mozambique | The extent to which the strategic outcomes outlined in the CSP were aligned with SDG goals and targets prioritized by Mozambique | <p>26. Evidence of matching between CSP strategic outcomes and national SDG goals and targets</p> <p>27. Explicit reference is made in CSP to the SDG framework of Mozambique⁴</p> <p>28. Evidence of interaction and collaboration of CO with the National Reference Group of the SDGs</p> <p>29. Perception of stakeholders on the degree of alignment of WFP objectives and interventions with SDGs prioritized by Mozambique</p> | <p>30. CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget revisions</p> <p>31. UNDAF (2017-2020) and its progress reports and evaluations, as available</p> <p>32. UNSDCF 2022-2026 preparatory docs, as available</p> <p>33. Mozambique SDG framework and voluntary national review of 2030 agenda</p> <p>34. Government officials, UN staff, donors, CO and RB staff</p> | <p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> | <p>Content analysis</p> <p>Triangulation across data collection methods and sources</p> |

⁴ Mozambique developed a “National Framework for SDG Indicators” which consisted of selecting indicators in each SDG and starting the process of setting targets by 2030.

| 1.2 To what extent did the country strategic plan address the needs of the most vulnerable people in the country to ensure that no one is left behind? | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1.2.1 CSP focus on the most vulnerable groups and regions | <p>The extent to which CSP design was informed by vulnerability assessments and analysis (including gender and disability)</p> <p>The extent to which CSP strategic outcomes and activities focus on the most vulnerable groups (including women and people with disability)</p> <p>The extent to which the CSP focused on geographical areas of: i) greatest poverty and vulnerability; ii) vulnerability to climate crises and natural disasters; iii) humanitarian crises (violence, insecurity, etc.)</p> <p>The extent to which CSP adapted in response to COVID crisis</p> | <p>35. Evidence that CSP design is based on vulnerability assessments (including gender and disability) and analysis of population groups and regions</p> <p>36. Evidence that CSP interventions prioritizes vulnerable population groups (including gender and disability) and regions of high vulnerability, and that it takes into account the differential needs of women and men, and girls and boys</p> <p>37. Evidence of changes in interventions, modalities, geographical coverage and/or beneficiaries in response to COVID-19 pandemic</p> <p>38. Number/type of beneficiaries targeted by the CSP design (disaggregated by vulnerable groups: children, youth, women)</p> <p>39. Perception of stakeholders of the CSP focus on the most vulnerable groups and regions</p> | <p>40. CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget revisions and ACR (2017-2020)</p> <p>41. ZHSR, CSP mid-term review, evaluation of WFP pre-operations</p> <p>42. Country reports and databases (INEs, household surveys, health and nutrition surveys, humanitarian and security situation, etc.)</p> <p>43. WFP and other UN-related databases and mappings (FewsNet, VAM, IPC, etc.)</p> <p>44. Government officials, UN officials, implementing partners, CO and RB staff and donors</p> | <p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> <p>E-survey</p> | <p>Content analysis</p> <p>Processing of quantitative data of country reports and databases</p> <p>Descriptive statistics from e-survey</p> <p>Triangulation across data collection methods and sources</p> |
| 1.2.2 CSP integrates gender equality and women's empowerment | <p>The extent to which CSP design was informed by a consistent gender analysis</p> | <p>45. Evidence that CSP design is based on a gender analysis</p> <p>46. Evidence that CSP interventions have sought to contribute to positive changes in gender roles and power</p> | <p>50. CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget revisions; ACR (2017-2020)</p> | <p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> | <p>Content analysis</p> <p>Four-scale gender equality coding</p> |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | The extent to which CSP strategic outcomes and activities focus on gender equality and women's empowerment | relations, and have identified challenges and opportunities from the perspective of gender and women's empowerment. 47. Evidence that the CSP strategies and priorities have advanced the commitment of WFP to gender transformation 48. Perception of stakeholders of gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment in the CSP 49. Breakdown/proportion of CSP activities by applying the IASC Gender with Age Marker Scale ⁵ | 51. Country reports and databases (INEs, household surveys, health and nutrition surveys, humanitarian and security situation, etc.) 52. WFP and other UN-related databases and mappings (FewsNet, VAM, IPC, etc.) 53. Government officials, UN officials, implementing partners, CO and RB staff and donors | E-survey IASC Gender with Age Marker Scale | framework analysis Descriptive statistics from e-survey |
| 1.3 To what extent has WFP strategic positioning remained relevant throughout the implementation of the country strategic plan in light of changing context, national capacities, and needs? | | | | | |
| 1.3.1 CSP relevance sustained in light of changing political and institutional context, climate and humanitarian crisis, national capacities and needs | The extent to which the CSP was able to adapt to evolving country needs and/or government requests, including in response to COVID pandemic The extent to which the CSP was able to adapt to political and institutional changes, and climate, humanitarian and COVID crises | 54. Evidence that CSP implementation was based on proper risk assessment and consistent adjustments to adapt to evolving country needs, political and institutional changes (elections and turnover of government officials), climate crisis (droughts, cyclones Kenneth and Idai), humanitarian crisis (evolving conflict situation in the north), sanitary crisis (COVID-19) 55. Perception of stakeholders on the strategic positioning of WFP in light of changing context | 57. CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget revisions and ACR (2017-2020) 58. Government officials (in office before and after elections) 59. CO, RB, other UN staff, implementing partners and other external stakeholders | Document review Semi-structured interviews E-survey | Content analysis Thematic coding from interview notes and evidence matrices Descriptive statistics from e-survey Timelines / lists of key events, ordered chronologically |

⁵ The IASC Gender with Age Marker looks at the extent to which essential programming actions address gender- and age-related differences, particularly in humanitarian response.

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | The extent to which WFP partnerships and relations within the UN system (in particular Rome-based agencies (RBAs)) were relevant to the CSP in light of changing context The extent to which WFP can position itself to add value as a service provider to government | 56. Positive/negative aspects and successes/failures of WFP implementation on behalf of the government in regard to Russian debt swap and IFI funding | | | Triangulation across data collection methods and sources |
| 1.4 To what extent is the country strategic plan CSP coherent and aligned with the wider United Nations and include appropriate strategic partnerships based on the comparative advantage of WFP in the country? | | | | | |
| 1.4.1 Alignment of CSP to the UN system priorities in Mozambique | The extent to which CSP strategic outcomes and activities are aligned with the objectives and priorities set in the UNDAF The extent to which the various changes to the CSP over the period of implementation have reinforced alignment with UN system priorities (i.e. continued relevance), particularly in regard to the humanitarian crisis and COVID-19 pandemic | 60. Evidence of matching between CSP (strategic outcomes and activities) and UNDAF priorities, objectives and focus areas (2017-2020) 61. Evidence of WFP participation and contribution to UNDAF implementation process, including cooperation and coordination with other UN agencies 62. Evidence of WFP contribution to or reinforce of UN system priorities particularly in regard to the humanitarian crisis and COVID-19 pandemic | 63. CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget revisions and ACR (2017-2020) 64. UNDAF (2017-2020) and its progress reports and evaluations, as available 65. Government officials (in office before and after elections) 66. CO, RB, other UN staff | Document review Semi-structured interviews | Content analysis Thematic coding from interview notes and evidence matrices Triangulation across data collection methods and sources |
| 1.4.2 Coherence within UN system and with other | The extent to which CSP has established strategic partnerships towards | 67. Evidence that CSP design is based on strategic partnerships within the UN system and with other | 70. CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget | Document review | Content analysis |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| development or humanitarian agencies | <p>better results through a sound collaboration and strategic positioning within the UN system (Delivering as One) in Mozambique.</p> <p>The extent to which CSP articulates the comparative advantage of WFP and reflects the comparative advantage of other UN agencies and partners</p> <p>The extent to which there are synergies and complementarities and/or overlaps between the CSP and activities of other UN agencies (including the RBAs), funds or programmes in Mozambique</p> | <p>development or humanitarian agencies</p> <p>68. Evidence that CSP implementation leveraged opportunities for collaboration and partnerships in the targeted areas</p> <p>69. Perception of stakeholders on the strategic positioning of WFP regarding strategic partnerships and alliances with multi-stakeholders</p> | <p>revisions and ACR (2017-2020)</p> <p>71. CSP implementation reports</p> <p>72. UNDAF (2017-2020) and its progress reports and evaluations</p> <p>73. Government officials (in office before and after elections)</p> <p>74. CO, RB, other UN staff, implementing partners</p> | <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> <p>E-survey</p> | <p>Thematic coding from interview notes and evidence matrices</p> <p>Descriptive statistics from e-survey</p> <p>Triangulation across data collection methods and sources</p> |
| Evaluation Question 2: What is the extent and quality of the specific contribution of WFP to country strategic plan strategic outcomes in the country? | | | | | |
| 2.1 To what extent did WFP deliver expected outputs and contribute to the expected country strategic plan strategic outcomes? | | | | | |
| 2.1.1 Achievement of CSP planned outputs to date and quality of performance | The extent to which CSP has achieved its planned outputs against CSP design | <p>75. Performance data at activity level (outputs accomplished)</p> <p>76. Perception of stakeholders on the quality of WFP performance under each CSP activity</p> | <p>77. CSP implementation reports and CO monitoring and performance reporting at activities and output levels (ACRs, standard project reports (SPRs), etc.)</p> | <p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> <p>Direct observation</p> | Processing and analysis of quantitative data of country reports and databases |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | 78. Indicators' target data (COMET) 79. Government officials, CO, RB, other UN staff, implementing partners and other external stakeholders | (when applicable) ⁶ E-survey | Descriptive statistics from e-survey Thematic coding from interview notes and evidence matrices Triangulation across data collection methods and sources |
| 2.1.2 Achievement of CSP planned strategic outcomes to date and quality of performance | The extent to which CSP planned contribution to CSP strategic outcomes achieved to date and quality of performance at three levels: i) individual; ii) organizational/institutional; iii) enabling environment | 80. Evidence of WFP contribution to Outcome 1 - Households in food insecure areas of Mozambique are able to maintain access to adequate and nutritious food throughout the year, including in times of shock 81. Evidence of WFP contribution to Outcome 2 - Shock affected people in Mozambique are able to meet their basic food and nutrition needs during and immediately after a crisis 82. Evidence of WFP contribution to Outcome 3 - Children in chronically food insecure areas have access to nutritious food throughout the year 83. Evidence of WFP contribution to Outcome 4 - Targeted people in | 89. CSP implementation reports and CO monitoring and performance reporting at outcome (ACRs, SPRs, etc.) 90. Indicators' target data (COMET) 91. National statistics, where available and relevant 92. Government officials, CO, RB, other UN staff, implementing partners and other external stakeholders | Document review Semi-structured interviews E-survey Focus groups | Processing and analysis of quantitative data of country reports and databases Descriptive statistics from e-survey Thematic coding from interview notes and evidence matrices Triangulation across data collection |

⁶ Provided that the in-country mission planned for the data collection phase can take contingent to the evolution of the COVID-19 pandemic situation

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | <p>prioritized areas of Mozambique have improved nutritional status in line with national targets by 2021</p> <p>84. Evidence of WFP contribution to Outcome 5 - Targeted smallholder farmers in northern and central Mozambique have enhanced livelihoods by 2021</p> <p>85. Evidence of WFP contribution to Outcome 6 - Humanitarian and development partners in Mozambique are supported by efficient and effective supply chain and ICT services and expertise</p> <p>86. Evidence of WFP contribution to Outcome 7 - Government and humanitarian partners in Mozambique have access to effective and reliable services during times of crisis.</p> <p>87. Perception of stakeholders on the quality of WFP performance under each CSP strategic outcome</p> <p>88. Extent of analysis on how programmes are affecting women and men differently</p> | 93. Reviews and evaluation reports as available | | methods and sources |
| 2.1.2 CSP effectiveness in capacity strengthening | The extent to which CSP contributed to strengthening national capacities according to the five critical pathways of WFP | 94. Evidence of CSP contribution to strengthening national capacities considering three fundamental levels: 1) the individual level; 2) the organizational or institutional level; 3) the enabling environment | 98. CSP implementation reports and CO monitoring and performance reporting at outcome (ACRs, SPRs, etc.) | Document review Semi-structured interviews Focus groups | Processing and analysis of quantitative data of country reports and databases |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>What were the main successes and limitations in terms of capacity strengthening across the CSP and what factors contributed to the respective achievements (particular areas of attention in this regard were the Government's capacity towards food security and nutrition analysis, the Government's capacity to ensure that social protection programmes and systems are shock-responsive, school feeding, and disaster preparedness)</p> <p>The extent to which WFP implementation on behalf of the Government in regard to Russian debt swap and IFI funding enabled or hindered national and local installed capacity</p> | <p>95. Evidence of whether WFP systems and processes are adapted and transferable to government led processes and arrangements</p> <p>96. Evidence of translation of knowledge and capacities generated into multi-sectoral coordination for planning (particularly regarding the capacity of the Technical Secretariat for Food and Nutrition Security (SETSAN) to design, facilitate and fund the various food security and nutrition assessments and IPC analysis), policy making (particularly the formulation of ESAN III and the establishment of the CONSAN); commitment and skills to take-over of programmes and evidence building to strengthening the nutrition agenda through COHA and FNG studies</p> <p>97. Perception of stakeholders on the relevance and effectiveness of the approaches to and progress in strengthening of national capacities</p> | <p>99. Indicators' target data (COMET)</p> <p>100. Government officials, CO, RB, other UN staff, implementing partners and other external stakeholders, and in particular those partners that also play a key role in capacity strengthening</p> | E-survey | Triangulation across data collection methods and sources, including by applying the WFP framework criteria to assess capacity strengthening ⁷ |
| 2.2 To what extent did WFP contribute to achievement of cross-cutting aims (humanitarian principles, protection, disability, accountability to affected populations, gender and other equity considerations)? | | | | | |

⁷ WFP support the underlying conditions that are critical to enhancing national response capacities by facilitating change at three fundamental levels: (1) the enabling environment, (2) the organizational or institutional level, and (3) the individual level

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>2.2.1 CSP contribution to cross-cutting aims</p> | <p>The extent to which CSP contributes to humanitarian principles, protection principles, accountability to affected populations, gender equity and women's empowerment, people with disability, environmental principles and targets</p> <p>To what extent the response to COVID-19 crisis changed the degree of contribution to cross-cutting aims</p> | <p>101.Evidence of humanitarian principles, protection principles, accountability to affected populations, disability, gender equity and women's empowerment, environmental principles reflected in the CSP</p> <p>102.Evidence of any change derived from the COVID-19 pandemic and response in regard to WFP contribution to cross-cutting aims</p> <p>103.Evidence of any gender transformation and other cross-cutting aims encompassing CSP implementation and results achieved</p> <p>104.Perception of stakeholders on the CSP contribution to reaching cross-cutting aims and targets.</p> | <p>105.WFP policy documents and guidelines on cross-cutting aims</p> <p>106.CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget revisions</p> <p>107.CSP implementation reports and CO monitoring reporting</p> <p>108.Government officials, CO, RB, other UN staff, implementing partners and other external stakeholders</p> <p>109.Reports from UN agencies and implementing partners</p> <p>110.Evaluations and reviews as available</p> | <p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> <p>E-survey</p> | <p>Content analysis</p> <p>Thematic coding from interview notes and evidence matrices</p> <p>Descriptive statistics from e-survey</p> <p>Triangulation across data collection methods and sources</p> |
| <p>2.3 To what extent are the achievements of the country strategic plan likely to be sustained?</p> | | | | | |
| <p>2.3.1 Country ownership and capacity (technical and financial) to sustain interventions after CSP completion</p> | <p>The extent to which The Government of Mozambique and other external stakeholders show ownership of CSP objectives and strategy and perceive integration of CSP and government objectives, approaches, and programmes</p> | <p>111.Evidence of alignment of government policies and programmes with CSP activities, i.e., extent to which objectives and approaches are shared</p> <p>112.Evidence of decision making and concrete steps by the Government and other stakeholders such as the private sector, civil society, etc. (e.g. national structures, legislation, plans and programmes at national and local level, human and financial resources,</p> | <p>115.Sectoral government policies and programmes (national and provincial level)</p> <p>116.Statements of government policy and strategy on health, nutrition, school feeding, social protection, disaster</p> | <p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> <p>E-survey</p> | <p>Content analysis</p> <p>Thematic coding from interview notes and evidence matrices</p> <p>Descriptive statistics from e-survey</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Quality of handover of programmes from WFP to government and the extent to which government acquired the necessary capacities to maintain and/or replicate the CSP results | etc.) to maintain and/or replicate the CSP results 113.Evidence that clear and agreed handover strategies have been completed and are in place 114.Perception of stakeholders on country ownership of CSP | risk reduction and preparedness 117.Government officials, CO, RB, other UN staff, implementing partners and other external stakeholders | | Triangulation across data collection methods and sources |
| 2.4 In humanitarian contexts, to what extent did the country strategic plan facilitate more strategic linkages between humanitarian, development, and (where appropriate) peace work? | | | | | |
| 2.4.1 Strategic links within the humanitarian-development-peace nexus | The extent to which CSP design addresses the humanitarian-development-peace nexus The extent to which CSP implementation facilitates progress at the humanitarian-development-peace nexus | 118.Evidence that CSP design acknowledges significance of the humanitarian-development-peace nexus 119.Evidence that CSP implementation adopted the “New Way of Working Approach” – i.e. greater collaboration, coordination and coherence between humanitarian and development actors – to facilitate progress at the humanitarian-development-peace nexus, particularly in crisis situations (climate, environmental, social, violence, COVID-19, etc.) that have affected Mozambique: this will be assessed by applying the concepts of: 1) collective outcome; 2) comparative advantage; and 3) multi-year timeframe to identify possible interlinkages between humanitarian, development and peace actions and actors in the frame of CSP implementation. | 124.CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget revisions; ACR (2017-2020) 125.Documentation and reports concerning the humanitarian situation and response in Mozambique 126.Reports from government counterparts and UN partner agencies 127.Government officials, CO, RB, other UN staff, implementing partners and other external stakeholders | Document review Semi-structured interviews E-survey | Content analysis Thematic coding from interview notes and evidence matrices Descriptive statistics from e-survey Analysis of the triple nexus based on the three key concepts underpinning the new way of working Triangulation across data collection methods and sources |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | <p>120.Evidence that CSP managed to mobilize resources for preparedness and response to emergencies</p> <p>121.Evidence of WFP engagement with the Government and partners at national and decentralized level, including how it has adapted its modalities of implementation (particularly in-kind transfers and cash-based transfers) to strengthen working across the nexus.</p> <p>122.Evidence of synergies with other UN agencies to facilitate progress at the humanitarian-development-peace nexus</p> <p>123.Stakeholder perceptions of the contribution of WFP to programming across the nexus</p> | | | |
| Evaluation Question 3: To what extent has WFP used its resources efficiently in contributing to country strategic plan outputs and strategic outcomes? | | | | | |
| 3.1 To what extent were outputs delivered within the intended timeframe? | | | | | |
| 3.1.1 Adherence to timeframe | <p>The extent to which CSP activities has been delivered as proposed in the CSP timeframe and subsequent annual plans</p> <p>The extent to which the COVID-19 pandemic affected the ability of WFP to deliver on time</p> | <p>128.Evidence that activities and outputs delivering meets the CSP timeframe</p> <p>129.Evidence of any adjustments in the timeframe duly justified and in accordance with eventualities or changes in context (e.g. humanitarian crisis and COVID-19 response)</p> <p>130.Comparative timeliness analysis pre- and post-Level 2 (L2)/Level 3 (L3) activation</p> | <p>133.CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget revisions; ACR (2017-2020)</p> <p>134.CSP implementation reports and CO monitoring reporting</p> <p>135.Government officials, CO, RB, other UN staff, implementing partners</p> | <p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> <p>Focus groups</p> | <p>Content analysis</p> <p>Analysis of logistics management indicators</p> <p>Qualitative analysis of causes for delays</p> |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | 131.Evidence of budget delivered as planned 132.Assessment of logistics management indicators | and other external stakeholders 136.Beneficiaries (recipients of food, CBT and other service delivery) | | Timelines / lists of key events, ordered chronologically Triangulation across data collection methods and sources |
| 3.2 To what extent was coverage and targeting of interventions appropriate? | | | | | |
| 3.2.1 Appropriateness of targeting and coverage | The extent to which targeting and coverage of CSP activities are justified and realistic based on existing mapping, assessments and stakeholders' perceptions The extent to which CSP targeting and coverage changed due to COVID-19 crisis | 137.Evidence of CSP activities reflecting standard criteria/practices to define targeting and coverage 138.Adoption of humanitarian, protection, accountability to affected populations, disability, gender equality and women's empowerment and environmental principles and goals to define targeting and coverage 139.Number of provinces and municipalities of greatest vulnerability targeted by the CSP design 140.Evidence of any adaptation in intervention's targeting and coverage in response to COVID crisis 141.Perception of stakeholders on the appropriateness of CSP targeting and coverage 142.Evidence of community/beneficiary consultations to define targeting and coverage | 143.WFP corporate guidelines and recommendations 144.CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget revisions; ACR (2017-2020) 145.CSP implementation reports and CO monitoring reporting 146.Country sectoral assessments, databases and mappings (INE, FewNet, VAM, IPC, etc.) 147.Government officials, CO, RB, other UN staff, implementing partners and other external stakeholders | Document review Semi-structured interviews E-survey | Content analysis Thematic coding from interview notes and evidence matrices Descriptive statistics from e-survey Timelines / lists of key events, ordered chronologically Triangulation across data collection methods and sources |

| 3.3 To what extent were WFP activities cost-efficient in delivery of its assistance? | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3.3.1 Cost-efficiency of CSP implementation | <p>The extent to which CSP has been able to maximize benefits with strategies to manage cost</p> <p>The extent to which CSP has incurred in additional costs regarding COVID-19 protective measures</p> <p>The extent to which WFP implementation on behalf of the government in regard to Russian debt swap and IFI funding contributed to an efficient management of public resources</p> | <p>148.Evidence of outputs achieved with strategies to manage cost in place</p> <p>149.Cost categories analysis by modality, geographical areas</p> <p>150.Assessment of costs evolution over time and of the most determinant factors affecting costs and what measures have been put in place to manage costs</p> <p>151.Evidence of active strategies in place to reduce costs and maximize benefits (e.g. complementarities between donors and partners, maximization of use of digital platforms, market and price analysis, etc.)</p> <p>152.Evidence of WFP ensuring the use of public resources (Russian debt swap and IFIs funding) for the intended purpose</p> <p>153.Evidence of lower transaction costs, more agile and faster procurement processes, complementarities between donors/partners and public resources, etc.</p> <p>154.Evidence of additional costs incurred due to COVID-19 response</p> <p>155.Perception of stakeholders on CSP cost-efficiency</p> | <p>156.CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget revisions; ACR (2017-2020)</p> <p>157.CSP implementation reports and CO monitoring reporting</p> <p>158.Funding and financial execution by strategic outcome and activity</p> <p>159.Government officials, CO, RB, other UN staff, implementing partners and other external stakeholders</p> | <p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> | <p>Content analysis</p> <p>Processing and analysis of budget and financial data of country reports and databases</p> <p>Thematic coding from interview notes and evidence matrices</p> <p>Timelines</p> <p>Triangulation across data collection methods and sources</p> |

| 3.4 To what extent were alternative, more cost-effective measures considered? | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3.4.1 Cost-effectiveness | <p>The extent to which other alternatives and types of interventions were considered in CSP design and/or subsequent annual plans</p> <p>The extent to which other alternatives and types of interventions were discussed with partners and government counterparts</p> | <p>160.Evidence of cost-effectiveness analysis in the CSP design and subsequent planning and whether alternative modalities/approaches were considered and if the choices made were justified</p> <p>161.Existence of studies/evaluations that examine issues around cost-effectiveness</p> <p>162.Evidence that CSP interventions and possible alternatives were discussed with government counterparts</p> <p>163.Perception of stakeholders on CSP cost-effectiveness</p> | <p>164.CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget revisions</p> <p>165.ACR (2017-2020)</p> <p>166.CSP implementation reports and CO monitoring reporting</p> <p>167.Funding and financial execution by strategic outcome and activity</p> <p>168.Government officials, CO, RB, other UN staff, implementing partners and other external stakeholders</p> <p>169.</p> | <p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> <p>E-survey</p> | <p>Content analysis</p> <p>Qualitative appreciation by different stakeholders of different modalities</p> <p>Qualitative analysis of flexibility in changing</p> <p>Triangulation across data collection methods and sources</p> |
| Evaluation Question 4: What are the factors that explain WFP performance and the extent to which it has made the strategic shift expected by the country strategic plan? | | | | | |
| 4.1 To what extent did WFP analyse or use existing evidence on the hunger challenges, food security and nutrition issues in the country to develop the country strategic plan? | | | | | |
| 4.1.1 Comprehensiveness and quality of data and analysis used in CSP design | <p>The extent to which qualitative and quantitative evidence/analysis on the hunger challenges, the food security and nutrition issues in Mozambique was used in CSP design</p> | <p>170.Evidence that CSP design was based on ZHSR analysis and on current government policy, and that the design systematically took into account different food security and nutrition needs of women, men, girls and boys.</p> <p>171.Evidence that lessons learned and recommendations from past</p> | <p>174.Zero Hunger Strategic Review</p> <p>175.CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget revisions</p> <p>176.ACR (2017-2020)</p> | <p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> | <p>Content analysis</p> <p>Triangulation across data collection methods and sources</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | The extent to which any data specific to the COVID-19 response has been collected | <p>evaluations and mid-term reviews were considered during design.</p> <p>172. Informant confirmation that CSP appropriately analysed/ used existing evidence in design</p> <p>173. Evidence that the CSP integrated attention to improving data and analysis where gaps exist, particularly in regard to COVID-19</p> | <p>177. Government policies, plans and programmes</p> <p>178. Government officials, UN officials, implementing partners, CO and RB staff and other external stakeholders</p> <p>179. Evaluations of pre-CSP operations and CSP mid-term review</p> | | |
| 4.2 To what extent has WFP been able to mobilize adequate, predictable and flexible resources to finance the country strategic plan? | | | | | |
| 4.2.1 Adequacy of resourcing for the CSP | <p>The extent to which CSP relied on adequate resource mobilization, maximizing and diversifying funding sources</p> <p>The extent to which the COVID-19 crisis reflected on additional financial needs</p> | <p>180. Needs vs mobilized resources for period 2016-2021 across outcome and activity areas</p> <p>181. Sources of funding per type and level of earmarking</p> <p>182. Funding and financial execution by strategic outcome and activity</p> <p>183. Evidence of additional requests and level of funding in response to COVID-19</p> <p>184. Evidence of active fundraising through the mobilization and engagement of government, RB, UN agencies, IFIs (e.g. fundraising strategy)</p> <p>185. Evidence that WFP has sought out new funders and new partnerships, namely IFIs (including in response to COVID-19)</p> | <p>189. CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget revisions; ACR (2017-2020); resource situation reports</p> <p>190. Memorandums of understanding (MOUs), technical and cooperation agreements</p> <p>191. Government officials, CO, RB, other UN staff, implementing partners and other external stakeholders</p> | <p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> | <p>Content analysis</p> <p>Processing and analysis of budget and financial data of country reports and databases</p> <p>Thematic coding from interview notes and evidence matrices</p> <p>Triangulation across data collection methods and sources</p> |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | <p>186.Evidence of gaps between CSP resources projected, allocated and received between 2016-2020 by strategic outcome, type of funds and donors</p> <p>187.Evidence that CSP programming and dedicated resources for gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) initiatives and GEWE-related expenses (15 percent threshold of project funds)</p> <p>188.Stakeholders' perceptions on the adequacy of funds, the quantity and quality of proposals presented to donors, and barriers to greater funding</p> | | | |
| 4.2.2 Predictability of resourcing for the CSP | The extent to which financial resources availability were timely and adequate to cover all SO of the CSP | <p>192.Evidence of gaps between funds expected, allocated and received, according to allocation commitments of the different donors/financing sources</p> <p>193.Funding and financial execution by strategic outcome and activity</p> <p>194.Evidence of use of emergency funds for unexpected situations (e.g. cyclones and other exceptional events)</p> | <p>195.CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget revisions; ACR (2017-2020); resource situation reports</p> <p>196.MoUs, technical and cooperation agreements</p> <p>197.Reports to donors</p> <p>198.Government officials, CO, RB, other UN staff, implementing partners and other external stakeholders</p> | <p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> | <p>Content analysis</p> <p>Processing and analysis of budget and financial data of country reports and databases</p> <p>Timelines</p> <p>Triangulation across data collection methods and sources</p> |
| 4.2.3 Flexibility of resourcing for the CSP | The extent to which the aid system was able to channel flexible funds, | 199.Proportion of funds earmarked to certain activities versus funds | 202.CSP (2017-2021) documents and | Document review | Content analysis |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | based on the entire CSP and unrestricted to specific levels | unrestricted to specific activities/outcomes 200.Evidence of active fundraising strategies and correspondent outcomes 201.Evidence of new funders and new partnerships in response to COVID-19 crisis | consecutive budget revisions; ACR (2017-2020) 203.Funding and financial execution by strategic outcome and activity 204.MoUs, technical and cooperation agreements 205.Reports to donors 206.Government officials, CO, RB, other UN staff, implementing partners and other external stakeholders | Semi-structured interviews | Processing and analysis of budget and financial data of country reports and databases Timelines Triangulation across data collection methods and sources |
| 4.3 To what extent did the country strategic plan lead to partnerships and collaborations with other actors that positively influenced performance and results? | | | | | |
| 4.3.1 Coherence and effectiveness of CSP strategic partnerships 4.3.2 Effectiveness of CSP strategic partnerships | Extent to which WFP has engaged in partnerships and collaboration during CSP implementation Coherence of partnerships and their influence and collaboration on CSP performance and results Extent to which WFP has engaged in and/or sought new partnerships in response to COVID-19 crisis | 207.Evidence of synergies and complementarities with other and new partners/partnerships to mobilize funding (e.g. CO partnership strategy) 208.Evidence of implementation of coordinated actions with partners and their effects (including in response to COVID-19) 209.Quality of South-South co-operation (especially with the Centre of Excellence against Hunger in Brazil) and its contribution to CSP results 210.Evidence of engagement with regional bodies/regional initiatives. | 213.CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget revisions; ACR (2017-2020) 214.MoUs, technical and cooperation agreements 215.Reports to and from partners 216.Government officials, CO, RB, other UN staff, implementing partners and other external stakeholders | Document review Semi-structured interviews | Content analysis Thematic coding from interview notes and evidence matrices Triangulation across data collection methods and sources |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | <p>211.Evidence that partnerships and collaborations allowed the replication or expansion of results</p> <p>212.Stakeholders' perceptions on the quality of partnerships and collaboration of CSP</p> | | | |
| 4.4 To what extent did the country strategic plan provide greater flexibility in dynamic operational contexts and how did it affect results? | | | | | |
| 4.4.1 Flexibility and organizational readiness in dynamic operational contexts | <p>WFP is equipped for delivering the different activities of the CSP by looking at key organizational readiness dimensions</p> <p>Extent to which the CSP provided WFP with adequate human resources</p> <p>Extent to which CSP structure and procedures have enhanced flexibility</p> <p>Extent to which of CSP structure and procedures have influenced results</p> <p>Extent to which the quality of CSP monitoring system has allowed to adjust to changes</p> | <p>217.Analysis of adequacy of human resources and internal organization for CSP implementation in a dynamic context</p> <p>218.Quality of CO leadership and evidence of extent to which CSP structure and procedures have affected flexibility in terms of funding allocation; human resource allocation; adaptiveness to evolving needs, context and contingencies – including in response to COVID-19</p> <p>219.Evidence of extent to which CSP structure and procedures - including the monitoring system - had a positive or negative effect on quantity and quality of results, including internal and external accountability</p> <p>220.Quality of oversight, technical guidance and support provided by HQ and RB to CO in the frame of CSP</p> | <p>221.CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget revisions; ACR (2017-2020)</p> <p>222.CSP mid-term review</p> <p>223.CSP implementation reports and CO monitoring reporting</p> <p>224.Reports to partners</p> <p>225.Government officials, CO, RB, other UN staff, implementing partners and other external stakeholders</p> | <p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> <p>E-survey</p> | <p>Content analysis</p> <p>Thematic coding from interview notes and evidence matrices</p> <p>Timelines</p> <p>Triangulation across data collection methods and sources</p> |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Extent to which WFP was able to adapt to needs created by the COVID pandemic | | | | |
| 4.5 What are the other factors that can explain WFP performance and the extent to which is has made the strategic shift expected by the country strategic plan? | | | | | |
| 4.5.1 Internal factors contributing to or challenging the successful implementation of CSP | Analysis of internal factors (under direct control of WFP and CO) | <p>226.Adequacy of staffing across CO structure and alignment with the ambitions of the CSP and the strategic shift envisioned (including level of staff retention/turnover and staff work overload)</p> <p>227.Extent of oversight and quality of support provided by the RB and by relevant HQ divisions to critical areas of programming and implementation.</p> <p>228.Adequacy and quality of the surge support provided for the humanitarian response.</p> <p>229.Evidence of adequate monitoring and evidence development systems, communication and knowledge management, lessons learned and extent to which these are used to inform and guide decision making and strategic shifts during the CSP implementation.</p> | <p>230.CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget revisions; ACR (2017-2020)</p> <p>231.CSP mid-term review</p> <p>232.Humanitarian evaluation and other reporting on the response to the cyclones</p> <p>233.CSP implementation reports and CO monitoring reporting</p> <p>234.WFP human resource data</p> <p>235.CO and RB staff</p> | <p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> <p>Processing of CO staff data</p> <p>E-survey</p> | <p>Content analysis</p> <p>Thematic coding from interview notes and evidence matrices</p> <p>Timelines</p> <p>Descriptive statistics from e-survey</p> <p>Triangulation across data collection methods and sources</p> |
| 4.5.2 External factors contributing to or challenging the successful implementation of CSP | Analysis of external factors (external variables out of direct control of WFP and CO) | 236.Evidence of adjustments and/or interruption of activities due to external factors (e.g. natural disasters, conflicts and humanitarian situations, health and sanitary crisis, etc.) | <p>238.CSP (2017-2021) documents and consecutive budget revisions; ACR (2017-2020)</p> <p>239.CSP mid-term review</p> | <p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> <p>E-survey</p> | <p>Content analysis</p> <p>Thematic coding from interview notes and evidence matrices</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | 237.Evidence of adjustments, delays, interruption of activities derived from capacity constraints of government counterparts, decentralization process, changes in government departments after elections, etc.. | 240.CSP implementation reports and CO monitoring reporting 241.Government officials, CO, RB, other UN staff, implementing partners and other external stakeholders | | Timelines Descriptive statistics from e-survey Triangulation across data collection methods and sources |
|--|--|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Annex 5: E-Survey Report

1. This annex presents the results of the online perception survey administered by the evaluation team. The e-survey was developed in Alchemer.com. A test survey was developed in May 2021 and tested first by the evaluation team and, following some adjustments, WFP staff in the country office. The final survey was launched in June 2021. It was shared with a total of 315 people. Two reminders were sent in June.
2. The survey has received a total of 122 replies. The survey response rate was 38.7 percent. The response rate for government contacts was 27.8 percent, that of development partners is 25.0 percent and the response rate of WFP staff was 39.5 percent.
3. The survey remained open in July because the team made significant efforts to increase the number of non-WFP respondents. The list used for distribution did not contain many names of partners or government officials and some of the names and addresses were no longer valid. The team used the interview process to remind and request stakeholders to reply to the survey.
4. Data from the survey should be used judiciously, especially when it comes to interpreting the answers from non-WFP stakeholders. Given the low number of responses in some stakeholder groups, the insights the survey provides might not be fully representative. The analysis presented below aggregates responses provided by external stakeholders. The limited number of responses from individual external stakeholder groups are not sufficient to provide statistically meaningful results when fully disaggregated.

STATISTICAL QUESTIONS

TABLE 4. TYPE OF ORGANIZATION/INSTITUTION

| Category | Percent | Count |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|
| Government | 8.2% | 10 |
| WFP | 83.6% | 102 |
| Development partner/aid agency/multilateral agency | 6.6% | 8 |
| Non-governmental organization (NGO)/other implementing partners | 0.8% | 1 |
| Private sector | 0.8% | 1 |
| | Total | 122 |

TABLE 5. GEOGRAPHICAL SCOPE OF YOUR WORK

| Value | Percent | Count |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|
| I work mostly at central/national level (e.g. central government or country office/mission) | 50% | 61 |
| I work mostly at the province level | 29.5% | 36 |
| I work mostly at the district or community level | 20.5% | 25 |
| | Total | 121 |

TABLE 6. GENDER OF E-SURVEY RESPONDENTS

| Segment | Value | Percent | Count | % of Total |
|-----------------------|--------|---------|-------|------------|
| WFP | Female | 41.2% | 42 | 17.2% |
| | Male | 58.8% | 60 | 24.6% |
| External stakeholders | Female | 45% | 9 | 3.7% |
| | Male | 55% | 11 | 4.5% |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------|-------|----|-------|
| All | Female | 41.8% | 51 | 20.9% |
| | Male | 58.2% | 71 | 29.1% |

TABLE 7. MAIN AREA(S) OF WORK IN RELATION TO WFP IN 2020 AND 2021

| Segment | Value | Percent | Count | % of Total |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|------------|
| WFP | Humanitarian assistance/emergency response | 49% | 50 | 20.5% |
| | Food security, including cash and/or food transfers | 31.4% | 32 | 13.1% |
| | Nutrition, including combat stunting and micronutrient deficiencies | 17.6% | 18 | 7.4% |
| | School feeding | 35.3% | 36 | 14.8% |
| | Social protection | 21.6% | 22 | 9% |
| | Resilience to climate-related shocks | 24.5% | 25 | 10.2% |
| | Support to smallholder farmers | 13.7% | 14 | 5.7% |
| | Gender and women's empowerment | 8.8% | 9 | 3.7% |
| | Logistics and supply chain | 17.6% | 18 | 7.4% |
| | Monitoring | 33.3% | 34 | 13.9% |
| Other | 17.6% | 18 | 7.4% | |
| External stakeholders | Humanitarian assistance/emergency response | 35% | 7 | 2.9% |
| | Food security, including cash and/or food transfers | 25% | 5 | 2% |
| | Nutrition, including combat stunting and micronutrient deficiencies | 15% | 3 | 1.2% |
| | School feeding | 10% | 2 | 0.8% |
| | Social protection | 5% | 1 | 0.4% |
| | Resilience to climate-related shocks | 10% | 2 | 0.8% |
| | Support to smallholder farmers | 30% | 6 | 2.5% |
| | Gender and women's empowerment | 10% | 2 | 0.8% |
| | Logistics and supply chain | 20% | 4 | 1.6% |
| | Monitoring | 10% | 2 | 0.8% |
| Other | 10% | 2 | 0.8% | |

PERCEPTION QUESTIONS

How would you rank WFP's expertise and role in the following thematic areas compared to other actors present in the country?

FIGURE 1. SUMMARY GRAPH FOR CATEGORY 'ALL'




TABLE 8. WFP EXPERTISE AND ROLE IN THE FOLLOWING THEMATIC AREAS COMPARED TO OTHER ACTORS

| | Don't know | | 1-low/not relevant | | 2-average/somewhat relevant | | 3-good/relevant | | 4-excellent/very relevant | | Responses Count |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------|--------------------|-------|-----------------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|---------------------------|-------|-----------------|
| | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | |
| Humanitarian response / emergency assistance | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 1 | 1.0% | 0 | % | 2 | 2.0% | 19 | 18.6% | 80 | 78.4% | 102 |
| External stakeholders | 0 | % | 0 | % | 3 | 17.6% | 8 | 47.1% | 6 | 35.3% | 17 |
| All | 1 | 0.8% | 0 | % | 5 | 4.2% | 27 | 22.7% | 86 | 72.3% | 119 |
| Food security, including cash and/or food transfers | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 2 | 2.0% | 0 | % | 1 | 1.0% | 40 | 39.2% | 59 | 57.8% | 102 |
| External stakeholders | 4 | 23.5% | 0 | % | 1 | 5.9% | 9 | 52.9% | 3 | 17.6% | 17 |
| All | 6 | 5.0% | 0 | % | 2 | 1.7% | 49 | 41.2% | 62 | 52.1% | 119 |
| Nutrition, including combat stunting and micronutrient deficiencies | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 5 | 4.9% | 1 | 1.0% | 10 | 9.8% | 53 | 52.0% | 33 | 32.4% | 102 |
| External stakeholders | 4 | 23.5% | 0 | % | 2 | 11.8% | 9 | 52.9% | 2 | 11.8% | 17 |
| All | 9 | 7.6% | 1 | 0.8% | 12 | 10.1% | 62 | 52.1% | 35 | 29.4% | 119 |
| School feeding | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 4 | 3.9% | 0 | % | 8 | 7.8% | 43 | 42.2% | 47 | 46.1% | 102 |
| External stakeholders | 4 | 23.5% | 0 | % | 3 | 17.6% | 8 | 47.1% | 2 | 11.8% | 17 |
| All | 8 | 6.7% | 0 | % | 11 | 9.2% | 51 | 42.9% | 49 | 41.2% | 119 |

| Social protection | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|-------|---|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|-----|
| WFP | 9 | 8.8% | 3 | 2.9% | 19 | 18.6% | 41 | 40.2% | 30 | 29.4% | 102 |
| External stakeholders | 5 | 31.3% | 0 | % | 6 | 37.5% | 4 | 25.0% | 1 | 6.3% | 16 |
| All | 14 | 11.9% | 3 | 2.5% | 25 | 21.2% | 45 | 38.1% | 31 | 26.3% | 118 |
| Resilience to climate-related shocks | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 7 | 6.9% | 3 | 3.0% | 25 | 24.8% | 40 | 39.6% | 26 | 25.7% | 101 |
| External stakeholders | 4 | 25.0% | 0 | % | 7 | 43.8% | 3 | 18.8% | 2 | 12.5% | 16 |
| All | 11 | 9.4% | 3 | 2.6% | 32 | 27.4% | 43 | 36.8% | 28 | 23.9% | 117 |
| Support to smallholder farmers | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 11 | 10.9% | 2 | 2.0% | 28 | 27.7% | 38 | 37.6% | 22 | 21.8% | 101 |
| External stakeholders | 3 | 15.8% | 2 | 10.5% | 6 | 31.6% | 5 | 26.3% | 3 | 15.8% | 19 |
| All | 14 | 11.7% | 4 | 3.3% | 34 | 28.3% | 43 | 35.8% | 25 | 20.8% | 120 |
| Logistics and supply chain | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 3 | 2.9% | 3 | 2.9% | 16 | 15.7% | 33 | 32.4% | 47 | 46.1% | 102 |
| External stakeholders | 3 | 17.6% | 0 | % | 1 | 5.9% | 7 | 41.2% | 6 | 35.3% | 17 |
| All | 6 | 5.0% | 3 | 2.5% | 17 | 14.3% | 40 | 33.6% | 53 | 44.5% | 119 |

How well has WFP been able to adapt and respond to changes in the external context (natural disasters, internal conflicts, humanitarian response, COVID-19)?

TABLE 9. WFP ADAPTATION TO CHANGES IN EXTERNAL CONTEXT

| Segment | Value | Percent | Count | % of Total |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|------------|
| WFP | WFP has successfully adapted to changes in external circumstances | 45.1% | 46 | 18.9% |
| | WFP has tried to adapt to external circumstances with some success but has also faced challenges | 51% | 52 | 21.3% |
| | WFP has tried to adapt to external circumstances with no success | 1% | 1 | 0.4% |
| | WFP has not tried to adapt to changes in external circumstances | 1% | 1 | 0.4% |
| | I don't know | 2% | 2 | 0.8% |
| External stakeholders | WFP has successfully adapted to changes in external circumstances | 15% | 3 | 1.2% |
| | WFP has tried to adapt to external circumstances with some success but has also faced challenges | 65% | 13 | 5.3% |
| | WFP has tried to adapt to external circumstances with no success | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| | WFP has not tried to adapt to changes in external circumstances | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| | I don't know | 20% | 4 | 1.6% |
| All | WFP has successfully adapted to changes in external circumstances | 40.2% | 49 | 20.1% |
| | WFP has tried to adapt to external circumstances with some success but has also faced challenges | 53.3% | 65 | 26.6% |
| | WFP has tried to adapt to external circumstances with no success | 0.8% | 1 | 0.4% |
| | WFP has not tried to adapt to changes in external circumstances | 0.8% | 1 | 0.4% |

| | | | | |
|--|--------------|------|---|------|
| | I don't know | 4.9% | 6 | 2.5% |
|--|--------------|------|---|------|

What could WFP have done to adapt better to changes in the external context?

TABLE 10. VIEWS FROM WFP RESPONDENTS

| ResponseID | Response |
|------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 41 | Career development and giving opportunities to everyone , we are in Mozambique and with great intellectual capacity and sometimes we are not considered for not being fluent in English , but there are foreigners who do not know how to speak Portuguese and we teach ourselves and sometimes we are the most capable and material and work experience, and school and recruitment criteria should be reviewed |
| 42 | More effective coordination with the Government for beneficiary targeting, selection and registration criteria harmonization |
| 43 | Improve engagement with partners of implementation |
| 50 | Trocar experiencias com outras agencias que estejam focalizadas e fortes em se adaptar melhor ainda a estas mudancas externas |
| 66 | O mais importante já fez. Reorganizou-se para adaptar-se ao novo contexto através de várias acções desenvolvidas nomeadamente divisão do número de beneficiários a serem atendidos na distribuição, obrigatoriedade de dois baldes de água com javel para a lavagem das mãos, uso obrigatório das máscaras, distanciamento etc. |
| 72 | Better planning and being proactive |
| 83 | Proteger cada vez mais e melhor os trabalhadres do campo (monitores de campo), porque estes lidam com diversas pessoas e a comunidade onde estao assistir. Equipar com material de proteccao das motorizadas que os monitores de campo usam para o seu trabalho do dia a dia (vestuario de proteccao termica e impacto, botas de seguranca, lucas, jaketas de conductor de motorizada. Por se tartar mota um veiculo nao so perigoso em termos de seguranca rodoviaria, assim tambem o monitor por estar ao at livre core o risco de ser contaminado pelo COVID-19 se alguem inspirar no ambiente onde esta a trafegar por andar for a de cabine, uma das solucoes seria os monitores de campo de PMA passarem a usar viatura em ves de motocicletas |
| 84 | Provide the communities with the necessary tools and technologies for them to be self sufficient |
| 85 | Vacinar todos os colaboradores do WFP que trabalham no terreno |
| 89 | O problema foi a falta de fundos para responder a alguns casos de assistencia humanitaria. Neste caso, deveria melhorar a gestao dos fundos e coordenar melhor com os doadores para nao enfrentar problemas similares no meio da assistencia humanitaria |
| 98 | In the external context, WFP should improve its conditional food assistance programs or for the creation of community assets or assets through long-term programs so that the assets in the communities have a follow-up to strengthen the beneficiaries in the recovery of their assets affected by the natural disasters |
| 100 | WFP could be better prepared with a strong VAM/research team that can inform not only possible threats/incoming changes, possible scenarios, but also best approaches. This would also contribute for fundraising |
| 101 | Melhorar a capacidade de resposta rapida/em tempo utel (logistica), mobilizacao de mais recursos para atender situacoes de desastres (imprevisiveis) |
| 103 | The adaptation to external circumstances does not always depend on the goodwill of the WFP, conjunctural issues at the political level of the government may create challenges that can hardly be adaptable for the WFP to timely respond to an emergency and humanitarian situation. The approach of a response through UN clusters to provide a complete package for humanitarian response and bilateral meetings with cooperating partners still the strategic approach to overcome some challenges in the political context, and successful, but above all, the identification of |

| | |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | the real needs of the target group (at district and community levels) is crucial to ensure an effective response and successful interventions |
| 109 | have more funds |
| 118 | Plan and prepare well. Making sure that all parties involved (external- government partners and internal-amongst different departments and different sub offices) are well aware of what is happening so as to share information and have better results. In summary, early inclusion of all involved |
| 126 | Improve prepositioning of staff and personnel at field level for forecasted emergencies |
| 128 | Be more wary of the changing political, economic and business environment at national level and regional level. Do more political and policy analysis and be proactive on prevention and mitigation of its effects and impacts |
| 134 | Good resources allocations. Strategic planning in a context based manner. Good programming especially moving from emergency interventions to long term development as well as changing on contracting type |
| 137 | Valorizacao do staff nacional |
| 139 | Attract more qualified staff |
| 142 | Angariar mais fundos por forma a aumentar mais o numero de beneficiarios |
| 143 | Save and changes lives |
| 148 | WFP has great flexibility to adjust the way it works to adapt to respond to new contexts. For example, in the context of the disasters: (before the disaster) WFP deployed staff to prepare the local population, (during a disaster) conduct assessment and use its logistic expertise to rescue and save lives, (immediately after) deliver food assistance to people in an emergency, and develop programmes strengthen their resilience to resist to future disasters |
| 149 | introduced to the beneficiaries tools to improve their lives |
| 151 | Trainings and continuous persistence in change management |
| 156 | Train your employees; Improve working conditions adjusted to prevention of COVID-19; Make appropriate plans for COVID-19 |
| 159 | Be more proactive in adapting and responding to changes, such as regarding to natural disasters, and having different experience worldwide should contribute with more expertise |
| 160 | WFP was not very efficient in moving to a remote environment, paperless |
| 165 | WFP responded in an acceptable manner and was leading the emergency intervention in the country |
| 166 | Poderia ter mais pessoas e recursos disponíveis para abraçar a causa |
| 172 | Better integration of the different activities under CSP; more training to implementation partners; better integration between emergency, social protection and development programmes and with government programmes |
| 173 | Leaving aside humanitarian assistance and school feeding, which I consider programs without many gaps, for programs such as social assistance, resilience to climate change and others with a development approach, WFP needs to be flexible to adjust interventions according to community realities, that is, without following pre-established standards imposed on communities that in some cases do not respond to real local demands. On the other hand, bureaucratic processes have led some programs to close the loop with gaps resulting from administrative and logistical problems thus affecting the desired impact; therefore this situation needs to be reviewed. Finally, the planning of community interventions needs to be at the grassroots level (theoretically the planning is bottom-up but in practice it is the other way around) cautious, with deep technical expertise (I say this because I am a community development technician and I have noticed that some programs have not achieved great results |
| 177 | CSP and CO set up had a heavy developmental component, and did not factor in the recurrent heavy weather occurrences and the early signs of conflict in the northern provinces of the country, therefore lacked strategic planning framework to respond to these events. Similarly, the CO is not equipped with staff and managers experienced in |

| | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | natural disaster and complex conflict emergencies, thus impacting on rapid and efficient responses |
| 180 | Well in my point of view WFP managed to adapt better the changes, for example in my SO Pemba - Cabo Delgado we are able to run the operation under COVID-19 prevention measures |
| 189 | I managed to adapte the diversity according the situation on time |
| 192 | Percebo que de acordo com a necessidade o PMA encontra estrategias tomando em consideracao o contexto especifico dos beneficiarios e do tipo de situacao em causa. |
| 198 | Dar mais formacao aos colaboradores, no sentido de se adaptarem com maior rapidez e eficacia as mudancas |
| 206 | Maior abrangência a assistência em diversas areas |
| 211 | Melhorar o sistema de burocracia interna, para melhorar a rapidez na resposta |
| 214 | In my opinion, what WFP has done so far is very positive in most of the areas. Further strengthen the work with communities and local authorities, and the most important is that the implementation of projects must have all key components in the same community; only with this approach can communities and populations be more resilient to increasingly intense shocks |
| 224 | everthing that WFP do is ok . no need update |
| 225 | Inclusão do pessoal da saúde para propagar de uma forma mais eficaz |
| 226 | Strengthen its staffing structure at all levels (country office and field offices). For example through a workforce planning exercise prior to the start of the new CSP (2022-20226) in-line with the anticipated workload and funding forecast. This will help to ensure robust delivery across its portfolio in the new CSP cycle |
| 231 | More training of national staff to better deal with different external circumstances |
| 232 | mobilize for additional funds to support programming |
| 235 | WFP have been adapt in the external changes |
| 244 | To adapt our current situation to make room for changes according to actual living standards |
| 259 | COVID-19: accessibility of testing for COVID-19 at the level of field offices because unfortunately we do not have doctors hired by the WFP at the field offices level and health insurances are not used due to the lack of accredited clinics, and in these cases, we must resort to public hospitals and take forever to have our diagnosis |
| 261 | Work more closely with government in the response for a holistic approach |
| 268 | Have more reports from other organizations to achieve the goals |
| 271 | Improved coordination with other international agencies and the Government of Mozambique, in the sectors related to humanitarian response and disaster risk management |
| 274 | Better communication and coordination within sectors, thus stakeholders |
| 287 | I think it's not particular WFP issue but some of the faced challenges depend on the external context and it really need time and more efforts to adapt. Ex.: Manage high number of beneficiaries during registration/distribution in pandemic times, deal with biometric data (fingerprint scanner). Yes, WFP manage but it's challenging... |
| 340 | Talvez reforcar as medidas de precaucao tendo como modelo as metodologias usadas em todos outros paises que se encontram na mesma situacao |

TABLE 11. VIEWS FROM EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS

| Response ID | Response |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 195 | Improve more |
| 342 | Shaper focus on staffing competency required to adapt to complexity of programming in conflict affected Cabo Delgado. More attention to coordination and integrated approach with other UN agencies and implementing partners |
| 350 | Negotiate access with Government and armed group |
| 357 | Need for better coordination within the UN System |
| 365 | Não tenho informação para uma opinião em relação a esta pergunta |
| 367 | Maior coordenacao com os governos locais |
| 379 | A better division of labour among the UN agencies would be welcome, there is competition for partners funding |
| 428 | Não sei |
| 429 | Não tenho informação adequada para formular uma opinião |
| 430 | Fortalecer cada vez mais a planificação conjunta das suas actividades com as instituições governamentais e com outros parceiros para a criação de sinergias |
| 497 | Improve coordination activities with government (central, provincial and district level) |
| 506 | Ter mais ações de prevenção |
| 523 | Melhorar a partilha das actividades e a respectiva coordenação das actividades |
| 547 | WFP has been leading emergency needs assessments, and food security analysis successfully before, it should keep as it was previously. Strengthen its capital on logistics and IT support, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic particularly with the UN |

What are the main factors that have hindered WFP performance during CSP implementation?

TABLE 12. MAIN FACTORS HINDERING WFP PERFORMANCE

| | Don't know | | 1-no effect | | 2-small effect | | 3-moderate effect | | 4-large effect | | Responses |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------|-------------|-------|----------------|-------|-------------------|-------|----------------|-------|-----------|
| | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count |
| Activity design | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 16 | 16.7% | 16 | 16.7% | 16 | 16.7% | 33 | 34.4% | 15 | 15.6% | 96 |
| External stakeholders | 6 | 40.0% | 3 | 20.0% | 3 | 20.0% | 2 | 13.3% | 1 | 6.7% | 15 |
| All | 22 | 19.8% | 19 | 17.1% | 19 | 17.1% | 35 | 31.5% | 16 | 14.4% | 111 |
| Methodology and tools | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 16 | 16.5% | 11 | 11.3% | 23 | 23.7% | 32 | 33.0% | 15 | 15.5% | 97 |
| External stakeholders | 5 | 31.3% | 2 | 12.5% | 6 | 37.5% | 3 | 18.8% | 0 | % | 16 |
| All | 21 | 18.6% | 13 | 11.5% | 29 | 25.7% | 35 | 31.0% | 15 | 13.3% | 113 |
| Identification of target populations areas (targeting and coverage) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 11 | 11.8% | 15 | 16.1% | 22 | 23.7% | 28 | 30.1% | 17 | 18.3% | 93 |
| External stakeholders | 3 | 18.8% | 2 | 12.5% | 6 | 37.5% | 4 | 25.0% | 1 | 6.3% | 16 |
| All | 14 | 12.8% | 17 | 15.6% | 28 | 25.7% | 32 | 29.4% | 18 | 16.5% | 109 |
| Partnerships and coordination with stakeholders/partners | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 10 | 10.4% | 7 | 7.3% | 30 | 31.3% | 28 | 29.2% | 21 | 21.9% | 96 |
| External stakeholders | 2 | 10.5% | 1 | 5.3% | 4 | 21.1% | 6 | 31.6% | 6 | 31.6% | 19 |
| All | 12 | 10.4% | 8 | 7.0% | 34 | 29.6% | 34 | 29.6% | 27 | 23.5% | 115 |
| Financial resources | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 16 | 16.3% | 6 | 6.1% | 16 | 16.3% | 29 | 29.6% | 31 | 31.6% | 98 |
| External stakeholders | 7 | 41.2% | 0 | % | 4 | 23.5% | 3 | 17.6% | 3 | 17.6% | 17 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|-----|
| All | 23 | 20.0% | 6 | 5.2% | 20 | 17.4% | 32 | 27.8% | 34 | 29.6% | 115 |
| Quality/adequacy of WFP human resources | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 9 | 9.3% | 13 | 13.4% | 25 | 25.8% | 26 | 26.8% | 24 | 24.7% | 97 |
| External stakeholders | 4 | 23.5% | 2 | 11.8% | 4 | 23.5% | 4 | 23.5% | 3 | 17.6% | 17 |
| All | 13 | 11.4% | 15 | 13.2% | 29 | 25.4% | 30 | 26.3% | 27 | 23.7% | 114 |
| Adequacy of WFP hand-over/exit strategies | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 20 | 21.1% | 11 | 11.6% | 13 | 13.7% | 30 | 31.6% | 21 | 22.1% | 95 |
| External stakeholders | 7 | 41.2% | 1 | 5.9% | 5 | 29.4% | 3 | 17.6% | 1 | 5.9% | 17 |
| All | 27 | 24.1% | 12 | 10.7% | 18 | 16.1% | 33 | 29.5% | 22 | 19.6% | 112 |

What are the internal factors that have hindered CSP implementation?

This question was posed to WFP stakeholders only.

FIGURE 2. INTERNAL FACTORS HINDERING COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLEMENTATION




TABLE 13. INTERNAL FACTORS HINDERING COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

| | Don't know | | 1-no effect | | 2-small effect | | 3-moderate effect | | 4-large effect | | Responses |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------|-------------|-------|----------------|-------|-------------------|-------|----------------|-------|-----------|
| | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count |
| Contents and design of the CSP | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 21 | 22.3% | 14 | 14.9% | 25 | 26.6% | 21 | 22.3% | 13 | 13.8% | 94 |
| Country office monitoring and evaluation system | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 14 | 14.9% | 14 | 14.9% | 18 | 19.1% | 35 | 37.2% | 13 | 13.8% | 94 |
| CSP funding flexibility, including earmarking | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 22 | 23.4% | 7 | 7.4% | 12 | 12.8% | 28 | 29.8% | 25 | 26.6% | 94 |
| Quality of oversight and support provided by headquarters | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 27 | 28.4% | 10 | 10.5% | 21 | 22.1% | 26 | 27.4% | 11 | 11.6% | 95 |
| Quality of oversight and support provided by regional bureau | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 25 | 26.0% | 13 | 13.5% | 26 | 27.1% | 23 | 24.0% | 9 | 9.4% | 96 |
| Insufficient access to technical guidance for specialized areas of work | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 16 | 16.8% | 15 | 15.8% | 18 | 18.9% | 33 | 34.7% | 13 | 13.7% | 95 |
| Adequacy and expertise of WFP staff | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 9 | 9.7% | 16 | 17.2% | 19 | 20.4% | 31 | 33.3% | 18 | 19.4% | 93 |
| Quality/adequacy of programme management | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 8 | 8.4% | 14 | 14.7% | 27 | 28.4% | 30 | 31.6% | 16 | 16.8% | 95 |
| WFP procurement rules/regulations | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 17 | 17.9% | 10 | 10.5% | 15 | 15.8% | 27 | 28.4% | 26 | 27.4% | 95 |
| Flexibility (rules, requirements) to build/establish partnerships | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 11 | 11.5% | 12 | 12.5% | 19 | 19.8% | 33 | 34.4% | 21 | 21.9% | 96 |

Based on your experience, do you think WFP activities are designed to be sustainable in the long term (i.e. to what extent are the benefits of the intervention likely to continue once WFP supports stop)?

This question was posed to external stakeholders only.

TABLE 14. PERCEPTIONS ON SUSTAINABILITY OF WFP INTERVENTIONS

| Segment | Value | Percent | Count | % of Total |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|------------|
| External stakeholders | WFP activities are sustainable | 20% | 4 | 10% |
| | WFP activities consider sustainability, but the design could be improved | 45% | 9 | 22.5% |
| | WFP activities are not sustainable due to poor design | 15% | 3 | 7.5% |
| | WFP activities are not sustainable due to country context and external factors | 5% | 1 | 2.5% |
| | I don't know enough to form an opinion | 15% | 3 | 7.5% |

Which of the following statements on cost effectiveness better reflects your experience with WFP?

This question was posed to external stakeholders only

TABLE 15. PERCEPTIONS ON COST EFFECTIVENESS

| Segment | Value | Percent | Count |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|
| External stakeholders | WFP cares about cost effectiveness and makes significant efforts to find the most cost-effective solutions. | 40% | 8 |
| | WFP cares about cost effectiveness but should do more to find the most cost-effective solutions | 45% | 9 |
| | I don't know enough to answer | 15% | 3 |

How would you rate the effectiveness of WFP training actions? Please, select the most relevant statement.

This question was posed to external stakeholders only

TABLE 16. PERCEPTION ON EFFECTIVENESS OF WFP TRAINING

| Segment | Value | Percent | Count | % of Total |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|------------|
| External stakeholders | WFP training activities have had a significant impact in my work and/or I apply the knowledge and skills acquired on a daily basis | 15% | 3 | 7.5% |
| | WFP training activities have had some impact, but I have limited opportunities to apply the knowledge and skills acquired | 25% | 5 | 12.5% |
| | WFP training is not relevant to the context because cannot be applied in practice | 5% | 1 | 2.5% |
| | I am not familiar with WFP training activities | 55% | 11 | 27.5% |

TABLE 17. RECOMMENDATIONS TO INCREASE THE IMPACT OF WFP TRAINING/CAPACITY BUILDING ACTIVITIES

| ResponseID | Response |
|------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 252 | 1. Criar sessoes on line de treinamento/induciao/actualizacao de acoes de todas areas tematicas do PMA aberto a todos colaboradores interessados 2. Criar planos anuais de capacitacoes especificas de acordo com as tarefas de cada colaborador |
| 350 | WFP can organize training but cannot impose application of that training to counterparts. Maybe finding a way how this training becomes more binding |
| 365 | Não tenho informação para expressar uma opinião em relação a esta pergunta |
| 367 | Aumentar a rede de cobertura de monitoria de precos de produtos agrarios e dar suporte financeiro para a disseminacao para os utentes |
| 414 | Aprimorar a relação institucional entre o PMA e as instituições governamentais a todos niveis |
| 428 | Trocas de experiências no processo de formação/aprendizagem |
| 429 | Na capacitação dos pequenos produtores na gestão pós-colheita continuar com as demonstrações práticas e as trocas de experiências entre produtores |
| 430 | Necessidade de treinar e criar oportunidade para aplicação prática. Assim como o devido acompanhamento técnico |
| 497 | Improve coordination with stakeholders and partners |
| 547 | I received WFP training in the past and was very effective |

To what extent have WFP interventions promoted coherence and coordination among the various actors across the “humanitarian-development-peace” nexus? Please, select the most relevant statement.

TABLE 18. PERCEPTIONS ON WFP CONTRIBUTION TO COHERENCE AND COORDINATION

| Segment | Value | Percent | Count | % of Total |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|------------|
| WFP | The different actors already acted in a coordinated manner across the nexus, even without WFP intervention | 7.9% | 8 | 3.3% |
| | WFP intervention has been crucial to promote greater coherence and coordination among different actors | 60.4% | 61 | 25.2% |
| | WFP has been making an effort to promote such coordination, but there are still many weaknesses and limitations | 25.7% | 26 | 10.7% |
| | I see no evidence or examples that WFP has contributed to promoting coherence or coordination across the nexus | 5.9% | 6 | 2.5% |
| External stakeholders | The different actors already acted in a coordinated manner across the nexus, even without WFP intervention | 10% | 2 | 0.8% |
| | WFP intervention has been crucial to promote greater coherence and coordination among different actors | 30% | 6 | 2.5% |
| | WFP has been making an effort to promote such coordination, but there are still many weaknesses and limitations | 40% | 8 | 3.3% |
| | I see no evidence or examples that WFP has contributed to promoting coherence or coordination across the nexus | 20% | 4 | 1.7% |
| All | The different actors already acted in a coordinated manner across the nexus, even without WFP intervention | 8.3% | 10 | 4.1% |
| | WFP intervention has been crucial to promote greater coherence and coordination among different actors | 55.4% | 67 | 27.7% |
| | WFP has been making an effort to promote such coordination, but there are still many weaknesses and limitations | 28.1% | 34 | 14% |
| | I see no evidence or examples that WFP has contributed to promoting coherence or coordination across the nexus | 8.3% | 10 | 4.1% |

TABLE 19. WFP RESPONDENTS' RECOMMENDATIONS TO INCREASE WFP CONTRIBUTION TO COHERENCE AND COORDINATION

| ResponseID | Response |
|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 41 | Career development and giving opportunities to everyone, we are in Mozambique and with great intellectual capacity and sometimes we are not considered for not being fluent in English , but there are foreigners who do not know how to speak Portuguese and we teach ourselves and sometimes we are the most capable and material and work experience, and school and recruitment criteria should be reviewed |
| 50 | O mesmo metodo de implementacao tendo em consideracao que existem resultados positivos |
| 66 | Deve-se trabalhar muito com os SDAE para promover um rápido desenvolvimento. As nossas actividades devem sempre estar alinhadas com o SDAE |
| 85 | Neste momento nao tenho nenhuma |
| 89 | As actividades de assistencia humanitaria devem ser coordenadas principalmente com outras agencias da ONU que actuam na mesma area |

| | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 98 | My recommendation to the PMA for coherence in coordination is that it should include motivating field monitors at the field office level for good work performance in your duty station |
| 100 | Ensure coherence within its own CSP (between activities) and establish partnerships that can further boost the results of WFP's activities. See WFP's activities beyond the usual set WFP-interventions in a way that there is sufficient flexibility to allow for stronger coordination and coherence |
| 104 | N/A |
| 118 | Have joint venture programmes especially in the districts or communities that different organizations are working in/ giving assistance |
| 126 | WFP should drive its interventions in two main directions, while keeping the emergency response arm ready: i) interventions to be designed and linked to deliver nutrition and food security, ii) focus on development and social welfare through resilience and long-terms approaches |
| 131 | Nenhuma |
| 134 | There should be a combination of actions within all the sector/programmes under implementation (Integrated programmes) and move from short to long term interventions |
| 137 | Empodramento das organizacoes governamentais |
| 142 | Mais intervencao do PMA em relacao aos parceiros |
| 143 | Always work in partnership with the government |
| 148 | Ensure participation of partners in the design phase of the projects, implementation, including evaluation for catalytic impact |
| 156 | Train your employees more in these matters; technically support those responsible for these areas |
| 159 | When it comes for showing an expertise and leadership all team must be considered to prove and provide any contribution, instead of chose only those who are familiar peers |
| 165 | The promotion of cluster group will improve coordination |
| 172 | WFP was able to coordinate well the FSC and livelihood cluster and participated in different coordination forums organized by Government providing technical support and sharing knowledge at National level. This support is still not at the required level at Provincial and district level and require additional resources. Better coordination and increase on number of joint projects, specially under recovery interventions with other UN Agencies to ensure good complementarities and and visible achievements. Generation of evidences is also key to have the required visibility and acknowledgement from donors and secure more longer term funding |
| 173 | N/A |
| 180 | WFP does sufficient in terms of coherence and coordination, mostly where there no OCHA presence WFP takes lead, I have been seeing in the past years that I am working for WFP |
| 189 | To involve different opinion in different level to reach the same goal |
| 206 | Sem nenhuma |
| 210 | N/A |
| 211 | Mais visibilidade e accao nos Cluster |
| 214 | I feel that there is still a need to further work with government authorities at grassroots level to disseminate its policies and projects among the stakeholders and beneficiaries. most of the time, the projects are implemented without proper dissemination |
| 224 | WFP need to continue support all moment in disasters , cyclones and continue assist people giving assistance on food and more assistance for all people needed assistance in Mozambique |
| 225 | Participar dos encontros de coordenação com os parceiros do governo. |
| 231 | In the field there has not been good coordination with the different actors for the implementation of the programs, there ends up being overlapping and non-complementary |
| 237 | Peace |

| | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 242 | Nenhuma |
| 244 | Have no comments to add |
| 257 | More communication among unit and when applying for grants. The target area should be viewed as priority when developing projects |
| 268 | N/A |
| 271 | Increase the number of fix term contracts and Portuguese speaker members in the team, which can help WFP to further improve coordination with national actors |
| 274 | Among technical issues it's important to capacity building in communication and team building |
| 340 | Organizacao de conferencias frequentes com os diferentes intervenientes |

TABLE 20. EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS' RECOMMENDATIONS TO INCREASE WFP CONTRIBUTION TO COHERENCE AND COORDINATION

| ResponseID | Response |
|------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 195 | You are in a good way |
| 350 | By providing Logistics services free of charge, WFP could request certain information sharing & coordination from supported actors |
| 365 | Não tenho informação para expressar uma opinião sobre esta pergunta |
| 367 | prevelegiar a imparcialidade na tomada das medidas de apoio |
| 428 | As intervenções/acções do PMA tem um elevado contributo para a melhoria da vida das famílias nas zonas rurais |
| 429 | Não tenho nada acrescentar |
| 430 | Para o PMA aumentar a coerência e coordenação das suas intervenções, acho que deve aprimorar o comprometimento. As suas intervenções devem ser partilhados desde o nível central, depois ao nível provincial e assim até ao distrital, isto é, respeitar a hierarquia institucional instituído pelo Estado Moçambicano |
| 497 | Decentralize their activities to local government and other partners |
| 523 | Maior abertura e aceitabilidade nas propostas, melhoria da coordenação e dos aspectos de governação do país |
| 547 | Promote internal and partners interface around the triple nexus. Disseminate guidance, and training materials so different partners can access |

How would you rate WFP performance across the following cross-cutting areas?

TABLE 21. PERCEPTIONS ON PERFORMANCE IN CROSS-CUTTING AREAS

| | Don't know | | 1-poor | | 2-below average | | 3-average | | 4-above average | | 5-good | | Response s |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------|--------|-------|-----------------|--------|-----------|--------|-----------------|--------|--------|--------|------------|
| | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count |
| Humanitarian principles (humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 4 | 4.0% | 0 | % | 1 | 1.0% | 15 | 14.9 % | 32 | 31.7 % | 49 | 48.5 % | 101 |
| External stakeholders | 2 | 12.5 % | 0 | % | 0 | % | 4 | 25.0 % | 7 | 43.8 % | 3 | 18.8 % | 16 |
| All | 6 | 5.1% | 0 | % | 1 | 0.9% | 19 | 16.2 % | 39 | 33.3 % | 52 | 44.4 % | 117 |
| Protection (activities that aim to prevent, reduce, mitigate and respond to the risks and consequences of violence, coercion, deprivation and abuse for persons, groups and communities) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 4 | 4.0% | 0 | % | 4 | 4.0% | 20 | 19.8 % | 36 | 35.6 % | 37 | 36.6 % | 101 |
| External stakeholders | 2 | 11.8 % | 0 | % | 0 | % | 6 | 35.3 % | 7 | 41.2 % | 2 | 11.8 % | 17 |
| All | 6 | 5.1% | 0 | % | 4 | 3.4% | 26 | 22.0 % | 43 | 36.4 % | 39 | 33.1 % | 118 |
| Inclusion of people with disability in activities/projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 8 | 7.9% | 5 | 5.0 % | 14 | 13.9 % | 22 | 21.8 % | 23 | 22.8 % | 29 | 28.7 % | 101 |
| External stakeholders | 4 | 25.0 % | 0 | % | 1 | 6.3% | 6 | 37.5 % | 2 | 12.5 % | 3 | 18.8 % | 16 |
| All | 12 | 10.3 % | 5 | 4.3 % | 15 | 12.8 % | 28 | 23.9 % | 25 | 21.4 % | 32 | 27.4 % | 117 |
| Accountability to affected populations | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 6 | 5.9% | 1 | 1.0 % | 5 | 4.9% | 23 | 22.5 % | 27 | 26.5 % | 40 | 39.2 % | 102 |
| External stakeholders | 3 | 18.8 % | 1 | 6.3 % | 2 | 12.5 % | 7 | 43.8 % | 2 | 12.5 % | 1 | 6.3% | 16 |
| All | 9 | 7.6% | 2 | 1.7 % | 7 | 5.9% | 30 | 25.4 % | 29 | 24.6 % | 41 | 34.7 % | 118 |
| Gender equality and women's empowerment | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 3 | 2.9% | 0 | % | 8 | 7.8% | 30 | 29.4 % | 31 | 30.4 % | 30 | 29.4 % | 102 |
| External stakeholders | 2 | 10.0 % | 0 | % | 0 | % | 7 | 35.0 % | 6 | 30.0 % | 5 | 25.0 % | 20 |
| All | 5 | 4.1% | 0 | % | 8 | 6.6% | 37 | 30.3 % | 37 | 30.3 % | 35 | 28.7 % | 122 |
| Integration of environmental risks and opportunities in WFP activities | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WFP | 5 | 4.9% | 4 | 3.9 % | 11 | 10.8 % | 24 | 23.5 % | 31 | 30.4 % | 27 | 26.5 % | 102 |
| External stakeholders | 2 | 11.8 % | 0 | % | 0 | % | 6 | 35.3 % | 8 | 47.1 % | 1 | 5.9% | 17 |
| All | 7 | 5.9% | 4 | 3.4 % | 11 | 9.2% | 30 | 25.2 % | 39 | 32.8 % | 28 | 23.5 % | 119 |

Thinking about the next 5 years, is WFP in a good position to respond to emerging needs or opportunities? Please select the most relevant option:

TABLE 22. PERCEPTIONS ON WFP CAPACITY TO RESPOND TO EMERGING NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES

| Segment | Value | Percent | Count | % of Total |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|------------|
| WFP | WFP is well aware of the context and emerging needs and is ready to respond | 72.5% | 74 | 30.3% |
| | WFP is well aware of the context and emerging needs, but it is not well placed to respond | 16.7% | 17 | 7% |
| | I don't know enough to answer | 10.8% | 11 | 4.5% |
| External stakeholders | WFP is well aware of the context and emerging needs and is ready to respon | 65% | 13 | 5.3% |
| | WFP is well aware of the context and emerging needs, but it is not well placed to respond | 10% | 2 | 0.8% |
| | I don't know enough to answer | 25% | 5 | 2% |
| All | WFP is well aware of the context and emerging needs and is ready to respond | 71.3% | 87 | 35.7% |
| | WFP is well aware of the context and emerging needs, but it is not well placed to respond | 15.6% | 19 | 7.8% |
| | I don't know enough to answer | 13.1% | 16 | 6.6% |

What are the emerging needs and opportunities that WFP should be addressing in 5 years' time?

TABLE 23. WFP RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ON EMERGING NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES

| ResponseID | Response |
|------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 41 | Career development and giving opportunities to everyone , we are in Mozambique and with great intellectual capacity and sometimes we are not considered for not being fluent in English , but there are foreigners who do not know how to speak Portuguese and we teach ourselves and sometimes we are the most capable and material and work experience, and school and recruitment criteria should be reviewed |
| 42 | Keep strengthening the capacity of the government in various areas; - Improve staff capacity building in preparing for and responding to conflicts; - Raise more funds. |
| 43 | Modern tools, vehicles and HR contracts |
| 50 | Nutricao,mudancas climaticas que poderam originar cheias ou secas,assistencia alimentar no ambito escolar,promocao de pequenos agricultores,protecao social,etc. |
| 66 | A fome Mundial, continuacão da seca severa em muitas zonas do Mundo, os desastres ou choques, etc |
| 72 | Employees Contract types as this motivates them to work and not be burnt out |
| 82 | Resposta as questoes Climaticas. Questoes de Genero |
| 83 | o PMA deve estar em constante coordenacao com outras agencias das nacoes unidas ou organizacoes nao governamentais incluindo governo para suprir outros problemas que nao sao do seu dominio nas comunidades onde atua, por exemplo as comunidades ha siclicamente seca tem problemas de agua e saneamento do meio que PMA deve coordenar com outras instituicoes |

| | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 85 | Reduzir a desnutrição |
| 89 | Necessidade de aumentar o seu staff para evitar o sobrecarregamento das actividades. Necessidade de mais treinamentos ao seu staff na lingua oficial do seu pais (portugues). Mais financiamentos por parte dos doadores para responder as necessidades emergentes |
| 98 | Emerging opportunities that the WFP should adopt for the next 5 years are: -Field Monitors salary increase; -Include Field Monitors in the planning of operations; - Exchange experience between Field Monitors from different sub-offices, or countries so that they learn and adopt experiences to better engage in the WFP mission in different community |
| 100 | Climate-change adaptation that goes beyond farming as livelihood alternative; disaster risk reduction and resilience of communities to climate shocks (ensuring that response to shocks always have a vision of supporting the communities to be more resilient in the future; ensure all interventions are nutrition-sensitive (and have good partnerships with research and communications institutions); have a stronger strategy for market development to support access to food among communities where agriculture production is limited for a number of reasons (aligned with alternative livelihood opportunities); continue to work in coordination with other organizations to strengthen the social protection sector in Mozambique |
| 103 | To address a complex and lasting conflict resulting from social inequalities, climate change and natural disasters, terrorism and displacement of populations (poverty, food insecurity, hunger and undernutrition) result in increased needs for emergency and humanitarian response and opportunities for interventions of full package in the design of interventions seeking for development and resilience of interventions: - reduce the risk against climate disasters through resilient assets (food for assets to improve/infrastructures for population in need, enabling environment for access to water resources/water harvesting systems for safe water and agricultural production); - reduce food insecurity effects and hunger through increased productivity of small hold farmers and their access to markets; - develop sustainable and inclusive school feeding program building synergies within all relevant WFP interventions for enabling environment for gender equality, access to education, to markets |
| 118 | Continue saving and changing lives through food, activities, inclusion and cooperations with government and national and international partners. WFP reaches to the most vulnerable and most forgotten communities far away from other populations. This has been the most significant work, reaching the most vulnerable families who had no hope of ever being reached. Despite road accessibility, armed conflicts, and whatever challenges the WFP team is presented, they reach the vulnerable families |
| 126 | Resilience and smart agriculture Women empowerment towards financial and economic inclusion Adolescent nutrition Water, energy and nutrition nexus |
| 128 | People and communities affected by conflicts in the Northern Mozambique - People and communities affected by cyclones and drought in Central and Southern Mozambique - People deprived of their sources of income due to Mozambique hidden debts crisis that has been lingering over the last six years - People depredated by the economic and social effects of COVID-19 pandemic |
| 134 | Investment in long term development programming Investment in resilience building Investment in capacity building/strengthening to both staff and beneficiaries Designing of integrated interventions in a context based approach |
| 137 | a componente de nutricao |
| 142 | - Assistencia humanitarian/resposta de emergencia; - Alimentacao escolar; - Nutricao, incluindo o combate a desnutricao cronica e deficiencia de micronutrients; - Seguranca alimentar, incluindo transferencias monetarias/ou alimentos; - Proteccao social; - Apoio aos pequenos Produtores; - Resiliencias e choques relacionados com o clima. |
| 143 | Have priority areas to act |
| 148 | Build resilience of the beneficiaries to weather-related disasters; Build enabling environment to promote access to market for the smallholder farmers; Promote and implement job-related interventions with focus to youth to be resilient and resist in |

| | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | swelling the ranks of terrorist groups to emerging; influence the direction of agricultural policy documents under development |
| 149 | dont know either |
| 151 | Implementation of fitpool positions - Review of the short term contract benefits/entitlements - Promotion modalities among national staff to be reviewed and be pegged on performance and duration of service |
| 156 | IDP's, nutrition and school reading |
| 159 | Create a sustainable projects that requires that people are no more longer ravaged by hunger and misery |
| 160 | Evaluation of needs, continuity of presence as staff high turn over really hinders the work |
| 165 | Digitalization, CBT, inclusion of local farmers in the supply of food, initiatives that promotes beneficiaries empowerment |
| 172 | Emerging food and nutritional needs affecting Cabo Degado Province and other Northern Provinces; Support Mozambican Government to better coordinate the response in the North; Better Preparedness for Natural Disaster Response |
| 173 | For the case of Mozambique, political instability in the northern zone and the occurrence of extreme and cyclical weather events lead the WFP to major challenges in responding to the resulting food insecurity and social assistance in response to the growing increase in vulnerable groups but also an opportunity for parents raise funds and use their experience, competence and professionalism to counter trends |
| 180 | Funds preposition, - Staff trained and ready to act; - Equipment - Coordination with government and humanitarian actors |
| 189 | To respond to all kinds of shock that communities may face according to adversity, but above all there must be resource availability |
| 198 | Na minha humilde opiniao,o PMA deve se focalizar mais no apoio a agricultura, aos refugiados de guerra, situacoes climaticas(cheias,seca,etc), saude e nutricao |
| 204 | Climate changes and social protection |
| 210 | N/A |
| 211 | Conjugando os ODM e o PSE do Pais, tambem estar sempre em prontidao, para responder aos fenomenos naturais (emergencias) |
| 212 | Having more means of transport, in the area of nutrition, seek to integrate community nutrition, create a link between the programs in the WFP and train its employees |
| 214 | Innovation / technology to transfer benefits to the beneficiaries, investing on hermetic technologies to reduce food loss and linking small holders farmers with emerging markets. mapping and addressing climate changes challenges |
| 217 | Resilience |
| 224 | Have assist and contribution in for all cases of emergence happening in Mozambique , and for another country |
| 225 | Necessita de estar em sintonia com os serviços de informação meteorologicas sobre possiveis cenários de emergência para poder responder prontamente |
| 226 | WFP should continue to invest more in the capacity strengthening of the Government of Mozambique, particularly in the areas of social protection, emergency preparedness and response, as well as climate adaptation and resilience |
| 231 | Climate changes and climate resilience on the household livelihoods opportunities |
| 232 | climatic changes and disease outbreaks |
| 237 | Continuing saving life |
| 241 | Resilience - Strategic projects that build food resilience or reduce dependence (eg, Niassa is a Province that has no silos, yet it produces a lot of beans) |
| 243 | WFP's capacity to respond is linked to structural issues stemming from management and some heads of units in CO, who's performance affects the whole team |
| 244 | WFP is well aware of the context and emerging needs and ready to respond for the next coming 5 years |
| 259 | Adaptation to climate change; Gender and Women's Empowerment |
| 261 | 1. Capacity to respond to sudden onset emergencies. Thereafter working at building the resilience of affected communities. 2. Developing the resilience of capacities for IDP |

| | |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | communities, opportunities exist in the northern province where there is high Agricultural potential. 3. Assisting the government in creating a database for IDPs and beneficiaries using a digitised system such as SCOPE |
| 268 | In the area of COVID-19, in the area of HIV the WFP must intervene in these areas to support the government |
| 271 | Improve the humanitarian-development nexus; improve coordination and targeting, in alignment with government actors and other non-governmental organisations; improve technical capacity of local WFP staff; increase resources allocated to capacity strengthening activities |
| 274 | 1.IDPs assistance (cash, CBT and in kind) 2.Sustainable development projects 3. School feeding 4. Nutrition |
| 275 | Climate changes |
| 340 | Bolsa de fome, desalojamento, desnutricao |

TABLE 24. EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS' PERCEPTIONS ON EMERGING NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES

| ResponseID | Response |
|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 342 | Addressing, humanitarian, resilience and development needs in a fast changing, insecure, complex political emergency |
| 350 | More beneficiary selection without blanket distributions, critical opinion vis a vis government without thin balance not to be sidelined |
| 365 | Continuar com o projecto/acções de apoio aos pequenos produtores na gestão pós-colheita com vista a zero perdas pós-colheita |
| 367 | Assistencia humanitaria nas populacoes que sofrem efeitos de conflitos armado e seguranca alimentar |
| 428 | - Continuar com as acções de apoio e capacitação dos pequenos produtores na gestão pós-colheita com vista a redução e/ou zero perdas pós-colheita |
| 429 | Extensão do programa de apoio aos produtores na gestão pós-colheita com vista a zero perdas pós-colheita |
| 506 | combate a desnutricao, emponderamento da mulher, proteccao climatica |
| 547 | Food insecurity expected to increase, open market opportunities for cereals/ maize and improve the food supply chains, adaption to the current context. IT support in line to the COVID19 pandemic needs. Build GIS and mapping support |

Annex 6: List of People Interviewed

| Name | Gender | Position | Institution | Interview Date | Location |
|--------------------|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------|----------|
| Antonella D'Aprile | F | Country Director | WFP CO | 30/07/2021 | Remote |
| Nicolas Babu | M | Head of Programme (HoP) | WFP CO | 28/07/2021 | Remote |
| Gina Meutia | F | Head of M&E | WFP CO | | Remote |
| Camilla Spalino | F | M&E Officer | WFP CO | 05/08/2021 | Remote |
| Punam Chandulal | F | Head of Budget and Programming | WFP CO | 30/06/2021 | Remote |
| Parvina Gafurova | F | Head of Business Support | WFP CO | | Remote |
| Lara Carrilho | F | Activity 1 (VAM) Lead | WFP CO | 22/07/2021 | Remote |
| Domingos Reane | M | Activity 1 team (VAM Officer) | WFP CO | 22/07/2021 | Remote |
| Panfilio Malamule | M | Activity 1 team (VAM/GIS Officer) | WFP CO | 22/07/2021 | Remote |
| Flavia Lorenzon | F | Activity 2 (Social Protection) Lead | WFP CO | 09/08/2021 | Remote |
| Silvia Pieretto | F | Activity 2 (Climate Resilience) Lead | WFP CO | | Remote |
| Chiara Dara | F | Head of CBT | WFP CO | 26/07/2021 | Remote |
| Geert Gompelman | M | Activity 3 Lead | WFP CO | 20/07/2021 | Remote |
| Pedro Mortara | M | Activity 4 Lead | WFP CO | 21/07/2021 | Remote |
| Edna Possolo | F | Head of Nutrition Unit/Activity 3 Lead & Activity 5 Team Member | WFP CO | 20/07/2021 | Remote |
| Berguete Mariquele | F | Activity 6 Lead | WFP CO | 10/08/2021 | Remote |
| Amosse Ubisse | M | Activity 6 M&E Focal Point | WFP CO | 10/08/2021 | Remote |
| Eunice Smith | F | Head of Supply Chain | WFP CO | 05/07/2021 | Maputo |
| Helga Gunnel | F | Gender and Protection Advisor | WFP CO | 28/07/2021 | Remote |
| Farirai Chataurwa | F | Head of Human Resources | WFP CO | | Remote |
| Anahita Boboeva | F | Head of Donor Relations, Communications, Reporting | WFP CO | | Remote |
| Claudia Santos | F | Logistics Officer | WFP | | Remote |
| Lindsey Wise | F | Former Head of Nutrition | Other | 22/07/2021 | Remote |

| Name | Gender | Position | Institution | Interview Date | Location |
|-----------------------|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------|
| Kai Roehm | M | Regional Programme Policy Officer (Lead on Social Protection, CBT and School Feeding) | WFP RB | 30/07/2021 | Remote |
| Grace Igweta | F | Regional Evaluation Officer | WFP RB | 09/08/2021 | Remote |
| Beatrice Tapawan | M | Regional Programme Policy Officer | WFP RB | 30/07/2021 | Remote |
| Mauricio Burtet | M | Regional Programme Policy Officer (Lead on Emergency Preparedness and Response) | WFP RB | 29/07/2021 | Remote |
| Caterina Kireeva | F | Regional Monitoring Advisor | WFP RB | | Remote |
| Karin Manente | F | Director of Partnerships and former Country Director | WFP HQ | | Remote |
| Camila Alencar | F | Programme Assistant | Centre of Excellence-Brazil | 14/07/2021 | Remote |
| Vinicius Limongi | M | Programme Officer | Centre of Excellence-Brazil | 14/07/2021 | Remote |
| Milena Damasio | F | Assistant to Director | Centre of Excellence-Brazil | 14/07/2021 | Remote |
| Gabriela Marques | F | Programme Assistant | Centre of Excellence-Brazil | 14/07/2021 | Remote |
| Maria Lukyanova | F | Senior Programme Officer - Capacity Strengthening | WFP HQ | 09/08/2021 | Remote |
| Karen Rodriguegervais | F | Programme Officer - Capacity Strengthening | WFP HQ | 10/08/2021 | Remote |
| Marla Amaro | F | Director Nutrition Department | Ministry of Health (MISAU) | 16/07/2021 | Remote |
| Sérgio Seni | M | Deputy Director for Medical Assistance | Ministry of Health (MISAU) | 15/07/2021 | Maputo |
| Félix Pinto | M | Head of Department | Ministry of Health (MISAU) | 15/07/2021 | Maputo |
| Arlinda Chaquice | F | National Director School Feeding | Ministry of Education and Human Development (MINEDH) | 22/07/2021 | Remote |
| Felizardo Cremildo | M | Head of Department of Nutrition and School Feeding | Ministry of Education and Human Development (MINEDH) | 06/07/2021 | Maputo |
| Eduarda Mungoi | F | National Director Food Fortification | Ministry of Industry and Trade (MIC) | 27/07/2021 | Remote |

| Name | Gender | Position | Institution | Interview Date | Location |
|---------------------|--------|----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------|
| Amílcar Pereira | M | National Director Planning and Policies | Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MADER) | 27/07/2021 | Remote |
| Sérgio Sambo | M | M&E Officer - MADER | Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MADER) | 06/08/2021 | Remote |
| António Beleza | M | Deputy Director – National Emergency Operations Centre (CENOE) | National Institute for Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (INGD) | 02/08/2021 | Remote |
| Ana Cristina | F | National Director - CENOE | National Institute for Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (INGD) | 02/08/2021 | Remote |
| Rita Almeida | F | National Director Planning & Coordination | National Institute for Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (INGD) | 02/08/2021 | Remote |
| Paulo Tomás | M | National Director | National Institute for Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (INGD) | 16/07/2021 | Maputo |
| Sisenando Marcelino | M | Head of Technical Department | National Institute for Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (INGD) | 16/07/2021 | Maputo |
| Ema Chuva | F | Chief of Planning, Coordination, M&E | National AIDS Council (CNCS) | 29/07/2021 | Remote |
| Carlota Tomucene | F | Chief of Programme Department | National Institute for Social Action (INAS) | 04/08/2021 | Remote |
| Mussa Mustafa | M | Deputy Executive Director | National Meteorology Institute (INAM) | 15/07/2021 | Maputo |
| Jonas Zucule | M | Head of Research | National Meteorology Institute (INAM) | 15/07/2021 | Maputo |
| Maria Angelina | F | Research Officer / WFP Focal Point | National Meteorology Institute (INAM) | 15/07/2021 | Maputo |

| Name | Gender | Position | Institution | Interview Date | Location |
|-------------------------|--------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------|
| Claudia Lopes | F | Director Planning and Polices | Technical Secretariat for Food and Nutrition Security (SETSAN) | 16/07/2021 | Remote |
| Jeronimo Tovela | M | Special Assistant to the Resident Coordinator | UN Resident Coordinator | 03/08/2021 | Remote |
| Hernani da Silva Coelho | M | FAO Representative | FAO | 09/08/2021 | Remote |
| Lino Matsinhe | M | Logistics Officer | UNICEF | | Remote |
| Pedro Gonzales | M | Supply and Logistics Manager | UNICEF | | Remote |
| Nadia Vaz | F | Assistant Representative | UNFPA | 10/08/2021 | Remote |
| Khalil Al Shayeb | M | Supply Associate & Officer | UNHCR | | Remote |
| Priscila Scalco | F | Displacement Management Coordinator | IOM | 06/08/2021 | Remote |
| Narciso Manhenge | M | | IFAD | | Remote |
| Sarah Lumsdon | F | Deputy Development Director | UK-FCDO | 03/08/2021 | Remote |
| John Grabowsky | M | Regional Advisor | USAID | 09/08/2021 | Remote |
| Marlies Lensink | F | Regional Food Assistance and Disaster Preparedness | European Union – European Commission’s Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO) | 29/07/2021 | Remote |
| Julie Bodin | F | Regional Protection and Gender Advisor | European Union - ECHO | 05/08/2021 | Remote |
| Zoran Filipovic | M | Manager Logistics | ICRC | 02/08/2021 | Remote |
| | | | World Bank | | Remote |
| Piyamon Arayaprayoon | F | Project Budget and Programming Officer | WFP HQ | 09/07/2021 | Remote |
| Neema MKOMAWANTHU | F | Field Staff Tete / School Feeding | WFP FO | 27/07/2021 | Remote |
| Hitesch KANAKRAI | M | Head of Field Office - Tete | WFP FO | 23/07/2021 | Remote |
| Cristina Graziani | F | Head of Field Office - Cabo Delgado | WFP FO | 05/08/2021 | Remote |
| Antonio Rafael | M | Head of Field Office - Nampula | WFP FO | | Remote |
| Arau Nhacudime | M | Head of Field Office - Zambézia | WFP FO | | Remote |

| Name | Gender | Position | Institution | Interview Date | Location |
|-------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|----------------|----------|
| Fernando Mamanodo | M | Nutrition Programme Associate | WFP FO | | Sofala |
| Amândio Fumane | M | Emergency/Recovery Programme Associate | WFP FO | | Sofala |
| Carlos Nhamikme | M | School Feeding Programme Assistant | WFP FO | | Sofala |
| Oliver J. Vembo | M | Programme Policy Officer | WFP FO | | Sofala |
| Nelson Quaria | M | Nutrition Programme Associate | WFP FO | | Sofala |
| Bharatkumar Harachlal | M | Logistics Associate – Supply Chain | WFP FO | | Sofala |
| Sónia Pascola | F | Gender/Protection Associate | WFP FO | | Sofala |
| Rafael de Campos | M | Communication Officer | WFP FO | | Sofala |
| Antonio Macajo Gento | M | School Feeding Focal Point | Provincial Directorate of Education - Tete | | Remote |
| Joao Gaspar Barroso | M | Provincial Director | Provincial Directorate of Education - Tete | | Remote |
| Claudina Conde de Rabia Ajuda | F | District Director | District Service of Education - Marara | | Remote |
| Fernando Nota Belo | M | School Director | Primary School EP1&2 Mufa Caconde - Marara | | Remote |
| Neema Mkomawanthu | F | Oficial do programa de Alimentacao Escolar | WFP FO - Tete | | Remote |
| Olerio Domingos Agostinho | M | School Director | Primary School EP1&2 Cassoca - Marara | | Remote |
| Altino Sairosse Macajo | M | School Feeding Manager | Primary School EP1&2 Cassoca - Marara | | Remote |
| Andre Justino Cuambe | M | School Feeding Focal Point | District Service of Education - Cahora Bassa | | Remote |
| Jaime Cantaene Junior | M | School Feeding Focal Point | District Service of Education - Cahora Bassa | | Remote |

| Name | Gender | Position | Institution | Interview Date | Location |
|--------------------------|--------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------|
| Eugenio Domingos Marrove | M | Technical Staff (UGEA) | District Service of Education - Cahora Bassa | | Remote |
| Regino Manio Arone | M | President | Farmers Association - Kuchinga - Cahora Bassa | | Remote |
| Paulo Ajudante | M | School Director | Primary School EP1&2 Cavulancie - Cahora Bassa | | Remote |
| Alberto Venancio | M | School Director | Primary School EP1 Matungulo - Cahora Bassa | | Remote |
| Reginario Lucio | M | School Feeding Manager | Primary School EP1 Matungulo - Cahora Bassa | | Remote |
| Carlitos Cabado Bonesse | M | Director da Escola | Primary School EP1&2 Caho - Cahora Bassa | | Remote |
| Ana Telma | F | Focal Point | Environment Provincial Service - Tete | | Remote |
| Manuel Alfinar | M | Executive Director | ACEAGRARIO - Tete | | Remote |
| Gentil Afuala | M | Supervisor "Rede-Extensao" | District Service of Economic Activities (SDAE) - Changara | | Remote |
| Antonio Cardoso | M | Produtor ICRM_Chipembere | ICRM Beneficiary - Changara District | | Remote |
| Helena Thole | F | Produtor ICRM_Wiriamo | ICRM Beneficiary - Changara District | | Remote |
| Jubeth Secane | F | Programme Officer | Conselho Cristão de Moçambique (NGO) | | Remote |
| Julio Jose Samo | M | Provincial Delegate | KULIMA (NGO) | | Tete |
| Ana Paula Correia | F | Head of Technical Department | INGD - Provincial | 07/07/2021 | Sofala |
| Maria Emilia | F | Technical Officer | INGD - Provincial | 07/07/2021 | Sofala |
| Sergio Meque | M | Technical Officer | INGD - Provincial | 07/07/2021 | Sofala |
| Diogo Borges David | M | Head of Department | Provincial Directorate of Agriculture | 07/07/2021 | Sofala |

| Name | Gender | Position | Institution | Interview Date | Location |
|-----------------------|--------|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------|
| Bharat Kumar | M | Logistic and Supply Chain Officer | WFP FO - Sofala | 07/07/2021 | Sofala |
| Luis Paulo Mandlate | M | Executive Director | Gabinete de Reconstrução Pós-Ciclones (GREPOC) | 07/07/2021 | Remote |
| Virgilio Caetano | M | Director of Health Office | District Health Service - Buzi | 08/07/2021 | Sofala |
| Manuel Chibugoloa | M | Programme Officer | District Health Service - Buzi | 08/07/2021 | Sofala |
| Joaquim José Passades | M | School Feeding Focal Point | District Health Service - Buzi | 08/07/2021 | Sofala |
| Abias Zacarias | M | School Director | District Service of Education - Buzi | 08/07/2021 | Sofala |
| Diana Borges | F | Head of Field Office - Gaza | WFP FO - Gaza | 12/07/2021 | Gaza |
| Manuel Afonso | M | Provincial Delegate | INGD | 12/07/2021 | Gaza |
| Timoteo Ferzara | M | Head of Provincial Department of Agriculture | Provincial Department of Agriculture - Gaza | 12/07/2021 | Gaza |
| Odécio Valente Sambo | M | Head of Provincial Department of Education | Provincial Department of Education - Gaza | 12/07/2021 | Gaza |
| Claudio Utui | M | School Feeding & School Production Officer | Provincial Department of Education - Gaza | 12/07/2021 | Gaza |
| Sergio Moiano | M | District Administrator | District Administration of Chibuto | 12/07/2021 | Gaza |
| Rosita Cossa | F | Social Action Officer | District Administration of Chibuto | 12/07/2021 | Gaza |
| Joaquim de Carvalho | M | Field Officer | WFP FO - Gaza | 13/07/2021 | Gaza |
| Lucia João | F | Field Officer | WFP FO - Gaza | 13/07/2021 | Gaza |
| Luis Hamido | M | Programme Officer | WFP FO - Gaza | 13/07/2021 | Gaza |
| Dora | F | Permanent Secretary of State | District Administration of Chókwé | 13/07/2021 | Gaza |
| Nelson Chamo | M | District Officer for Economic Activities (SDAE) | District Administration of Chókwé | 13/07/2021 | Gaza |
| Flavio Cristiano | M | Director of Education Services | District Education Services | 14/07/2021 | Gaza |

| Name | Gender | Position | Institution | Interview Date | Location |
|----------------|--------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------|
| António Chioze | M | School Director | Primary School | 14/07/2021 | Gaza |

Annex 7: Bibliography

- ABC, 2018a Agência Brasileira de Cooperação (ABC) e Centro de Excelência contra a Fome do Programa Mundial de Alimentos (PMA). 2018. Programa de Execução de Cooperação Sul-Sul Trilateral Moçambique-PMA. Apoio à Consolidação e Expansão do Programa Nacional de Alimentação Escolar de Moçambique – PRONAE. Relatório 2018
- AfDB, 2018a African Development Bank. 2018. *African Economic Outlook 2018*
- AfDB, 2018b African Development Bank. 2018. *Mozambique Country Strategy Paper 2018-2022*
- AfDB, 2020 African Development Bank. 2020. *African Economic Outlook 2020*
- AfDB, 2021 African Development Bank. 2021. *Mozambique Macroeconomic Performance and Outlook*.
- AGRA, 2017 AGRA 2017. *Mozambique Operational Plan*.
- AI, 2021 Amnesty International 2021. *The State of the World's Human Rights*.
- Bailey, S., Polvanesi, M., 2019 **Bailey, S., Polvanesi, M.**, 2019. Cash transfers and vouchers in response to drought in Mozambique: lessons on social protection linkages and separation of functions.
- CARE, 2019 CARE. 2019. Rapid Gender Analysis: A Commitment to Addressing Gender and Protection Issues in Cyclone- and Flood-Affected Malawi, Mozambique and Zimbabwe
- Carrilho, *et al*, nd. **Carrilho J. Abbas, M, Junior, A. Chidassicua, J & Mosca, J.**, nd. *Food Security and Nutrition Challenges in Mozambique*, Observatorio do Meio Rural.
- Centro Terra Viva, 2016 Centro Terra Viva. 2016. Mozambique - Context and Land Governance. <https://cambra7.landportal.org/book/countries/2016/mozambique-context-and-land-governance>
- Climatelinks, nd. Climatelinks nd. Mozambique: Climate Vulnerability Profile. <https://www.climatelinks.org/countries/mozambique>
- Cosaca – Humanitarian Consortium, 2019 Cosaca – Humanitarian Consortium. 2019. Rapid Gender and Protection Analysis - Cyclone Kenneth Response in Cabo Delgado Province, Mozambique.
- EU, 2020 European Union. 2020. *Final Evaluation of the Programme “Accelerate Progress Towards Millennium Development Goal 1C (MDG1.C Programme)”*
- FAO, 2018 FAO 2018. <http://www.fao.org/countryprofiles/lifdc/en>
- FAO, nd (a) FAO nd.. <http://www.fao.org/mozambique/fao-in-mozambique/mozambique-at-a-glance/en/>
- FAO, nd (b) FAO nd, Sustainable Development Goals. <http://www.fao.org/sustainable-development-goals/indicators/211/en>
- FEWS NET, 2014 [Famine Early Warning Systems Network](http://www.fewsnet.org/). 2014. *Mozambique Livelihood Zone Descriptions*.
- FNG, nd Fill the Nutrition Gap, nd. Nutrition Situation Analysis framework and decision tool.
- Germanwatch, 2021 Germanwatch. 2021. Global Climate Risk Index 2021
- GHI, 2020 (a) Global Hunger Index www.globalhungerindex.org
- GHI, 2020 (b) Global Hunger Index, Mozambique, 2020. <https://www.globalhungerindex.org/mozambique.html>
- Global Nutrition Report, 2020 [Global Nutrition Report](http://www.globalnutritionreport.org/). 2020.
- GoM, 2003 Government of Mozambique. 2003. *Agenda 2025*

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| GoM, 2007 | Government of Mozambique. 2007. <i>Social Action Policy</i> . |
| GoM, 2010 (a) | Government of Mozambique. 2010. <i>Plan of Action and the Multisectoral Plan of Action for the Reduction of Chronic Malnutrition (PAMRDC)</i> |
| GoM, 2010 (b) | Government of Mozambique. 2010. <i>National Basic Social Security Strategy</i> |
| GoM, 2012 (a) | Government of Mozambique. 2012. <i>National School Feeding Programme (PRONAE)</i> |
| GoM, 2012 (b) | Government of Mozambique. 2012. <i>National Strategy of Adaptation and Mitigation of Climate Change</i> |
| GoM, 2013 | Government of Mozambique. 2013. Agreement between the Government of Mozambique and the Government of the Russian Federation on the disbursement of the debt of the Republic of Mozambique owed to the Russian Federation on financing the development projects in the territory of the Republic of Mozambique. |
| GoM, 2014 | Government of Mozambique. 2014. <i>The National Development Strategy</i> |
| GoM, 2015 (a) | Government of Mozambique. 2015. <i>Five-Year Government Programme (PQG 2015-2019)</i> |
| GoM, 2015 (b) | Government of Mozambique. 2015. <i>National Strategic Plan to Fight Against HIV/AIDS</i> |
| GoM, 2015 (c) | Government of Mozambique. 2015. <i>National Strategy and Action Plan of Biological Diversity of Mozambique 2015-2035</i> |
| GoM, 2016 | Government of Mozambique. 2016. <i>National Strategy for Food Fortification 2016-2020</i> |
| GoM, 2019 (a) | Government of Mozambique. 2019. Draft National Food Security and Nutrition Strategy (ESAN III 2020-2030) |
| GoM, 2019 (b) | Government of Mozambique. 2019. <i>National Forestry Plan 2019-2035</i> |
| GoM, 2020 (a) | Government of Mozambique. 2020. <i>Five-Year Government Programme (PQG 2020-2024)</i> |
| GoM, 2020 (b) | Government of Mozambique. 2020. <i>National Voluntary Review of the SDGs</i> . |
| GoM, nd (a) | Government of Mozambique, nd. Portal do Governo de Moçambique, www.portaldogoverno.gov.mz/por/Governo/Ministerios |
| GoM, nd (b) | Government of Mozambique, nd. <i>Environmental Strategy for the Sustainable Development of Mozambique</i> |
| HANCI, 2019 (a) | Hunger and Nutrition Commitment Index (HANCI-Africa) |
| Hera, 2015 (a) | Hera. 2015. Integração da cadeia de abastecimentos dos Artigos Médico – Cirúrgicos. Moçambique |
| Hera, 2015 (b) | Hera. 2015. Avaliação da Cadeia de Abastecimentos dos Produtos de Nutrição em Moçambique. |
| Hera, 2015 (c) | Hera. 2015. Supply Chain Integration. Fast-Moving Medical-Surgical Items. |
| Hera, 2015 (d) | Hera. 2015. Supply Chain Assessment of Nutrition Products In Mozambique. |
| Human Development Report, 2020 | Human Development Report. 2020. <i>The Next Frontier: Human Development and the Anthropocene: Briefing note for countries on the 2020 Human Development Report – Mozambique</i> |
| IAHE, 2020 | Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation of the Response to Cyclone Idai in Mozambique, July 2020 |
| IFAD, nd. | International Fund for Agricultural Development, nd. Mozambique country profile. https://www.ifad.org/web/operations/country/id/mozambique |
| INAS, 2021 (a) | Instituto Nacional de Acção Social. 2021. <i>INAS Capacity Stocktaking Draft Report</i> |
| INAS, 2021 (b) | Instituto Nacional de Acção Social. 2021. <i>Inventário Rápido de Capacidades. Relatório Preliminar</i> . |
| INE, 2016 | Instituto Nacional de Estatística. 2016. <i>Inquérito ao Orçamento Familiar (IOF) 2014/15</i> |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| IPC, nd | Integrated Food Security Phase Classification - http://www.ipcinfo.org |
| IPC-IG, 2018 | International Policy Centre for Growth. 2018. <i>World Food Programme's intervention to improve market access for vulnerable smallholder farmers in the provinces of Manica, Nampula, Tete and Zambezia</i> . Impact evaluation report. |
| IPC-IG, 2019 | International Policy Centre for Growth. 2019. Avaliação da Cobertura e das Incidências dos Benefícios da Fortificação de Alimentos em Moçambique. |
| Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, 2016. | Government of Mozambique, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security. 2016. <i>Gender Strategy and Action Plan for Agrarian Sector 2016-2025</i> |
| Ministry of Agriculture, 2011 | Government of Mozambique, Ministry of Agriculture. 2011. <i>Strategic Plan for the Development of the Agricultural Sector 2011-2020 (PEDSA)</i> |
| Ministry of Agriculture, 2013 | Government of Mozambique, Ministry of Agriculture. 2013. <i>National Agriculture Investment Plan 2014-2018 (PNISA)</i> |
| Ministry of Economy and Finance, 2017 | Government of Mozambique Ministry of Economy and Finance and World Food Programme. 2017. Memorandum of Understanding Between the Government of Mozambique represented by the Ministry of Economy and Finance of the Republic of Mozambique and The World Food Programme to support the implementation of Mozambique's National School Feeding Programme (PRONAE) for the period 2017-2021. |
| Ministry of Education and Human Development, 2016 | Government of Mozambique, Ministry of Education and Human Development and World Food Programme. 2016. Memorando de Entendimento entre MINEDH e PMA. |
| Ministry of Education and Human Development, 2017 | Government of Mozambique, Ministry of Education and Human Development and World Food Programme. 2017. Adenda ao Memorando de Entendimento entre o MINEDH e o PMA. |
| (a) | |
| Ministry of Education and Human Development, 2017 | Ministério da Educação e Desenvolvimento Humano. 2017. Plano Operacional do PRONAE, 2017 e 2018. |
| (b) | |
| Ministry of Education and Human Development, 2019 | Ministério da Educação e Desenvolvimento Humano. 2019. Plano Operacional do PRONAE. |
| Ministry of Education and Human Development, 2020 | Ministério da Educação e Desenvolvimento Humano. 2020. Plano Operacional do PRONAE. |
| Ministry of Education and Human Development, 2021 | Ministério da Educação e Desenvolvimento Humano, 2021. Plano Operacional do PRONAE. |
| Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Action, 2016 | Gender Profile – Mozambique |
| Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Action, nd | Ministério do Género, Criança e Acção Social. nd. Termos de referência da equipe técnica sobre protecção social adaptativa (.ppt). |
| Ministry of Health, 2014 | Government of Mozambique, Ministry of Health. 2014. <i>Strategic Plan for the Health Sector 2014-2019</i> |

Molina, E. & Martin, G., 2015
NAI, 2018
OCHA, 2017
OCHA, 2019
OCHA, nd.
OECD, nd.
República de Moçambique, 2016
Santos, et al, 2017
SABER, 2016
Transparency International, nd.
UN, 2016.
UNAIDS, 2019
UNDP, 2020
UNEG, 2011
UNEG, 2018
UNFPA, nd
UNHCR, 2019
UNHCR, 2020
UNICEF, 2019
UNICEF, nd (a)
UNICEF, nd (b)
UNICEF, nd (c)
UNICEF, nd (d)
UNICEF, nd (e)
UNICEF/WHO/WB, 2017
UNSTATS, nd

Molina, E. & Martin, G. 2015. Education Service Delivery in Mozambique: A Second Round of the Service Delivery Indicators Survey. World Bank.

Nordiska Afrikainstitutet. 2018. "Debt, Aid and Poverty In Mozambique: Lessons Learned From the Debt Crisis"

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. 2017. *New Way of Working*.

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. 2019. Operationalizing Collective Outcomes.

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. nd. Humanitarian Development Nexus.

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Development Assistance Committee. nd. Better Criteria for Better Evaluation.

Government of Mozambique and World Food Programme. 2016. Documento Do Projecto. Apoio à Implementação do Programa Nacional de Alimentação Escolar de Moçambique (PRONAE) através do Acordo de Conversão da Dívida para Projectos de Desenvolvimento entre o Governo de Moçambique e o Governo da Rússia.

Santos, Ricardo & Salvucci, Vincenzo. 2017. "Pobreza e bem-estar multidimensional em Moçambique", Policy Brief 2017

SABER. 2016. Alimentação Escolar - Relatório Nacional. Moçambique 2016.

Transparency International Corruption Perception Index.
<https://www.transparency.org/en/countries/mozambique>

United Nations. 2016. One humanity: shared responsibility.

UNAIDS, 2019. Mozambique Country Profile,
www.unaids.org/en/regionscountries/countries/mozambique

United Nations Development Programme, 2020. Human Development Index Human Development Report - Mozambique Country Profile.

United Nations Evaluation Group, 2011. *Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation -- Towards UNEG Guidance*.

United Nations Evaluation Group. 2018. *The Humanitarian Development Nexus – What do evaluations have to say?*

United Nations Population Fund. nd. World Population Dashboard – Mozambique, nd. www.unfpa.org/data/world-population/MZ

United Nations Refugee Agency. 2019. KAP Survey – Maratane Refugee Camp.

United Nations Refugee Agency. 2020. Mozambique Fact Sheet.

United Nations Children Fund Education Sector Budget and Expenditure Brief

United Nations Children Fund. nd. Database, <https://data.unicef.org>

United Nations Children Fund. nd. Country profile, <http://www.unicef.org/mz/>

United Nations Children Fund. nd. Mozambique Nutrition at a Glance

United Nations Children Fund. nd. Mozambique responds to gender-based violence in the context of COVID-19.
<https://www.unicef.org/mozambique/en/stories/mozambique-responds-gender-based-violence-context-covid-19>

United Nations Children Fund, nd. UNICEF Database
<https://data.unicef.org/country/moz/>

UNICEF/WHO/World Bank. 2017. Joint Malnutrition estimates

United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Statistics Division, nd.
<https://unstats.un.org/capacity-development/UNSD-FCDO/mozambique/>

| | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| VOA News | VOA News, 2021. Mozambique's Humanitarian Crisis in Cabo Delgado has displaced 700,000. https://www.voanews.com/africa/mozambiques-humanitarian-crisis-cabo-delgado-has-displaced-700000 |
| WFP, 2012 | World Food Programme. 2012. Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO 200355) |
| WFP, 2014 | World Food Programme. 2014. <i>Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation 200355, Assistance to Vulnerable Groups and Disaster-affected Populations in Mozambique: An evaluation of WFP's Operation (2012-2014)</i> . |
| WFP, 2015 | World Food Programme. 2015. <i>WFP 200286 Country Programme: An evaluation of WFP's Operation (2012-2015)</i> . |
| WFP, 2016 (a) | World Food Programme. 2016. Indicators from SPRs. |
| WFP, 2016 (b) | World Food Programme. 2016. Policy on Country Strategic Plans |
| WFP, 2017 (b) | World Food Programme. 2017. Indicators from SPRs |
| WFP, 2017 (c) | World Food Programme. 2017. <i>Annual Country Report 2017</i> |
| WFP, 2017 (d) | World Food Programme. 2017. <i>The Cost of Hunger in Africa</i> |
| WFP, 2017 (e) | World Food Programme. 2017. <i>Country Strategic Plan Document (2017-2021)</i> |
| WFP, 2017 (f) | World Food Programme. 2017. <i>WFP Strategic Plan (2017-2021)</i> |
| WFP, 2017 (g) | World Food Programme. 2017. Immediate Response Emergency Operation (EMOP 201067) |
| WFP, 2017 (h) | World Food Programme. 2017. <i>Integrated Context Analysis (ICA) Technical Paper</i> . |
| WFP, 2018 (a) | World Food Programme. 2018. <i>Mozambique Annual Country Report 2018 Country Strategic Plan (2017-2021)</i> |
| WFP, 2018 (b) | World Food Programme. 2018. Resource situation, date: 18/03/2018 |
| WFP, 2018 (c) | World Food Programme. 2018. WFP and the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus Discussion Paper: WFP Executive Board. |
| WFP, 2018 (d) | World Food Programme. 2018. <i>Centro de Excelência contra a Fome. 2018. Relatório Anual</i> . |
| WFP, 2018 (e) | World Food Programme. 2018. Gender Analysis: Food Assistance for Assets in Mozambique. Recommended Improvement Actions. |
| WFP, 2018 (f) | World Food Programme. 2018. CBT – Gender, Protection & Accountability to Affected People. |
| WFP, 2018 (g) | World Food Programme. 2018. Gender Snap Shot Mozambique 2018. |
| WFP, 2018 (h) | World Food Programme. 2018. Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) Training. Report on Let's MAP training—inter-state UAS training for Madagascar and Mozambique. |
| WFP, 2018 (i) | World Food Programme. 2018. Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) Report. |
| WFP, 2018 (j) | World Food Programme. 2018. Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) Report 2. |
| WFP, 2018 (k) | World Food Programme. 2018. <i>Processo e Metodologia de Mapeamento das Necessidades de Fortalecimento de Capacidades (PPT)</i> . |
| WFP, 2018 (l) | World Food Programme, 2018. Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) Coordination in Humanitarian Response. Final Report on a Government of Belgium-funded WFP Project January 2017 – May 2018. |
| WFP, 2019 (a) | World Food Programme. 2019. <i>Mozambique Annual Country Report 2019</i> |
| WFP, 2019 (b) | World Food Programme. 2019. <i>Mid-Term Review of WFP Mozambique Country Strategic Plan (2017-2021)</i> |
| WFP, 2019 (d) | World Food Programme. 2019. <i>2019 Protection and Gender Assessment for Change of Food Assistance Modalities in Quissanga Praia and Mocimboa da Praia</i> . |
| WFP, 2019 (e) | World Food Programme. 2019. Country Office Mozambique. 2018 Annual Performance Plan. |
| WFP, 2019 (f) | World Food Programme. 2019. Country Office Mozambique. 2019 Annual Performance Plan – MYR. |

| | |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| WFP, 2019 (g) | World Food Programme. 2019. Process Monitoring Report Cylone Idai Emergency. |
| WFP, 2019 (h) | World Food Programme, Executive Board. 2019. Report on global losses for the period from 1 January to 31 December 2018. |
| WFP, 2020 (a) | World Food Programme. 2020. <i>WFP Mozambique Country Strategic Plan, revision 07</i> |
| WFP, 2020 (b) | World Food Programme. 2020. <i>Mozambique Annual Country Report 2020</i> |
| WFP, 2020 (c) | World Food Programme. 2020. <i>School Feeding Contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals: A Strategic Evaluation Inception Report, 27 May 2020</i> |
| WFP, 2020 (d) | World Food Programme. 2020. Mozambique IPC Acute Food Insecurity Analysis, <i>October 2020 – September 2021</i> |
| WFP, 2020 (e) | World Food Programme. 2020. WFP Mozambique CO, Emergency Option Matrix; December 17, 2020 |
| WFP, 2020 (f) | World Food Programme. 2020. Internal Situation Report – Northern Mozambique Displacement Crisis; December 16 2020 |
| WFP, 2020 (g) | World Food Programme. 2020. Terms of Reference |
| WFP, 2020 (h) | World Food Programme, UNICEF, UKAid. 2020. Lean season nutrition response and resilience building in Mozambique Final Report |
| WFP, 2020 (i) | World Food Programme. 2020. Virtual Farmers Market Project |
| WFP, 2020 (j) | World Food Programme. 2020. The Virtual Farmer Market project 2020 – 2022. Baseline survey |
| WFP, 2020 (k) | World Food Programme. 2020. Smallholder Agriculture Market Support. |
| WFP, 2020 (l) | World Food Programme. 2020. End-line survey report of the WFP Post-Harvest Loss management for school meals. |
| WFP, 2020 (m) | World Food Programme, Centro de Excelência contra a Fome. 2020. <i>Relatório Anual.</i> |
| WFP, 2020 (n) | World Food Programme. 2020. Gender Analysis Chemba District, Sofala Province, Mozambique |
| WFP, 2020 (o) | World Food Programme. 2020. <i>Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (KAP) Study on maternal nutrition, infant and young child feeding, sanitation and hygiene, and sexual and reproductive health, including obstetric fistula, in Chemba District, Sofala.</i> |
| WFP, 2020 (p) | World Food Programme. 2020. Virtual Farmers Market. Rapid Gender Analysis for Nampula. |
| WFP, 2020 (q) | World Food Programme. 2020. WFP Mozambique - Gender Factsheet 2020. |
| WFP, 2020 (r) | World Food Programme. 2020. <i>BTO Report on UAS (drones) Emergency Response Training.</i> |
| WFP, 2020 (s) | World Food Programme. 2020. Gender Transformative and Nutrition-sensitive (GTNS) Stunting Prevention Project in Chemba District, Mozambique. |
| WFP, 2020 (t) | World Food Programme. 2020. WFP Mozambique Gender Transformative and Nutrition Sensitive (GTNS) Programme (2019 to 2021) Summary Baseline Report. |
| WFP, 2020 (u) | World Food Programme. 2020. Results WFP Mozambique Outcome Survey May/June 2020 Endline 2019-20 Lean Season Response (in Cabo Delgado, Nampula, Zambezia, Sofala, Tete, Manica, Gaza, Inhambane, and Maputo). |
| WFP, 2020 (v) | World Food Programme. 2020. Process-Output Monitoring Report Mozambique June—September 2020. |
| WFP, 2020 (x) | World Food Programme. 2020. Process Monitoring Report. Lean Season Response Mozambique. November 2019—March 2020. |
| WFP, 2020 (y) | World Food Programme. 2020. Results WFP Mozambique Outcome Survey – Internal. November 2019. |
| WFP, 2020 (z) | World Food Programme. 2020. <i>Decentralized Evaluation of Namibia National School Feeding Programme 2012-2018. Evaluation Report (Volume 1).</i> |
| WFP, 2020 (aa) | World Food Programme. 2020. The New CBT Business Process Model & RACI Matrix: The core guidance documents for WFP CBT interventions. |

| | |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| WFP, 2021 (a) | World Food Programme. 2021. Master list -CO - Mozambique 2016 - 2021 - All Staff. |
| WFP, 2021 (b) | World Food Programme. 2021. CPB_Resource Situation_27.01.2021 |
| WFP, 2021 (c) | World Food Programme. 2021. ACR4-A-Financial_Detail_by_Contribution_-_Internal_Version_27.01.2021. |
| WFP, 2021 (d) | World Food Programme. 2021. CPB_Grant_Balances_Report_27.01.21 |
| WFP, 2021 (e) | World Food Programme. 2021. ACR1-A_-_Standard_Country_Report_27.01.2021. |
| WFP, 2021 (f) | World Food Programme. 2021. CPB_-_Plan_vs_Actuals_Report_27.01.2021 |
| WFP, 2021 (g) | World Food Programme. 2021. School Feeding Contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals: A Strategic Evaluation. SFSE Evaluation Report draft 2 for submission 10.02.2021 |
| WFP, 2021 (h) | World Food Programme. 2021. Pre-CSP Mozambique Distribution Contribution Stats |
| WFP, 2021 (i) | World Food Programme. 2021. CM-R002b_-_Annual_Beneficiaries_by_Strategic_Outcome,_Activity_and_Modality_(CSP)_v1.1 |
| WFP, 2021 (j) | World Food Programme. 2021. CM-R020_-_Adj_Pars_&_Bens_by_Act_Tag,_Ben_Grp,_Gender,_Age_Grp_v1.1 (1) |
| WFP, 2021 (k) | World Food Programme. 2021. ACR1-A - Standard Country Report, date: 27.01.2021 |
| WFP, 2021 (l) | World Food Programme. 2021. ACR4-A-Financial Detail by Contribution, date: 27.01.2021 |
| WFP, 2021 (m) | World Food Programme. 2021. CPB Resource situation, date: 27/01/2021 |
| WFP, 2021 (n) | World Food Programme. 2021. CPB Grant Balances Report, date: 27/01/2021 |
| WFP, 2021 (o) | World Food Programme, 2017. Resource Situation, date: 31/12/2017 |
| WFP, 2021 (p) | World Food Programme. 2021. Distribution Contribution Stats |
| WFP, 2021 (q) | World Food Programme, UNICEF. 2021. <i>WFP and UNICEF's joint nutrition relief and recovery operation in response to Tropical Cyclones Idai and Kenneth. Consolidated Final Report.</i> |
| WFP, 2021 (r) | World Food Programme. 2021. Programming to treat Moderate Acute Malnutrition |
| WFP, 2021 (s) | World Food Programme. 2021. Retrospective analysis. Availability and Stockout of Specialized Nutritious Foods for Acute Malnutrition Treatment in Mozambique. |
| WFP, 2021 (t) | World Food Programme. 2021. Food security and livelihoods under a changing climate in Mozambique. |
| WFP, 2021 (u) | World Food Programme. 2021. Food security and climate change, the pressing reality of Mozambique |
| WFP, 2021 (v) | World Food Programme. 2021. Gender Analysis Report |
| WFP, 2021 (w) | World Food Programme. 2021. Management Information Note: Interim Findings from the Internal Audit of WFP Operations in Mozambique. |
| WFP, 2021 (x) | World Food Programme. 2021. Beneficiary Feedback & Complaint Mechanism. Standard Operational Procedures (SOP) |
| WFP, 2021 (y) | World Food Programme. 2021. Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (KAP) study. From the multisectoral Gender Transformative and Nutrition Sensitive stunting prevention Project in Sofala, Mozambique. |
| WFP, 2021 (z) | World Food Programme. 2021. Country Office Mozambique. 2020 Annual Performance Plan – EYR. |
| WFP, 2021 (aa) | World Food Programme. 2021. Results WFP Mozambique Outcome Survey October/November 2020 Baseline 2020-2021 Lean Season Response (Zambezia, Tete, Manica, Sofala, Inhambane, Gaza and Maputo). |
| WFP, 2021 (ab) | World Food Programme. 2021. Eloise After Action Review (AAR) Results. |

| | |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| WFP, 2021 (ac) | World Food Programme. 2021. Results of WFP Mozambique Outcome Survey May 2021 Endline 2020-2021 Lean Season Response (Zambezia, Tete, Manica, Sofala, Inhambane, Gaza and Maputo), L2 Response to IDPs (Cabo Delgado and Nampula), and COVID-19 Response (Tete and Zambezia). |
| WFP, 2021 (ad) | World Food Programme. 2021. Outcome Monitoring Integrated Climate Risk Management Climate-resilient food security for women and men smallholders in Mozambique through integrated climate risk management |
| WFP, 2021 (ae) | World Food Programme. 2021. Minimum Monitoring Requirements by programme. |
| WFP, 2021 (af) | World Food Programme. 2021. Mid-Term Review of the Integrated Climate Risk Management Project, Mozambique. |
| WFP, 2021 (ag) | World Food Programme. 2021. Process-Output Monitoring Report Mozambique. November 2020 – March 2021. |
| WFP, 2021 (ah) | World Food Programme. 2021. Standard Operating Procedures for Outcome and Process Monitoring WFP Mozambique. |
| WFP, 2021 (ai) | World Food Programme. 2021. Mainstreaming of Disability Disaggregation: A Phased Approach. Technical Note. |
| WFP, 2021 (aj) | World Food Programme. 2021. Strategy for Support to Social Protection: Summary version. |
| WFP, 2021 (ag) | World Food Programme. 2021. Annual Performance Plan 2020 – EYR. |
| WFP, 2021 (ah) | World Food Programme. 2021. Corporate Results Framework. Management Key Performance Indicators. Percentage of post-delivery losses for PDL Report. |
| WFP, 2021 (ai) | World Food Programme. Executive Board, 2021. Report on global losses for the period from 1 January to 31 December 2020. |
| WFP, 2021 (aj) | World Food Programme. 2021. Retrospective analysis. Availability and Stockout of Specialized Nutritious Foods for Acute Malnutrition Treatment in Mozambique. |
| WFP, 2021 (ak) | World Food Programme. 2021. State of School Feeding Worldwide 2020. |
| WFP, nd (a) | World Food Programme, nd. WFP Mozambique |
| WFP, nd. (b) | World Food Programme, nd. <i>Provision of Logistics and Emergency Telecommunications Support to Humanitarian Emergency Operations in Flood Affected Areas of Mozambique</i> |
| WFP, nd. (c) | World Food Programme, UNESCO, nd. <i>Integrating Nutrition Education and School Meals Programmes in Mozambique.</i> |
| WFP, nd. (d) | World Food Programme, nd. Concept Note: Towards a nutrition sensitive agricultural value chain. |
| WFP, nd. (e) | World Food Programme, nd. Concept Note: A chance for every schoolchild: Partnering to scale up school health and nutrition for human capital in Mozambique. |
| WFP, nd. (f) | World Food Programme, nd. WFP – Cartier Philanthropy Partnership. Project Proposal. Scaling-Up the Zero Food Loss Initiative in Mozambique: Empowering smallholder farmers and market actors in Mozambique to reduce postharvest loss. |
| WFP, nd. (g) | World Food Programme, nd. Gender transformative and nutrition sensitive programme to strengthen food and nutrition security, and resilience—Post-Harvest Loss Component. |
| WFP, nd. (h) | World Food Programme, nd. Project Concept Note: Improving smallholder farmers’ market integration in Mozambique through a Virtual Farmers Market. |
| WFP, nd. (i) | World Food Programme, nd. Technical and Financial Report – 2017-2020 partnership period. |
| WFP, nd (j) | World Food Programme, Centro de Excelência contra a Fome, nd. Série Boas Práticas Alimentação Escolar Nos Países DeLíngua Portuguesa Cabo Verde • São Tomé E Príncipe • Brasil • Moçambique. |

| | |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| WFP, nd (k) | World Food Programme, Centro de Excelência contra a Fome nd. Série Boas Práticas Financiando Alimentação Escolar. Ferramentas para reforçar programas nacionais. |
| WFP, nd (l) | World Food Programme. nd. WFP Standard Operating Procedures. Safe and Dignified Distributions. Mozambique. |
| WFP, nd (m) | World Food Programme. nd. <i>WFP's Gender Transformative Country Strategic Plan (2017-2021)</i> . |
| WFP, nd (n) | World Food Programme. nd. Step by step guide for handling cases of sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) – country office Mozambique. |
| WFP, nd (o) | World Food Programme. nd. A Cooperação Sul-Sul ganha asas: Madagáscar e Moçambique embarcam num treino avançado de Veículos Aéreos Não Tripulados (VANT ou Drones). |
| World Bank, 2018 | World Bank. 2018. Facing Forward: Schooling and Learning in Africa |
| World Bank, 2020 (a) | World Bank. 2020. Education Service Delivery in Mozambique: A Second Round of the Service Delivery Indicators Survey |
| World Bank, 2021 (a) | World Bank. 2021. International Development Association. Project Appraisal Document on a Proposed Grant. |
| World Bank, 2021 (b) | World Bank. 2021. Financing agreement (Northern Crisis Recovery Project) between the Republic of Mozambique and International Development Association. |
| World Bank, nd. | World Bank DataBase , |
| World Bank, nd. | World Bank, World Food Programme. nd. Estudo sobre mecanismos de coordenação entre o INAS E O INGC. |

Annex 8: Agenda of the In-Country Mission

Colour Legend:

| |
|--------------------------------------|
| Field work in the Capital, Maputo |
| Field work in the province of Sofala |
| Field work in the province of Gaza |

TABLE 25: FIELD WORK AGENDA

| Date | | | Field activity |
|-----------|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 05/07 | Monday | Morning | WFP country office: meeting with CD + WFP staff |
| 05/07 | Monday | Afternoon | Meeting with Head of Supply Chain |
| 06/07 | Tuesday | Morning | Meetings with government authorities (MINEDH) |
| 06/07 | Tuesday | Afternoon | Meeting with Head of Programme |
| 06/07 | Tuesday | Afternoon | Travel to Beira by air (province of Sofala) |
| 07/07 | Wednesday | Morning | Meeting with Head of Field Office - Sofala |
| | | | Meeting with INGD delegation in Beira + Agriculture Directorate |
| | | Afternoon | Meetings with Logistic Associate - WFP Sofala office |
| | | | Meeting Office of Reconstruction post-cyclones - GREPOC |
| 08/07 | Thursday | Morning | Travel to Buzi district |
| | | | Focus groups with district authorities and beneficiaries of post-emergency support to cyclone-affected households in Buzi |
| | | Afternoon | Return to Beira |
| 09/09 | Friday | Morning | Travel to Dondo |
| | | | Focus group with food assistance for assets (FFA) beneficiaries |
| | | | Meeting with district authorities in Dondo |
| | | Return to Beira and follow-up meeting with INGD | |
| Afternoon | Focus group with WFP field office Sofala staff | | |
| 10/07 | Saturday | Morning | Return to Maputo by air |

| | | | |
|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11/07 | Sunday | Morning | Travel by road to Xai-Xai (province of Gaza) |
| 12/07 | Monday | Morning | Meeting with Head of WFP Field Office (Gaza) |
| | | | Meeting with provincial authorities – agriculture + INGD and education |
| | | Afternoon | Travel by road to Chibuto district |
| | | | Meeting with district administrator and district social action officer Meeting with climate risk management officer and district monitors – WFP Gaza |
| 13/07 | Tuesday | Morning | Focus groups with beneficiaries in Chibuto FFA and integrated climate risk management (ICRM) component + early warning system. |
| | | Afternoon | Travel by road to Chokwé district Meeting with Chókwé district authorities – permanent secretary + agriculture |
| 14/07 | Wednesday | Morning | Travel by road to Massingir district |
| | | | Meeting with District Director of Education |
| | | | Visit to school and meeting with school director in Massingir (school feeding) |
| | | Afternoon | Travel by road to Chokwé district Focus group with beneficiaries of integrated climate risk management component + early warning system Travel by road to Maputo (capital) |
| 15/07 | Thursday | Morning | Meetings with government authorities (MoH) |
| | | Afternoon | Meetings with government authorities (INAM) |
| 16/07 | Friday | Morning | Meeting with government authorities (INGD) |
| | | | Meeting with government authorities (SETSAN) |
| | | | Meeting with government authorities (MoH – Nutrition Dep) |
| | | Afternoon | Team work – wrap up |

Annex 9: Evaluability Assessment

1. This annex provides an overview of the evolution of the logical framework of the country strategic plan since its inception and an evaluability assessment. Detailed data at the indicator level is presented in Annex 15.

Overall data availability, quality and challenges

2. Over time the country strategic plan has been subject to seven budget revisions, often in connection with changes in the country context (for example, emergency response to cyclones, droughts, floods and the escalation of non-state armed attacks in the north). These revisions vary in scope, but they reflect a very dynamic country context. The country strategic plan has also seen substantial changes (for example, new activities were introduced in 2019), while WFP had to deal with new and emerging operational priorities through a significant expansion of the country budget (following revisions to needs-based assessments) and saw a corresponding substantial increase in staff numbers. As a result, the country strategic plan in Mozambique does not follow a linear implementation. The onset of large-scale emergencies has a significant impact on WFP operations in Mozambique. Furthermore, conducting the evaluation before the end of the country strategic plan limited the ability to perform a complete assessment of all the activities.

Data availability

3. Both the definition and the number of indicators the country office has reported against have evolved over time, thus challenging trend analysis. On one hand, the number of indicators has expanded over time. On the other hand, reporting against existing indicators has increased significantly, particularly between 2019 and 2020. Substantial changes to the number and type of indicators make it difficult to track progress over the implementation of the country strategic plan. The issue affects 2017 and 2018 data for most type of indicators. The baseline for many indicators was recorded in 2019 for the first time.

4. Quantitative indicators have been used to monitor activities of a mostly qualitative nature such as capacity strengthening and technical assistance. Indicators for these activities record the number of activities conducted (for example, trainings) and attendees (for example, to a training), but do not provide qualitative information about the usefulness and results of activities. The team tried to assess this dimension by other means, including through attention to the effects of capacity strengthening in interviews and focus groups, and by identifying changes in terms of the quality of processes (for example, planning process, response capacity, etc.).

5. WFP documentary evidence and data are rich. However, the impact of COVID-19 limited the ability of WFP to conduct thorough outcome and process monitoring activities over 2020 and 2021, which compromised the availability of data for this period.

6. A changing and expanding beneficiary population, especially following external shocks, made it difficult to compare across years. In this regard, indicators examined by the team had to be assessed against existing plans and not linearly due to changes in the underlying population. During the evaluation, the team explored the data in more detail (for example, geographical breakdown) to develop a more refined analysis wherever possible.

7. Overall, gender disaggregated data is available for beneficiaries, cross-cutting, output and outcome indicators. Beneficiary data is also broken down by age. The team has identified some challenges in relation to performance indicators. These challenges apply to indicators in general and are not specific to data disaggregated by sex.

8. Some activities bundle together different interventions that have changed over time. For example, Activity 3 is the sole activity under Outcome 2. Due to the different emergencies, Activity 3 accounts for 70 percent of the budget received. At the same time, the target population has changed over time. At some point, it was predominantly cyclone-affected communities, while now the main target is internally displaced people (IDP) in Cabo Delgado. The same indicators are used across the implementation of the country strategic plan, but changes in the underlying population mean that values sometimes reflect these changes rather than performance issues.

OUTCOME INDICATORS

9. The number of outcome indicators reported for the country strategic plan increased significantly in 2019 compared to previous years. In 2017, there were 26 indicators reported. In 2019, the figure increase to 57. In 2020, there was a drop in the number of outcome indicators reported. This is due to the impact of COVID-19, which impacted outcome monitoring activities. The number of indicators broken down per gender is slightly lower, but this is expected because not all outcome indicators can be broken down per gender.

10. There are only two outcome indicators looking at capacity strengthening in the country strategic plan. Activity 5 and Activity 6 include an indicator on the “number of national food security and nutrition policies, programmes and system components enhanced as a result of WFP capacity strengthening”.

TABLE 26. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN OUTCOME INDICATORS PER ACTIVITY

| Act .# | Activity | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | Ove/fem/ mal | Ove/fem/ mal | Ove/fem/ mal | Ove/fem/ mal |
| 1 | Coping strategy Index (CSI)1: 01. Provide capacity strengthening to prepare for, respond to and recover from, weather-related shocks, to the Government at national, subnational and community levels | 0/0/0 | 0/0/0 | 1/0/0 | 1/0/0 |
| 2 | CSI2: 02. Provide technical assistance to the Government in making social protection programmes shock-responsive and hunger-sensitive | 0/0/0 | 0/0/0 | 12/10/10 | 13/10/10 |
| 3 | URT1: 03. Provide cash and/or food transfers to vulnerable households affected by crisis | 19/19/19 | 19/18/18 | 24/23/23 | 23/22/22 |
| 4 | SMP1: 04. Strengthen the capacity of the government bodies responsible for the national home-grown school feeding programme | 3/3/3 | 2/2/2 | 4/4/4 | 1/1/1 |
| 5 | NPA1: 05. Provide capacity strengthening and technical assistance to government entities implementing the national strategy to combat stunting and micronutrient deficiencies | 0/0/0 | 0/0/0 | 3/0/0 | 3/0/0 |
| 6 | SMS1: 06. Enhance the aggregation, marketing and decision making capacities of smallholder farmers, with focus on women | 3/1/1 | 2/0/0 | 12/8/8 | 11/8/8 |
| 7 | CPA1: 07. Provide supply chain services to humanitarian and development partners | 1/0/0 | 1/0/0 | 1/0/0 | 1/0/0 |
| 8 | CPA1: 08. Provide services through the logistics cluster to government and other humanitarian and development partners | 0/0/0 | 0/0/0 | 0/0/1 | 0/0/0 |
| 9 | CPA2: 09. Provide emergency telecommunications cluster services to government and other humanitarian and development partners | 0/0/0 | 0/0/0 | 0/0/0 | 0/0/0 |
| 10 | CPA3: 10. Provide humanitarian air services to government and other humanitarian and development partners | 0/0/0 | 0/0/0 | 0/0/0 | 0/0/0 |
| 11 | CPA4: 11. Provide accommodation, transport and other services as required to humanitarian and development partners | 0/0/0 | 0/0/0 | 0/0/0 | 0/0/0 |
| | Total | 26/23/23 | 24/20/20 | 57/45/46 | 53/41/41 |

Source: COMET

OUTPUT INDICATORS

11. The number of output indicators reported by the country office has increased from 21 in 2017 to 96 in 2020. Compared to outcome indicators, the number of output indicators is more variable than outcome indicators (for example, in 2018 there are 76 indicators reported, compared to 68 in 2019) because outcome indicators are adjusted to the type of activity. Nonetheless, it is interesting to look at the number of indicators reported against target values to get an idea of improvements in the monitoring framework. The data shows that no indicators were reported against target values in 2017 and 2018. In 2019 the number of indicators reported against target values was 63. In 2020 the figure dropped slightly to 61.

TABLE 27. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN OUTPUT INDICATORS PER ACTIVITY

| Act. # | Activity | Total reported | | | | Reported against target | | | |
|--------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------|------|------|-------------------------|------|------|------|
| | | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| 1 | CSI1: 01. Provide capacity strengthening to prepare for, respond to and recover from, weather-related shocks, to the Government at national, subnational and community levels | 3 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 |
| 2 | CSI2: 02. Provide technical assistance to the Government in making social protection programmes shock-responsive and hunger-sensitive | 4 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 |
| 3 | URT1: 03. Provide cash and/or food transfers to vulnerable households affected by crisis | 6 | 51 | 21 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 26 |
| 4 | SMP1: 04. Strengthen the capacity of the government bodies responsible for the national home-grown school feeding programme | 4 | 11 | 18 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 6 |
| 5 | NPA1: 05. Provide capacity strengthening and technical assistance to government entities implementing the national strategy to combat stunting and micronutrient deficiencies | 3 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| 6 | SMS1: 06. Enhance the aggregation, marketing and decision making capacities of smallholder farmers, with focus on women | 1 | 2 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 7 |
| 7 | CPA1: 07. Provide supply chain services to humanitarian and development partners | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 |
| 8 | CPA1: 08. Provide services through the logistics cluster to government and other humanitarian and development partners | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 9 | CPA2: 09. Provide emergency telecommunications cluster services to government and other humanitarian and development partners | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 10 | CPA3: 10. Provide humanitarian air services to government and other humanitarian and development partners | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 11 | CPA4: 11. Provide accommodation, transport and other services as required to humanitarian and development partners | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| | Total | 21 | 76 | 68 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 61 |

Source: COMET

CROSS-CUTTING INDICATORS

12. The number of cross-cutting indicators reported in the country strategic plan has increased over time. Interestingly, COMET indicates that all cross-cutting indicators are recorded for Activity 3 only. In comparison gender indicators were reported for all five components of Country Programme 200286 and protection indicators were reported for two components.

TABLE 28. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN CROSS-CUTTING INDICATORS PER ACTIVITY

| Act. # | Activity | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|--------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| 1 | CSI1: 01. Provide capacity strengthening to prepare for, respond to and recover from, weather-related shocks, to the Government at national, subnational and community levels | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|----|----|
| 2 | CSI2: 02. Provide technical assistance to the Government in making social protection programmes shock-responsive and hunger-sensitive | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | URT1: 03. Provide cash and/or food transfers to vulnerable households affected by crisis | 0 | 4 | 10 | 10 |
| 4 | SMP1: 04. Strengthen the capacity of the government bodies responsible for the national home-grown school feeding programme | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | NPA1: 05. Provide capacity strengthening and technical assistance to government entities implementing the national strategy to combat stunting and micronutrient deficiencies | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | SMS1: 06. Enhance the aggregation, marketing and decision making capacities of smallholder farmers, with focus on women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | CPA1: 07. Provide supply chain services to humanitarian and development partners | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | CPA1: 08. Provide services through the logistics cluster to government and other humanitarian and development partners | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | CPA2: 09. Provide emergency telecommunications cluster services to government and other humanitarian and development partners | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | CPA3: 10. Provide humanitarian air services to government and other humanitarian and development partners | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | CPA4: 11. Provide accommodation, transport and other services as required to humanitarian and development partners | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 0 | 4 | 10 | 10 |

Source: COMET

Annex 10: Country Strategic Plan Strategic Outcomes, Outputs and Activities

TABLE 29: COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN STRATEGIC OUTCOMES, OUTPUTS AND ACTIVITIES

| CSP Strategic Outcomes | CSP Outputs | CSP Activities | Focus Area |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| SO 1 - Households in food-insecure areas of Mozambique are able to maintain access to adequate and nutritious food throughout the year, including in times of shock | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. People in shock-prone areas benefit from the Government's strengthened capacity to plan and prepare for, respond to and recover from shocks in order to meet their basic needs in times of crisis. 2. Shock-affected people benefit from the Government's strengthened capacity to provide expanded safety-net services in order to meet their basic needs in times of crisis. 3. Targeted food insecure communities benefit from construction and/or rehabilitation of assets that improve food security and build resilience to natural shocks and climate change. 4. Targeted households benefit from improved knowledge in nutrition, care practices and healthy diets in order improve their food consumption and nutritional status. 5. Targeted food insecure communities receive conditional cash- and/or food-based transfers in order to improve their food consumption. | <p>Activity 1: Provide capacity strengthening to prepare for, respond to and recover from weather-related shocks, to the Government at national, subnational and community levels</p> <p>Activity 2: Provide technical assistance to the Government in making social protection programmes shock-responsive and hunger – sensitive</p> | Resilience building |
| SO 2 - Shock-affected people in Mozambique are able to meet their basic food and nutrition needs during and immediately after a crisis | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shock-affected people receive unconditional cash and/or food-based transfers in order to meet their basic food and nutrition requirements. 2. Shock-affected malnourished children and pregnant and lactating women receive specialized nutritious foods in order to treat and reduce acute malnutrition rates. 3. Shock-affected people benefit from improved knowledge in nutrition, care practices and healthy diets in order to improve their nutritional status. | <p>Activity 3: Provide cash and/or food transfers to vulnerable households affected by crisis</p> | Crisis response |
| SO 3 - Children in chronically food-insecure areas have access to nutritious food throughout the year | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School children targeted by the national home-grown school feeding programme benefit from improved design, finance and implementation | <p>Activity 4: Strengthen the capacity of the government bodies responsible for the national home-grown school feeding programme</p> | Root causes |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| | <p>capacity of the Government that helps meet their basic food and nutrition needs and increase school attendance and retention.</p> <p>2. WFP-targeted school children receive a nutritious meal every day they attend school in order to meet basic food and nutrition needs and increase school attendance and retention.</p> <p>3. Targeted school children benefit from improved knowledge in nutrition, care practices and healthy diets in order to improve their nutritional status.</p> | | |
| SO 4 - Targeted people in prioritized areas of Mozambique have improved nutrition status in line with national targets by 2021 | <p>1. Vulnerable people in Mozambique benefit from strengthened, evidence-based national capacity to combat stunting and micronutrient deficiencies in order to improve their nutritional status.</p> <p>2. Vulnerable people in Mozambique benefit from improved knowledge in nutrition, care practices and healthy diets in order to improve their nutritional status.</p> | Activity 5: Provide capacity strengthening and technical assistance to government entities implementing the national strategy to combat stunting and micronutrient deficiencies | Root causes |
| SO 5 – Targeted smallholder farmers in northern and central Mozambique have enhanced livelihoods by 2021 | <p>1. Targeted smallholder farmers benefit from WFP value chain support in order to have improved access to profitable markets and increase their incomes.</p> <p>2. Targeted smallholder farmer households benefit from improved knowledge in nutrition, care practices and healthy diets in order to improve their nutritional status.</p> | Activity 6: Enhance the aggregation, marketing and decision making capacities of smallholder farmers, with focus on women | Root causes |
| SO 6 – Humanitarian and development partners in Mozambique are reliably supported by an efficient and effective supply chain and information and communications technology services and expertise | <p>1. Vulnerable communities benefit from WFP provision of supply chain and IT services and expertise to the Government and other partners that improves the effectiveness of development and humanitarian programmes.</p> <p>2. Vulnerable communities benefit from increased supply chain capacity of the Government and other partners that improves the effectiveness of development and humanitarian programmes.</p> | Activity 7: Provide supply chain services to humanitarian and development partners | Resilience building |
| SO 7 – Government and humanitarian partners in Mozambique have access to effective and reliable services during times of crisis | <p>1. Populations affected by crisis benefit from logistics cluster services to national disaster management cells, humanitarian agencies and partners in order to timely receive life-saving food and medical supplies.</p> <p>2. Populations affected by crisis benefit from emergency telecommunications services to national disaster management cells, humanitarian agencies and partners in order to receive timely life-saving assistance.</p> <p>3. Populations affected by crisis benefit from the humanitarian air services to national disaster management cells, humanitarian agencies and partners in order to receive timely humanitarian assistance.</p> | <p>Activity 8: Provide services through the logistics cluster to government and other humanitarian and development partners</p> <p>Activity 9: Provide emergency telecommunications cluster services to government and other humanitarian and development partners</p> <p>Activity 10: Provide humanitarian air services to government and other humanitarian and development partners</p> | Crisis response |

| | | | |
|--|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| | <p>4. Populations affected by crisis benefit from on-demand services to humanitarian and development partners in order to receive timely humanitarian assistance.</p> | <p>Activity 11: Provide accommodation, transport and other services as required to humanitarian and development partners</p> | |
|--|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|

Source: Evaluation team based on Country Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and subsequent budget revisions

Annex 11: Country Strategic Plan Alignment with National Policies and Strategies

TABLE 30. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT WITH NATIONAL POLICIES AND STRATEGIES

| Type | National policy or strategy | Focus | Alignment with WFP Country Strategic Plan |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Overarching policy document | Agenda 2025 (nation's vision and strategy) | Intends to be a guide for the country's development up to 2025 functioning as a shared national vision to provide a set of guidelines for medium and long-term action. Food security is set as a top priority for an agricultural and rural development strategy. However, no specific nutrition targets or concrete actions are articulated | Being an overarching policy document, the CSP document affirms its alignment with the Agenda 2025. However, no explicit reference to such alignment was found in the rationale of the SOs and its respective activities stated in the CSP. Nevertheless, it is clear that SO 5 is well aligned with this vision, namely in regard to the enhancement of smallholder farmers' capacities through WFP value chain support (Activity 6). |
| | National Development Strategy (2015-2035) | This strategy was approved to guide the operationalization of the Agenda 2025. References to nutrition priorities and concrete nutrition-related actions are scarce. The food insecurity issue is mainly addressed through increased production and access to markets by smallholder farmers | Not mentioned in the CSP document. However, Activity 6 within SO 5 is aligned with this strategy by focusing on improving smallholder farmers' access to profitable markets and increase of their incomes |
| | Five-Year Government Programme (PQG 2015-2019) | Is the central policy document that guides the Government's intervention across sectors ⁸ and is implemented through the different sectoral policies and strategies. The PQG focuses on five priorities to reduce poverty: i) consolidating national unity, peace and sovereignty; ii) developing the human capital and social; iii) promoting employment, productivity and competitiveness; iv) developing economic and social infrastructure; and v) ensuring sustainable management and transparent natural resources and environment. More specifically, food and nutrition security is addressed within priority (iii) - promoting employment and improving productivity and competitiveness. Key policy actions include the development of market-oriented agriculture, with strong involvement of family farming and private sector in order to generate employment and income. It is | As the main document that guides government action, the PQG is recurrently mentioned in the CSP document Under SO 1, Activity 1 focusing on increasing resilience to face climate-related shocks is well aligned with the strategic actions defined under PQG priority 5: "Reduce the vulnerability of communities, the economy and infrastructure to climate risks and natural and anthropogenic disasters" |

⁸ The PQG 2015-2019 was in force at the time of the formulation of the CSP. The new PQG covers the period 2020-2024.

| Type | National policy or strategy | Focus | Alignment with WFP Country Strategic Plan |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | <p>also worth noting that this PGQ incorporates gender-sensitive design and promotes secure tenure, equitable use and sustainable management of natural resources by poor rural men and women and other marginalized groups</p> | <p>Under SO 3, Activity 4 focusing on strengthening the national school feeding programme is aligned with PQG priority 2 aimed at strengthening human and social capital.</p> <p>Under SO 4, part of Activity 5 that focuses on improving knowledge in nutrition, care practices and healthy diets is also aligned with the abovementioned PQG priority 2</p> <p>Under SO 5, the CSP document mentions alignment with PQG priority 2, but no evidence was found in this regard. On the other hand, evidence of explicit alignment of SO 5 with the PQG was found within its priority 3, namely in regard to promoting employment and improving productivity and competitiveness, with an emphasis on agriculture</p> <p>SO 6 and SO 7 are broadly aligned with PQG priority 1 focusing on consolidating the culture of peace, democracy and political, economic, social and cultural stability</p> |
| <p>Agriculture, food security and nutrition-related policies and strategies</p> | <p>Strategic Plan for the Development of the Agricultural Sector 2011-2020 (PEDSA)</p> | <p>The PEDSA aims at contributing to the food security and income of agrarian producers in a competitive and sustainable manner, guaranteeing social and gender equity. This strategic plan is based on four key pillars:</p> <p>Pillar 1: agricultural productivity – increased productivity, production and competitiveness in agriculture contributing to an adequate diet</p> <p>Pillar 2: market access – services and infrastructure for greater market access and guiding framework conducive to agrarian investment</p> <p>Pillar 3: natural resources – sustainable use and full use of land, water, forests and fauna resources</p> <p>Pillar 4: institutions – strong agricultural institutions</p> | <p>Quoted in the CSP document.</p> <p>Alignment of WFP strategy within the focus areas of resilience (SO 1) and root causes (SO 3, SO 4 and SO 5) with PEDSA pillars 1 and 2</p> |
| | <p>Multisectoral Plan of Action for the</p> | | <p>Quoted in CSP document and good alignment within Activity 5 under SO 4 focusing on</p> |

| Type | National policy or strategy | Focus | Alignment with WFP Country Strategic Plan |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Reduction of Chronic Malnutrition 2011-2020 (PAMRDC) | The PAMRDC was approved in 2011 under the coordination of the Ministry of Health, with a strong involvement of SETSAN and WFP support. It aims to reduce stunting in children under 5, recognizing wasting in pregnant and lactating women and girls and in children under 2 as risk factors for stunting | providing capacity strengthening and technical assistance towards combating stunting |
| | National Food and Nutrition Security Strategy 2008-2015 (ESAN) | The ESAN was adopted in 1998 and reviewed in 2007. In terms of content, this strategy states that FNS and the right to food are core aspects of the different sectoral strategies towards fighting against hunger at all levels of governance. ESAN II strategic pillars are based on food and nutrition security dimensions (food production and availability, access to food, food consumption, etc.), thus contributing to a comprehensive approach. | Quoted in CSP document. Alignment of WFP strategy within the focus areas of resilience (SO 1) and root causes (SO 3, SO 4 and SO 5) |
| | National Strategy for Food Fortification 2016-2020 | This strategy aims to accelerate and expand the fortification of staple foods in Mozambique, namely wheat and maize flour, cooking oil, salt and sugar | Quoted in CSP document, its review and update was supported by the WFP under Activity 5 (SO 4) in the frame of the MGD1c programme, funded by the European Union |
| | Sustenta Programme | The “Sustenta” Programme is financed by the World Bank aiming at integrating family farming into productive value chains and improving livelihoods of rural households by promoting sustainable agriculture (social, economic and environmental) | Not mentioned in the CSP document |
| | National Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2013-2017 (PNISA) | The PNISA contains a list of priority national investments and interventions for the agrarian sector with the aim of contributing to food security, increasing the income and profitability of producers, and increasing market-oriented agricultural production | Not mentioned in the CSP document |
| Health sector | Strategic Plan for the Health Sector 2014-2019 | This plan provides the overall policy guidance for the health sector. It includes a specific nutrition programme focused, inter alia, on promoting good food and nutrition practices at the household level through the development and implementation of the social and behaviour communication changes strategies and contribute to the reduction of micronutrient deficiencies | Not mentioned in the CSP document, but broad alignment within Activity 5 (SO 4) regarding the capacity strengthening towards combating stunting and micronutrients deficiencies |
| | National Strategic Plan for Response to HIV/AIDS (2015-2019) | This provides strategic directions for addressing nutrition in the context of HIV/AIDS mitigation as when nutrition and food support are integrated into treatment, they can reduce mortality and save lives | Not mentioned in the CSP document. No evidence of concrete alignment within CSP SOs and related activities |
| | Strategy for Maternity Waiting Homes (2009) | This strategy sets out dietary requirements for pregnant women close to delivery | Quoted in the CSP document and strong alignment within Activity 5 (SO 4) towards |

| Type | National policy or strategy | Focus | Alignment with WFP Country Strategic Plan |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | improving knowledge in nutrition, care practices, and healthy diets |
| Social protection sector | National Strategy for Basic Social Security (2016–2024) | <p>Provides the overall policy guidance in regard to basic social protection. In particular, it aims to improve the management and coverage of social security programmes, including during emergency response and recovery</p> <p>It also includes as a priority the provision of food to primary schools, as well as to other vulnerable groups through boarding schools</p> | <p>Mentioned in the CSP document. Strong alignment within Activity 2 (SO 1) in regard to technical assistance to social protection programmes, as well as within Activity 3 (SO 2) in regard to the provision of cash and food transfers to vulnerable populations affected by crisis</p> <p>Alignment within Activity 4 (SO 3) as an opportunity for institutionalizing school feeding as a “safety net” as part of a broader national social protection system</p> |
| Education sector | Strategic Plan for the Education Sector | Provides the overall policy guidance for the education sector. School feeding is placed as a priority for the education sector, recognizing that adequate food is essential for the good performance of students. This strategy proposes that the school environment include, among others, access to drinking water, sanitation and access to a balanced diet. This strategy links school feeding with social protection and stipulates the gradual introduction of a school feeding programme in districts with higher levels of vulnerability to food insecurity and dropouts | Not mentioned in the CSP document, but strong alignment within Activity 4 (SO 3) towards strengthening the Government’s capacity to manage the school feeding programme (PRONAE) |
| | National School Feeding Programme (PRONAE) | Approved in 2013, the programme foresees the expansion of school feeding to all pre-primary and primary schools, emphasizing local food procurement, community participation and nutrition education | Mentioned in the CSP and strongly linked to Activity 4 (SO 3) towards strengthening the Government’s capacity to manage the school feeding programme (PRONAE) |
| Climate change | National Strategy of Adaptation and Mitigation of Climate Change 2013-2025 | This strategy sets out guidelines for building resilience, including reducing climate risks, in communities and the national economy and promoting low-carbon development and a green economy, through its integration into the sectoral and local planning process | Quoted in the CSP document with alignment within Activity 1 (SO 1) focusing on resilience building to prepare for and respond to weather-related shocks |
| | Environmental Strategy for the Sustainable Development of Mozambique | This strategy guides government action to promote sustainable development, including natural resource management and climate change mitigation | Not mentioned in the CSP document |

| Type | National policy or strategy | Focus | Alignment with WFP Country Strategic Plan |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | National REDD+ Strategy 2016-2030 | Mozambique's REDD+ Strategy guides the actions of the Government and other actors to promote the reduction of carbon emissions in the context of combating climate change. In particular, its agriculture-focused objective 2 provides guidance to promote sustainable agricultural practices that ensure increased productivity of both subsistence and cash crops | Not mentioned in the CSP document |
| | National Sustainable Development Programme 2030 (PNDS) | The programme aims to promote inclusive, sustainable, integrated development aimed at generating income in rural areas | Not mentioned in the CSP document |
| Gender | Gender Strategy and Action Plan for Agrarian Sector 2016-2025 | This strategy provides guidelines to ensure access to and control of resources, benefits, rights and equal opportunities for women and men in order to sustainably ensure an increase in production and productivity, allowing for food security and increased family income | Not mentioned in the CSP document, although a broad alignment can be found within Activity 5 (SO 4) and Activity 6 (SO 5) regarding improvement of knowledge and healthy diets of vulnerable communities |
| | Gender Strategy of the Education and Human Development Sector 2016-2020 | Formulated with the support of UNICEF, This strategy provides guidelines to strengthen equal rights and opportunities for children, young people and adults of both sexes in accessing education | Quoted in the CSP document with alignment within Activity 4 (SO 3) with a view of making the school feeding programme more gender-transformative |
| | National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security 2018-2022 | Although approved after the design of the CSP, this strategy is relevant as it addresses the political and legal framework on women, peace and security; the gender perspective in emergency relief and recovery efforts and sexual and gender-based violence in conflict and peace situations | Not mentioned in any of the CSP reviews, but relevant in the context WFP supply chain services towards resilience building (SO6) and crisis response (SO7) |
| | Strategic Gender Plan of the National Institute of Management of Calamities (INGD) 2016-2020 | This strategic plan provides guidance for the multi-sectoral and participatory approach on the need to ensure the equitable participation of men and women in the actions of risk and disaster reduction and climate change adaptation, (CCA) in improving attention to the specific needs of women and girls for prevention of gender-based violence, sexual violence and HIV/AIDS in Mozambique | Not quoted in the CSP document, but relevant in the context WFP supply chain services to humanitarian and development partners (SO 6) and crisis response (SO 2 and SO 7) |
| Disaster Risk Reduction | Master Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction (2017-2030) | Defines the government's strategy for disaster risk reduction and the main actions for reducing vulnerability to extreme events in Mozambique | Mentioned in the CSP document with alignment within the focus areas of resilience building (SO 1 and SO 6) and crisis response (SO 2 and SO 7) |

Source: Evaluation team based on documentary review

Annex 12: Country Strategic Plan Alignment with the National Sustainable Development Goals Framework

TABLE 31. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT WITH NATIONAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOAL PRIORITIES

| CSP Strategic Outcomes | SDG target in the Country Strategic Plan | CSP Activities | Alignment with the Mozambique National SDG Framework |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>SO 1 - Households in food-insecure areas of Mozambique are able to maintain access to adequate and nutritious food throughout the year, including in times of shock</p> | <p>SDG Target 2.1: By 2030, end hunger and ensure access by all people, in particular the poor and people in vulnerable situations, including infants, to safe, nutritious and sufficient food all year round</p> | <p>Activity 1: Provide capacity strengthening to prepare for, respond to and recover from weather-related shocks, to the Government at national, subnational and community levels</p> | <p>Included as a priority in the National Framework for SDG indicators. The SETSAN/Ministry of Agriculture is responsible for collecting and reporting data through the "Baseline Study on Food and Nutrition Security" and the "National Survey on Food and Nutrition Security"</p> |
| <p>SO 2 - Shock-affected people in Mozambique are able to meet their basic food and nutrition needs during and immediately after a crisis</p> | | <p>Activity 2: Provide technical assistance to the Government in making social protection programmes shock-responsive and hunger-sensitive</p> | |
| <p>SO 3 - Children in chronically food-insecure areas have access to nutritious food throughout the year</p> | | <p>Activity 3: Provide cash and/or food transfers to vulnerable households affected by crisis</p> <p>Activity 4: Strengthen the capacity of the government bodies responsible for the national home-grown school feeding programme</p> | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>SO 4 - Targeted people in prioritized areas of Mozambique have improved nutrition status in line with national targets by 2021</p> | <p>SDG Target 2.2: By 2030, end all forms of malnutrition, including achieving, by 2025, the internationally agreed targets on stunting and wasting in children under 5 years of age, and address the nutritional needs of adolescent girls, pregnant and lactating women and older persons</p> | <p>Activity 5: Provide capacity strengthening and technical assistance to government entities implementing the national strategy to combat stunting and micronutrient deficiencies</p> | <p>Included as a priority in the National Framework for SDG indicators. The Ministry of Health and the National Institute of Statistics (INE) are responsible for collecting and reporting data through the “Health Demographic Survey (HDS)”</p> |
| <p>SO 5 - Targeted smallholder farmers in northern and central Mozambique have enhanced livelihoods by 2021</p> | <p>SDG Target 2.3: By 2030, double the agricultural productivity and incomes of small-scale food producers, in particular women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers, including through secure and equal access to land, other productive resources and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets and opportunities for value addition and non-farm employment</p> | <p>Activity 6: Enhance the aggregation, marketing and decision making capacities of smallholder farmers, with focus on women</p> | <p>Included as a priority in the National Framework for SDG indicators. The Ministry of Agriculture is responsible for collecting and reporting data through the “Integrated Agrarian Survey”</p> |
| <p>SO 6 - Humanitarian and development partners in Mozambique are reliably supported by an efficient and effective supply chain and information and communications technology services and expertise</p> | <p>SDG Target 17.16: Enhance the global partnership for sustainable development, complemented by multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of the sustainable development goals in all countries, in particular developing countries</p> | <p>Activity 7: Provide supply chain services to humanitarian and development partners</p> | <p>Not included as a priority in the National Framework for SDG indicators</p> |
| <p>SO 7 - Government and humanitarian partners in Mozambique have access to effective and reliable services during times of crisis</p> | | <p>Activity 8: Provide services through the logistics cluster to the Government and other humanitarian and development partners</p> <p>Activity 9: Provide emergency telecommunications cluster services to the Government and other humanitarian and development partners</p> | |

| | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| | | <p>Activity 10: Provide humanitarian air services to the Government and other humanitarian and development partners</p> <p>Activity 11: Provide accommodation, transport and other services as required to humanitarian and development partners</p> | |
|--|--|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|

Source: Evaluation team based on documentary review

Annex 13: Country Strategic Plan Alignment with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework

TABLE 32. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT WITH UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FRAMEWORK (2017-2020)

| CSP Strategic Outcomes | CSP Activities | Alignment with UNDAF outcomes and outputs |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>SO 1 - Households in food-insecure areas of Mozambique are able to maintain access to adequate and nutritious food throughout the year, including in times of shock</p> | <p>Activity 1: Provide capacity strengthening to prepare for, respond to and recover from, weather-related shocks, to the Government at national, subnational and community levels</p> <p>Activity 2: Provide technical assistance to the Government in making social protection programmes shock-responsive and hunger-sensitive</p> | <p>OUTCOME 10: Communities are more resilient to the impact of climate change and disasters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OUTPUT 10.1: Mechanisms for information management for climate change and disaster risk reduction are enhanced and coordinated OUTPUT 10.2: Capacity of communities, government, and civil society to build resilience is strengthened <p>OUTCOME 5: Poor and most vulnerable people benefit from a more effective system of social protection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OUTPUT 5.2: Social protection programmes are implemented in a transparent and more efficient way OUTPUT 5.3: Enrolment in social protection programmes improves the access of vulnerable groups to health, nutrition and education services |
| <p>SO 2 - Shock-affected people in Mozambique are able to meet their basic food and nutrition needs during and immediately after a crisis</p> | <p>Activity 3: Provide cash and/or food transfers to vulnerable households affected by crisis</p> | <p>Not aligned</p> |
| <p>SO 3 - Children in chronically food-insecure areas have access to nutritious food throughout the year</p> | <p>Activity 4: Strengthen the capacity of the government bodies responsible for the national home-grown school feeding programme</p> | <p>OUTCOME 1: Vulnerable populations are more food secure and better nourished</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OUTPUT 1.1: Government and stakeholders' ownership and capacity strengthened to design |

| CSP Strategic Outcomes | CSP Activities | Alignment with UNDAF outcomes and outputs |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | and implement evidence-based food and nutrition security policies |
| <p>SO 4 - Targeted people in prioritized areas of Mozambique have improved nutrition status in line with national targets by 2021</p> | <p>Activity 5: Provide capacity strengthening and technical assistance to government entities implementing the national strategy to combat stunting and micronutrient deficiencies</p> | <p>OUTCOME 1: Vulnerable populations are more food secure and better nourished</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OUTPUT 1.4: Communities (and women in particular) acquire the knowledge to adopt appropriate practices and behaviours to reduce chronic undernutrition |
| <p>SO 5 - Targeted smallholder farmers in northern and central Mozambique have enhanced livelihoods by 2021</p> | <p>Activity 6: Enhance the aggregation, marketing and decision-making capacities of smallholder farmers, with focus on women</p> | <p>OUTCOME 1: Vulnerable populations are more food secure and better nourished</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OUTPUT 1.2: Producers in the agriculture and fisheries sectors with enhanced capacity to adopt sustainable production techniques for own consumption and markets |
| <p>SO 6 - Humanitarian and development partners in Mozambique are reliably supported by an efficient and effective supply chain and information and communications technology services and expertise</p> | <p>Activity 7: Provide supply chain services to humanitarian and development partners</p> | <p>Not aligned</p> |
| <p>SO 7 - Government and humanitarian partners in Mozambique have access to effective and reliable services during times of crisis</p> | <p>Activity 8: Provide services through the logistics cluster to government and other humanitarian and development partners</p> <p>Activity 9: Provide emergency telecommunications cluster services to government and other humanitarian and development</p> <p>Activity 10: Provide humanitarian air services to government and other humanitarian and development partners</p> | <p>Not aligned</p> |

| CSP Strategic Outcomes | CSP Activities | Alignment with UNDAF outcomes and outputs |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| | Activity 11: Provide accommodation, transport and other services as required to humanitarian and development partners | |

Source: Evaluation team based on documentary review

Annex 14: Financial Overview (2016-2021)

1. This annex provides an overview of funding for all WFP operations in Mozambique included in the scope of this evaluation (2016-2021). It contains a more detailed analysis for the country strategic plan.


Mozambique Country Strategic Plan (2017-2021)

Funding

2. According to the WFP resource situation report dated 22 August 2021, total needs for implementation of the country strategic plan over the period 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2022 were USD 1,087.1 million. Current funding for the country strategic plan stands at USD 514.32 million or 47.3 percent of the needs-based plan (NBP). Current shortfall is USD 572.75m (52.7 percent of the needs-based plan).

3. Since the country strategic plan was approved, it has been reviewed on five occasions to accommodate changes in the context of and/or the number of beneficiaries. The country strategic plan has experienced substantial growth over its implementation. Following a small revision in November 2018, budget revision 04 added strategic outcome 4 and new activities to deal with the impact of Cyclone Idai. Three more substantial revisions have been made subsequently to adapt to the increasing number of beneficiaries resulting from the combination of the aftermath of the cyclones, deteriorating food security situation in the country and the escalation of the conflict in Cabo Delgado.

FIGURE 3. BUDGET REVISIONS AND BENEFICIARY CHANGES IN MOZAMBIQUE COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN MZ01



Source: Country strategic plan MZ01 BR03, BR04, BR05, BR06 and BR07

TABLE 33 - COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN BUDGET REVISIONS


| Budget revision | Date | Purpose of the revision | Adjustments made |
|-----------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| BR03 | November 2018 | <p>Increase planning for the 2018/2019 lean season response in line with latest food security assessment figures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise the WFP ration for drought relief assistance to align it with the food security cluster (FSC) standard operational procedure (SOP) on harmonization of food assistance. Include provision of food assistance for 25,000 internally displaced people in the conflict-affected northern province of Cabo Delgado. Extend the duration of food assistance provided to refugees living in Maratane camp throughout 2019. | <p>Budget: +USD 24,738,788</p> <p>Beneficiaries: +295,000</p> |
| BR04 | April 2019 | <p>Increase the scale of existing Activity 3 (provide cash and/or food transfers to vulnerable households affected by crisis) under strategic outcome 2 (shock-affected people in Mozambique are able to meet their basic food and nutrition needs during and immediately after a crisis) in order to provide emergency food assistance for up to 1.7 million people affected by Cyclone Idai and other flooding for an initial three months.</p> <p>Added a new strategic outcome 7 (government and humanitarian partners in Mozambique have access to effective and reliable services during times of crisis), and associated Activities 8, 9, 10 and 11, to allow for the provision of supply chain, emergency telecommunications and other essential services to support the broader humanitarian response.</p> | <p>Budget: +USD 168,103,738</p> <p>Beneficiaries: +1,700,000</p> |
| BR05 | October 2019 | <p>Based on the deteriorating food security and nutrition situation, revision 5 scaled-up recovery interventions for cyclone-affected populations through food assistance for assets; increased the scale of the relief assistance for drought-affected populations; scaled up moderate acute malnutrition (MAM) treatment for children and pregnant and lactating women; increased the number of internally displaced persons benefitting from food assistance; and expanded school feeding in targeted cyclone-affected districts.</p> | <p>Budget: +USD 162,970,276</p> <p>Beneficiaries: +568,914</p> |
| BR06 | June 2020 | <p>Throughout the 2019/2020 agricultural season, rainfall was variable and poorly distributed over time across southern Mozambique, leading to a third consecutive poor harvest season. In central provinces, localized floods, fall armyworm and prolonged dry spells also impacted the upcoming harvest, leading to food shortage for the most vulnerable groups, including those affected by Cyclone Idai, who subsequently lost their livelihoods and remain displaced in resettlement centres.</p> <p>Given the rise in the level of insecurity in the province of Cabo Delgado, WFP also increased the number of conflict-affected internally displaced persons who benefitted from life-saving food assistance. WFP also increased requirements under the resilience building and root causes focus areas.</p> | <p>Budget: +USD 277,574,130</p> <p>Beneficiaries: +1,362,914</p> |
| BR07 | May 2021 | <p>The intensification of armed conflict in Cabo Delgado and the subsequent displacement of nearly 670,000 people, prevailing drought for the third consecutive year, loss of crops due to unprecedented floods and cyclones, and the COVID-19 pandemic led to an increase in food insecurity in Mozambique.</p> | <p>Budget: +USD 281,191,035</p> <p>Beneficiaries: +1,487,018</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| | | This revision also extended the duration of the country strategic plan by six months until June 2022 to ensure that the second-generation CSP is aligned with the UNSDCF. | |
|--|--|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|

Source: Country strategic plan MZ01 BR03, BR04, BR05, BR06 and BR07

4. Looking at the **country strategic plan donors**, the United States of America (US) is by far the largest contributor with USD 151.66 or 30 percent of the total contributions recorded to date (data as of 22 August 2021). The US is followed at a significant distance by the United Kingdom of Great Britain (UK), Mozambique (via the Russian debt swap) and Germany (see Figure 4). In aggregate, the top ten sources of funding account for 86 percent of the total funding. In total, there are 36 different sources of funding (excluding WFP internal funding). "Flexible funding" refers to multilateral contributions made by WFP through the Strategic Resource Allocation Committee (SRAC).

FIGURE 4. TOP DONORS TO THE COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN MZ01, USD (MILLIONS) AND PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL FUNDING



Source: Resource situation report 22/08/2021

5. Figure 5 provides an overview of the funding of the country strategic plan per type of contribution and expenditure. It shows that food and cash-based transfer costs are the two main drivers of expenditure. Please note that this data is generated annually and shows some differences with the total amount of allocated resources indicated in the graphs below.

FIGURE 5. BREAKDOWN OF CONTRIBUTIONS BY TYPE OF CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE, USD

| | Total | Total in % of expend. | Incoming and Outgoing Transfers | Non-Direct Multilateral | Subtotal Directed Multilateral |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Allocated resources | 422,145,011 | - | 6,480,204 | 63,887,342 | 351,777,465 |
| Expenditures | | | | | |
| Food and related costs | 146,485,754 | 48.7% | 5,703,527 | 24,717,489 | 116,064,770 |
| Cash based transfer & related costs | 61,998,142 | 20.6% | 0 | 2,818,630 | 59,237,721 |
| Capacity strengthening | 18,217,823 | 6.1% | 0 | 172,474 | 18,045,941 |
| Service delivery | 8,238,807 | 2.7% | 0 | 1,159,681 | 7,057,159 |
| Total transfer | 234,940,527 | 78.1% | 5,703,527 | 28,868,274 | 200,405,591 |
| Implementation cost | 28,291,377 | 9.4% | 479,635 | 1,798,816 | 25,952,904 |


| | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------------|--------------------|-------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | Total direct operational costs | 263,231,905 | 87.6% | 6,183,161 | 30,667,090 | 226,358,495 |
| | Direct support cost (DSC) | 15,349,668 | 5.1% | 277,034 | 594,954 | 14,477,679 |
| | Total direct costs | 278,581,573 | 92.7% | 6,460,196 | 31,262,045 | 240,836,175 |
| | Indirect support cost (ISC) | 22,056,349 | 7.3% | 0 | 1,683,912 | 20,372,436 |
| | Total expenditures | 300,637,921 | 100% | 6,460,196 | 32,945,957 | 261,208,611 |
| | Carry-over to subsequent operation | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Balance of resources | 121,507,089 | - | 20,009 | 30,941,385 | 90,568,854 |
| | Outstanding contributions receivable | | | | | 69,848,861 |
| | Cash balance | | | | | 20,719,993 |

ACR4-A-Financial Detail by Contribution, date: 27.08.2021

6. When looking at the **type of funding**, the data presented in Figure 6 shows that most contributions are direct multilateral contributions (donors awarding grants to the country strategic plan directly). Multilateral contributions made by WFP through the Strategic Resource Allocation Committee account for 7 percent of total funding to date. There are some funds (12 percent) that were carried forward from previous operations or generated locally, including through cost recovery service provision (for example, logistics).

7. **Direct contributions are strongly earmarked at the activity level.** Earmarking applies essentially to directed contributions. Multilateral undirected contributions are provided by SRAC to cover significant gaps in implementation. Figure 6 shows that donor contributions at the activity level account for 72 percent of total contributions. Earmarked contributions at the strategic outcome account for 15 percent of direct contributions. Earmarking at the strategic result level affects 1 percent of direct contributions. Approximately 10 percent of contributions are flexible (earmarked at country level).


FIGURE 6. FUNDING SOURCES BY TYPE (LEFT) AND GRANT EARMARKING LEVEL (RIGHT), USD (MILLIONS)



Source: CPB Grant Balances Report 22/08/2021

8. Figure 7 shows the breakdown of total needs at the activity level and compares it with the resources received by the country strategic plan to date. The figure shows that the allocation of resources closely follows the distribution of total needs. Some variability is observed in the smaller activities (for example, Activity 4). The figure also helps to illustrate the relative size of the activities compared to each other. Activity 3 is by far the largest one and accounts for over two thirds of total needs and allocated resources. The large size of Activity 3 makes it difficult to explore differences among activities.


FIGURE 7. TOTAL NEEDS BY ACTIVITY (INSIDE) AND FUNDED RECEIVED BY ACTIVITY (OUTSIDE), USD (MILLIONS) *



Source: CPB Plan vs Actual Report, 22/08/2021 & CPB Grants Balance report, 22/08/2021
 *Excludes Indirect Support Costs (ISC)

9. Figure 8 compares actual spending with the needs-based plan broken down at the activity level. With 11 months of implementation left, the comparison should provide a good overview of how far the implementation of the country strategic plan has gone. Important shortfalls are recorded across several activities. If we aggregate activities under strategic outcomes, SO 3, SO 5 and SO 1 are the most severely underfunded. SO 2 and SO 4 are also substantially underfunded. In comparison, SO 6 (Activity 7) is relatively well funded at 84.6 percent of total needs. Within SO 7, there is significant variability across activities. Direct support costs are calculated as percentage of total funding and currently stand at 47.2 percent of total needs. As expected, funding of direct support costs is closely aligned with the overall funding of the needs-based plan (47.3 percent).


FIGURE 8. ACTIVITY SPENDING COMPARED TO NEEDS-BASED PLAN AS OF END OF JULY 2021 (PERCENTAGE)



Source: CPB Plans vs. Actual Report, 22/08/2021

10. Figure 9 shows distribution of donor contributions over the implementation of the country strategic plan. Contributions expanded significantly in the aftermath of cyclone Idai, but they have contracted in 2020 and 2021, despite the important increase in needs introduced in budget revisions 6 and 7. This confirms the challenges in raising funding described by different stakeholders during the interview process.

FIGURE 9. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN CONFIRMED CONTRIBUTIONS PER YEAR AND NEEDS-BASED PLAN (USD MILLIONS)



Source: CPB Grants Balance report, 22/08/2021

Budget implementation

11. This section looks at the implementation of the country strategic plan at the activity level. Every year, the country office approves an implementation plan based on the existing and planned contributions. The implementation plan essentially provides an interpretation of the needs-based plan considering the resources available.

12. Table 34 provides a cumulative overview of the implementation plans for the period 2017 to 2021 and actual expenditure up to 31 July 2021. The data presented in the table indicates that expenditure compared to the implementation plan is quite significant for Activity 7 and 9. Nonetheless, these activities have relatively small budgets, and the deviation is not significant in absolute figures. Activities 2, 4 and 10 are the furthest behind in relation to the implementation plan.

TABLE 34. COUNTRY PORTFOLIO BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND ACTUAL EXPENDITURE, CUMULATIVE 2017-JULY 2021, USD MILLION

| Activity number | Needs-based plan | Implementation plan | Actuals | (%) Actuals vs implementation plan |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|
| Act. 1 | 5.20 | 2.68 | 1.54 | 58% |
| Act. 2 | 43.72 | 31.34 | 12.07 | 39% |
| Act. 3 | 789.75 | 376.56 | 294.04 | 78% |
| Act. 4 | 83.41 | 37.02 | 16.42 | 44% |
| Act. 5 | 9.69 | 4.61 | 3.90 | 85% |
| Act. 6 | 10.12 | 3.55 | 2.53 | 71% |
| Act. 7 | 15.18 | 8.40 | 12.85 | 153% |
| Act. 8 | 11.33 | 10.37 | 8.13 | 78% |
| Act. 9 | 1.90 | 1.03 | 1.14 | 110% |
| Act. 10 | 6.79 | 2.76 | 0.89 | 32% |
| Act. 11 | 1.82 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0% |
| DSC | 41.78 | 32.86 | 19.71 | 60% |
| Total | 1020.68 | 511.32 | 373.22 | 73% |

13. Table 35 presents the annual breakdown of the data presented above. Please note that the data for 2017 only covers six months. Data for 2021 cover the first 7 months of implementation out of a total of 12. It shows that actual expenditure compared to annual implementation plans shows significant variability over the implementation of the country strategic plan. In 2018 expenditure accounted for 89.3 percent of the implementation plan. In 2019, the figure decreases to 69.1 percent. In 2020 expenditure against the implementation plan increases again 92.3 percent. Data for 2021 is more difficult to read, but expenditure against the implementation plan is likely to fall again. Data for individual activities also shows a substantial amount of variability across years

TABLE 35. COUNTRY PORTFOLIO BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND ACTUAL EXPENDITURE, PER YEAR, USD

| Act. # | 2017 | | | 2018 | | |
|--------------|---------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|
| | Impl. plan | Actuals | Actuals (%) Impl. Plan | Impl. plan | Actuals | Actuals (%) Impl. plan |
| 1 | - | 118,857 | - | 480,101 | 339,541 | 70.7% |
| 2 | - | 177,682 | - | 470,075 | 793,831 | 168.9% |
| 3 | - | 4,501,687 | - | 12,836,823 | 18,164,874 | 141.5% |
| 4 | - | 497,122 | - | 11,438,782 | 2,895,351 | 25.3% |
| 5 | - | 1,047,191 | - | 671,110 | 1,383,791 | 206.2% |
| 6 | - | 586,965 | - | 294,896 | 824,857 | 279.7% |
| 7 | - | 4,128,968 | - | 5,197,563 | 3,852,947 | 74.1% |
| 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 11 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| DSC | - | 1,041,627 | - | 2,925,696 | 2,371,957 | 81.1% |
| Total | - | 12,100,099 | - | 34,315,045 | 30,627,150 | 89.3% |
| Act. # | 2019 | | | 2020 | | |
| | Impl. plan | Actuals | Actuals (%) Impl. plan | Impl. Plan | Actuals | Actuals (%) Impl. plan |
| 1 | 808,667 | 539,688 | 66.7% | 637,446 | 250,080 | 39.2% |
| 2 | 4,702,136 | 2,485,385 | 52.9% | 4,761,054 | 4,035,763 | 84.8% |
| 3 | 152,648,813 | 104,403,744 | 68.4% | 98,203,470 | 95,689,738 | 97.4% |
| 4 | 3,510,673 | 5,527,276 | 157.4% | 8,609,650 | 3,978,944 | 46.2% |
| 5 | 1,294,650 | 148,321 | 11.5% | 1,250,066 | 754,317 | 60.3% |
| 6 | 204,892 | 182,065 | 88.9% | 1,185,119 | 384,796 | 32.5% |
| 7 | 1,738,983 | 4,298,465 | 247.2% | 381,128 | 283,465 | 74.4% |
| 8 | 7,499,973 | 5,485,109 | 73.1% | 781,169 | 776,328 | 99.4% |
| 9 | 1,030,969 | 1,068,855 | 103.7% | - | 69,564 | - |
| 10 | 130,135 | 109,803 | 84.4% | - | - | - |
| 11 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| DSC | 13,526,952 | 4,973,303 | 36.8% | 6,949,345 | 7,110,347 | 102.3% |
| Total | 187,096,844 | 129,222,014 | 69.1% | 122,758,447 | 113,333,342 | 92.3% |
| Act. # | 2021 - January to 31 July | | | | | |
| | Impl. plan | Actuals | Actuals (%) Impl. plan | | | |
| 1 | 753,786 | 289,641 | 38.4% | | | |
| 2 | 21,409,231 | 1,942,208 | 9.1% | | | |

| | | | |
|--------------|-------------|------------|-------|
| 3 | 112,871,333 | 64,613,028 | 57.2% |
| 4 | 13,457,265 | 3,392,320 | 25.2% |
| 5 | 1,390,980 | 533,267 | 38.3% |
| 6 | 1,863,632 | 550,587 | 29.5% |
| 7 | 1,082,110 | 268,668 | 24.8% |
| 8 | 2,088,093 | 1,872,300 | 89.7% |
| 9 | - | - | |
| 10 | 2,625,877 | 659,910 | |
| 11 | 153,600 | - | |
| DSC | 9,458,257 | 3,908,255 | 41.3% |
| Total | 167,154,164 | 78,030,182 | 46.7% |

Source: CPB Plan vs Actual Report, 28/08/2021

Country programme 200286

14. The country programme (CP) ran from 1 March 2012 to 30 June 2017. Key highlights from the data below include:

- 44 percent of needs funded
- Largest donors were the United Nations, Canada, stock transfers from WFP and WFP multilateral contributions (donor funds managed by WFP headquarters).
- 53 percent of the budget seems to be unearmarked. This figure needs to be approached cautiously because it excludes non-direct multilateral funding allocated by WFP and there are limitations in the data.


FIGURE 10. COUNTRY PROGRAMME 200286 RESOURCE SITUATION

Recipient Country: **Mozambique**
 Project No.: 200286 Country Programme
 Project Title: Country Programme - Mozambique (2012-2015)
 Project Duration: 01 Mar 2012 to 30 Jun 2017

| Operational Requirements (U.S. Dollars) | | |
|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 121,968,302 | | |
| Donor | Confirmed Resource Level (in US\$) | Share of Requirements (%) |
| MULTILATERAL | 8,296,359 | 6.80 |
| BELGIUM | 4,075,444 | 3.34 |
| CANADA | 11,584,017 | 9.50 |
| JAPAN | 400,000 | 0.33 |
| PRIVATE DONORS | 3,093,787 | 2.54 |
| STOCK TRANSFER | 8,502,744 | 6.97 |
| SWITZERLAND | 261,725 | 0.21 |
| U.K. | 37,879 | 0.03 |
| UN Common Funds and Agencies | 15,035,561 | 12.33 |
| U.S.A. | 189,677 | 0.16 |
| MISCELLANEOUS INCOME | 2,139,878 | 1.75 |
| Gross Needs Funded: | 53,617,071 | |
| % Gross Needs Funded: | 44.0% | |
| Shortfall (of Gross Needs): | 68,351,231 | |


Source: resource situation, date: 31/12/2017

FIGURE 11. COUNTRY PROGRAMME 200286 DONORS IN PERCENT OF TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS



Source: resource situation, date: 31/12/2017

FIGURE 12. COUNTRY PROGRAMME 200286 EARMARKING EXCLUDING NON-DIRECT MULTILATERAL GRANTS, USD (MILLIONS)



Source: Distribution contribution stats⁹

Protracted relief and recovery operation 200355

15. The protracted relief and recovery operations (PRRO) ran from 1 March 2012 to 30 June 2017. Key highlights from the data below include:

- 56.6 percent of needs funded.

⁹ Following the advice of WFP headquarters staff, each grant in the “Distribution Contribution Stats” has been crossed with the “general remarks” to verify the earmarking level. This dataset also excludes non-direct multilateral funding.

- Largest donors include the United States of America, multilateral donors funds managed by WFP, European Commission, Germany and United Nations funds.
- 62 percent of the budget seems to be unearmarked. This figure needs to be approached cautiously because it excludes non-direct multilateral funding allocated by WFP and there are limitations in the data.


FIGURE 13. PROTRACTED RELIEF AND RECOVERY OPERATION 200355 RESOURCE SITUATION

Recipient Country: **Mozambique**
 Project No.: **200355** **Single Country PRRO**
 Project Title: **Assistance to Vulnerable Groups and Disaster Affected Populations in Mozambique**
 Project Duration: **01 Mar 2012 to 30 Jun 2017**

| Operational Requirements (U.S. Dollars) | | |
|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 136,286,985 | | |
| Donor | Confirmed Resource Level (in US\$) | Share of Requirements (%) |
| MULTILATERAL | 14,925,542 | 10.95 |
| AUSTRALIA | 1,090,617 | 0.80 |
| CANADA | 3,078,522 | 2.26 |
| EUR. COMMISSION | 10,704,682 | 7.85 |
| GERMANY | 10,090,144 | 7.40 |
| IRELAND | 1,630,435 | 1.20 |
| ITALY | 479,557 | 0.35 |
| JAPAN | 2,700,000 | 1.98 |
| PRIVATE DONORS | 1,117,766 | 0.82 |
| STOCK TRANSFER | -1,042,737 | -0.77 |
| SWEDEN | 233,420 | 0.17 |
| SWITZERLAND | 809,669 | 0.59 |
| U.K. | 3,504,105 | 2.57 |
| UN Common Funds and Agencies | 6,555,996 | 4.81 |
| U.S.A. | 21,175,493 | 15.54 |
| MISCELLANEOUS INCOME | 51,024 | 0.04 |
| Gross Needs Funded: | 77,104,237 | |
| % Gross Needs Funded: | 56.6% | |
| Shortfall (of Gross Needs): | 59,182,749 | |


Source: resource situation, date: 18/03/2018

FIGURE 14. PROTRACTED RELIEF AND RECOVERY OPERATION 200355 DONORS IN PERCENT OF TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS



Source: resource situation, date: 18/03/2018

FIGURE 15. PROTRACTED RELIEF AND RECOVERY OPERATION 200355 EARMARKING EXCLUDING NON-DIRECT MULTILATERAL GRANTS, USD (MILLIONS)



Source: Distribution contribution stats¹⁰

Immediate response emergency operation 201067

16. The immediate response emergency operation (EMOP) ran from March 2017– June 2017. No funding data has been found. Project document indicated the project used “borrowed stocks” from the Government.

¹⁰ Following the advice of WFP headquarters staff, each grant in the “distribution contribution stats” has been crossed with the “general remarks” to verify the earmarking level. This dataset also excludes non-direct multilateral funding.

Annex 15: Outcome and Output Performance Data

1. This annex contains a summary of monitoring and evaluation data to support the analysis presented in the report. Whenever possible, this annex presents data for pre-country strategic plan operations. It reviews the following types of indicators:

- Beneficiaries
- Distribution
- Outcome indicators
- Output indicators
- Cross-cutting indicators

2. Data has been extracted from the country office monitoring and evaluation tool (COMET) files facilitated by WFP, available strategic outcome monitoring reports and the annual country reports (ACR) for the years 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020.


3. It is worth noting that the “process-output monitoring reports” that have been published since 2019 include some additional data on beneficiaries, distribution and cross-cutting issues (for example, disability and complaint mechanisms) for some activities.

BENEFICIARY DATA PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW

4. Beneficiary data reflects substantial changes in the size and scope of the country strategic plan over the implementation period. As shown in Figure 16, from 2017 to 2019 the number of planned beneficiaries reported in annual country reports increased in line with total needs declared in needs-based plans and budget revisions. However, as of 2020, the planned beneficiary numbers in the annual country reports were lower than those in the budget revisions, reflecting funding challenges. WFP reached 81.5 percent of planned beneficiaries in 2017, down to 51.1 percent in 2018, increased again to 69.4 percent in 2019, and declined to 56.1 percent in 2020. As of 31 July 2021, WFP had reached 71.2 percent of planned beneficiaries for the year. When data is broken down by gender, performance in the first two years of implementation is generally a little better for women and girl beneficiaries.

5. When figures are broken down per gender, in the first two years of implementation, performance is generally a couple of percentage points better for women and girl beneficiaries than for men and boy beneficiaries (83.3 percent women and girl beneficiaries reached compared to 78.8 percent men and boy beneficiaries in 2017 and 52.4 percent compared to 49.7 percent in 2018). In 2019 and 2020, this trend is inverted (68.0 percent women and girl beneficiaries reached compared to 71.0 percent men and boy beneficiaries in 2019 and 55.9 percent women and girl beneficiaries compared to 56.4 percent in 2020). This change matches the significant expansion of the country strategic plan after the cyclone response and the deteriorations of the Cabo Delgado crisis.


FIGURE 16. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN ACTUAL AND PLANNED BENEFICIARIES 2017-2021 AS OF 31 JULY



Source: ACR2 2017, ACR 2018, ACR 2019, ACR 2020 and country office data for 2021

6. The 2020 annual country report breaks down beneficiary figures per programme area (Figure 17). The figure also includes partial data up to 31 July 2021.

FIGURE 17. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN ACTUAL AND PLANNED BENEFICIARIES 2020-2021 BY PROGRAMME AREA



Source: ACR 2020 and data from country office

7. Table 36 presents a breakdown of the country strategic plan beneficiaries per age group. The data is presented for 2019 and 2020 because the age groups were different in previous years. Data show that while all age groups were reasonably covered in 2019, in 2020 coverage is much higher for population in the 5-11 year age group. This is probably explained by school feeding activities.

TABLE 36. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN ACTUAL VERSUS PLANNED BENEFICIARIES 2019-2020 PER AGE GROUP AND GENDER

| All beneficiaries | male | 1,568,073 | 1,298,248 | 83% | 1,673,437 | 944,564 | 56% |
|--------------------------|--------|-----------|-----------|-----|-----------|-----------|-----|
| | female | 1,726,201 | 1,402,653 | 81% | 1,812,892 | 1,012,890 | 56% |
| | total | 3,294,274 | 2,700,901 | 82% | 3,486,329 | 1,957,454 | 56% |
| 0-23 months | male | 148,242 | 123,955 | 84% | 163,857 | 86,417 | 53% |
| | female | 151,537 | 127,614 | 84% | 170,830 | 89,050 | 52% |
| | total | 299,779 | 251,569 | 84% | 334,687 | 175,467 | 52% |
| 24-59 months | male | 148,242 | 123,955 | 84% | 163,857 | 86,417 | 53% |
| | female | 151,537 | 127,614 | 84% | 170,830 | 89,050 | 52% |
| | total | 299,779 | 251,569 | 84% | 334,687 | 175,467 | 52% |
| 5-11 years | male | 424,961 | 325,688 | 77% | 313,770 | 253,685 | 81% |
| | female | 415,079 | 323,426 | 78% | 327,715 | 247,982 | 76% |
| | total | 840,040 | 649,114 | 77% | 641,485 | 501,667 | 78% |
| 12-17 years | male | 243,776 | 219,684 | 90% | 313,770 | 158,027 | 50% |
| | female | 253,659 | 229,851 | 91% | 327,715 | 165,222 | 50% |
| | total | 497,435 | 449,535 | 90% | 641,485 | 323,249 | 50% |
| 18-59 years | male | 576,498 | 480,574 | 83% | 683,320 | 342,460 | 50% |
| | female | 701,681 | 545,364 | 78% | 746,075 | 386,470 | 52% |
| | total | 1,278,179 | 1,025,938 | 80% | 1,429,395 | 728,930 | 51% |
| 60+ years | male | 26,354 | 24,392 | 93% | 34,863 | 17,558 | 50% |
| | female | 52,708 | 48,784 | 93% | 69,727 | 35,116 | 50% |
| | total | 79,062 | 73,176 | 93% | 104,590 | 52,674 | 50% |

Source: ACR 2019 & ACR 2020

8. Table 37 presents beneficiary data for pre-country strategic plan operations. On average, the number of beneficiaries reached by these operations is higher than the beneficiaries reached by the country strategic plan.

TABLE 37. PRE-COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN OPERATIONS: ACTUAL VERSUS PLANNED BENEFICIARIES 2016-2017 PER OPERATION, ACTIVITY, MODALITY AND SEX (PERCENTAGE)

| Operation/activity | Actual vs. Planned Beneficiaries (Food) | | Actual vs. Planned Beneficiaries (CBT) | | Actual vs. Planned Beneficiaries (Total) | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------|----------------------------------------|-------|------------------------------------------|--------|
| | 2016 | 2017 | 2016 | 2017 | 2016 | 2017 |
| 200355 total | 87.1% | 140.5% | - | 16.6% | 87.1% | 131.3% |
| School feeding (on-site) | 84.8% | 103.6% | - | - | 84.8% | 103.6% |
| Female | 84.9% | 103.9% | - | - | 84.9% | 103.9% |
| Male | 84.7% | 103.4% | - | - | 84.7% | 103.4% |
| Food assistance for assets | 86.1% | 149.1% | - | 0.0% | 86.1% | 133.5% |
| Female | 86.1% | 149.1% | - | 0.0% | 86.1% | 133.5% |
| Male | 86.1% | 149.1% | - | 0.0% | 86.1% | 133.5% |
| General food distribution | 117.4% | 175.8% | - | - | 117.4% | 186.6% |
| Female | 117.4% | 175.8% | - | - | 117.4% | 186.6% |
| Male | 117.4% | 175.8% | - | - | 117.4% | 186.6% |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|------|--------|--------|
| Nutrition: stand-alone micronutrient supplementation | 0.0% | 0.0% | - | - | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Female | 0.0% | 0.0% | - | - | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Male | 0.0% | 0.0% | - | - | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Nutrition: treatment of moderate acute malnutrition | 11.3% | 65.8% | - | - | 11.3% | 65.8% |
| Female | 16.1% | 72.0% | - | - | 16.1% | 72.0% |
| Male | 0.0% | 54.7% | - | - | 0.0% | 54.7% |
| 201067 total | - | 125.0% | - | - | - | 125.0% |
| Food assistance for assets | - | 125.0% | - | - | - | 125.0% |
| Female | - | 125.0% | - | - | - | 125.0% |
| Male | - | 125.0% | - | - | - | 125.0% |
| 200286 total | 60.8% | 108.1% | 86.1% | 0.0% | 62.4% | 93.4% |
| School feeding (on-site) | 54.5% | 108.1% | 100.5% | 0.0% | 58.1% | 93.4% |
| Female | 54.4% | 108.1% | 100.6% | 0.0% | 58.1% | 93.3% |
| Male | 54.5% | 108.1% | 100.4% | 0.0% | 58.1% | 93.4% |
| Food assistance for assets | 138.2% | - | 0.0% | - | 130.5% | - |
| Female | 138.2% | - | 0.0% | - | 130.5% | - |
| Male | 138.2% | - | 0.0% | - | 130.5% | - |
| Nutrition: stand-alone micronutrient supplementation | 0.0% | - | - | - | 0.0% | - |
| Female | 0.0% | - | - | - | 0.0% | - |
| Male | 0.0% | - | - | - | 0.0% | - |

Source: COMET data

DISTRIBUTION DATA PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW

9. Distribution data is presented in Table 38 (refers to food items) and Table 39. In 2016, data was reported for each operation independently. In 2017, data is presented aggregated for all operations, but is broken down per strategic outcome. This is probably due to the fact that there were two operations running until 30 June 2017 that were superseded by the country strategic plan as of 1 July. Disaggregated data for 2017 are not available. From 2018 onwards, data belong to the country strategic plan only. When distribution was not planned for a certain item, the actual distribution figures in Meticals (Mt – Mozambique currency) are indicated in red in the table.

10. The evaluation team collected partial distribution data for 2021, but there are no target values the target can compare it with.

TABLE 38. FOOD: ACTUAL VERSUS PLANNED DISTRIBUTION PER STRATEGIC OUTCOME/ACTIVITY AND YEAR (PERCENTAGE AND METRIC TON)

| Operation/component/SO | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|---------------------------------|------|------|-------|--------|--------|
| Country strategic plan | | | | | |
| SO 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maize | - | 7% | 107% | 0% | - |
| Peas | - | 7% | 110% | 0% | - |
| SO 2 | | | | | |
| Beans | - | 74% | 253% | 6% | 2% |
| Corn soya blend | - | 474% | 31% | 11% | 322% |
| High energy biscuits | - | - | - | 68.0 | 0.2 |
| Iodised salt | - | 42% | 141% | 23.3 | 65.8 |
| Lipid-based nutrient supplement | - | - | - | 25% | 242.0 |
| Maize | - | 35% | 180% | 111% | 247% |
| Maize meal | - | 36% | 2% | 51% | 5% |
| Peas | - | 34% | 83% | 40% | 30% |
| Ready to use supp. food | - | 121% | 83% | 3% | 4% |
| Rice | - | - | - | 52% | 12% |
| Sorghum/millet | - | - | - | - | - |
| Split lentils | - | - | - | 1.7 | 24.1 |
| Split peas | - | - | 41.2 | 7202.9 | 4441.4 |
| Vegetable oil | - | 54% | 78% | 73% | 44% |
| Wheat soya blend | - | 32.8 | - | - | - |
| SO 3 | | | | | |
| Beans | - | 0.3 | 115.3 | 103.5 | - |
| Iodised salt | - | 33% | 21% | 22% | 0% |
| Maize | - | 33.7 | - | - | - |
| Maize meal | - | 24% | 10% | 0% | 0% |
| Peas | - | 26% | 3% | 0% | 0% |
| Rice | - | - | - | 395.8 | - |
| Vegetable oil | - | 31% | 15% | 17% | 0% |
| Comp 1 | | | | | |
| Beans | - | - | - | - | - |
| Iodised salt | 30% | - | - | - | - |
| Maize meal | 35% | - | - | - | - |
| Peas | 20% | - | - | - | - |
| Vegetable oil | 32% | - | - | - | - |
| 200286 | | | | | |
| Comp 2 | | | | | |
| Beans | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maize | 184% | - | - | - | - |
| Peas | 107% | - | - | - | - |
| Comp 3 | | | | | |
| Corn soya blend | - | - | - | - | - |
| Micronutrition powder | 0% | - | - | - | - |
| 200355 | | | | | |
| Beans | - | - | - | - | - |
| Corn soya blend | 5% | - | - | - | - |
| Iodised salt | 30% | - | - | - | - |
| Maize | 53% | - | - | - | - |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|---|---|---|---|
| Maize meal | 26% | - | - | - | - |
| Peas | 16% | - | - | - | - |
| Ready to use supp. food | 0% | - | - | - | - |
| Sorghum/millet | - | - | - | - | - |
| Vegetable oil | 39% | - | - | - | - |
| Wheat soya blend | - | - | - | - | - |
| Micronutrition powder | - | - | - | - | - |

Source: COMET data

11. Table 39 presents data on cash-based transfer and voucher distribution. As in the previous case, data for 2017 is aggregated for all operations. When distribution was not planned for a certain item, the actual figures in USD are indicated in the table. The evaluation team collected partial cash-based transfer distribution data for 2021, but there are no target values the target can compare it with.

TABLE 39. CASH-BASED TRANSFER/VOUCHER: ACTUAL VERSUS PLANNED DISTRIBUTION PER STRATEGIC OUTCOME/ACTIVITY AND YEAR (PERCENTAGE AND USD)

| Operation/component/SO | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|------------------------|------|------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| Country strategic plan | | | | | |
| SO 1 | | | | | |
| Cash | - | 0% | 0% | 44% | 0% |
| Commodity voucher | - | - | - | - | 89% |
| Value voucher | | | | 1157026.8 | |
| SO 2 | | | | | |
| Cash | - | - | 11% | 25% | 5% |
| Commodity voucher | - | 5% | 58% | 46% | 53% |
| Value voucher | - | - | - | 38% | 31% |
| SO 3 | | | | | |
| Cash | - | 28% | 31% | 0% | 6% |
| Commodity voucher | - | - | 33082.1 | 1513771.8 | 2616975.6 |
| 200286 | | | | | |
| Comp 1 | | | | | |
| Cash | 28% | - | - | - | - |
| Comp 2 | | | | | |
| Cash | 0% | - | - | - | - |

Source: COMET data

OUTCOME INDICATORS PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW

12. There has been a significant improvement in the reporting of outcome indicators since the introduction of the country strategic plan. For Activity 1, Activity 2, Activity 5 and Activity 6, baseline and follow up values were essentially first recorded in 2019. In the other activities outcome indicators are more consistent across time, but there is also an increase in the number of indicators recorded as of 2019 (for example, Activity 3 included four new indicators in 2019). Based on the data presented, WFP reported data against 24 outcome indicators. As shown in the tables below, up to three values can be reported for each indicator (i.e., male,

female, overall). In comparison, data was reported against 58 indicators in 2019. In 2020, the total number of indicators drops to 53. The difference is probably due to changes and challenges in data collection due to the COVID-19 pandemic (see the 2020 annual country report).

13. Please note that in general, baseline (base) values are collected in the first-year data is reported for the indicators. In many cases both values are the same. When the figure is different, this is because data was collected through a survey conducted earlier in the first year of reporting.

Strategic outcome 1 performance

14. SO 1 comprises two different activities. Indicator coverage for Activity 1 and Activity 2 starts in 2019. Outcome indicators mostly focus on Activity 2. There is only one outcome indicator for Activity 1. The analysis of outcome indicators shows a positive trend in 2020 compared to 2019 even if several targets have not been met. Positive trends have been recorded in the food consumption score (FCS). The ICRM Project - January 2021 outcome survey notes that this is a good sign given that data was collected during the lean season. Nonetheless, economic vulnerability remains high. The outcome survey mentions that more time is required for progress to be made given that project does not provide food, cash, or voucher transfers.

15. At a more strategic level, it is important to note that the outcome indicators barely capture the capacity strengthening elements of SO 1. There is only one indicator per activity where these elements are captured. In both cases, the indicator only captures the number of policies or systems supported by WFP.

TABLE 40. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN STRATEGIC OUTCOME 1 OUTCOME INDICATORS PER ACTIVITY

| SO/Activity/Indicator | Base value | 2017 Follow up | 2018 Follow up | 2019 Follow up | 2019 target | 2020 Follow up | 2020 target | CSP end target |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| Act. 1 - CSI 1: 01. Provide capacity strengthening to prepare for, respond to and recover from weather-related shocks, to the Government at national, subnational and community levels | | | | | | | | |
| Number of national food security and nutrition policies, programmes and system components enhanced as a result of WFP capacity strengthening (new) | | | | | | | | |
| Overall | 0 | 0 | | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| Act. 2 - CSI 2: 02. Provide technical assistance to the Government in making social protection programmes shock-responsive and hunger-sensitive | | | | | | | | |
| Consumption-based coping strategy index (average) | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 11.34 | | | 11.34 | 8 | 11.83 | 8 | 8 |
| Male | 10.79 | | | 10.79 | 8 | 11.37 | 8 | 8 |
| Overall | 11.08 | | | 11.08 | 8 | 11.68 | 8 | 8 |
| Dietary diversity score | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 5.05 | | | 5.05 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 |
| Male | 5 | | | 5 | 6 | 5.33 | 6 | 6 |
| Overall | 5.03 | | | 5.03 | 6 | 5.1 | 6 | 6 |
| Food consumption score/percentage of households with acceptable food consumption score | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 39 | | | 39 | 55 | 41.83 | 55 | 55 |
| Male | 46 | | | 46 | 55 | 52.28 | 55 | 55 |
| Overall | 42 | | | 42 | 55 | 45.19 | 55 | 55 |
| Food consumption score/percentage of households with borderline food consumption score | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 56 | | | 56 | 40 | 56.01 | 40 | 40 |
| Male | 49 | | | 49 | 40 | 45.69 | 40 | 40 |
| Overall | 53 | | | 53 | 40 | 52.69 | 40 | 40 |
| Food consumption score/percentage of households with poor food consumption score | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 5 | | | 5 | 5 | 2.16 | 5 | 5 |
| Male | 5 | | | 5 | 5 | 2.03 | 5 | 5 |
| Overall | 5 | | | 5 | 5 | 2.12 | 5 | 5 |
| Food expenditure share | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 68 | | | 68 | 60 | 55 | 60 | 60 |
| Male | 63 | | | 63 | 60 | 42 | 60 | 60 |

| SO/Activity/Indicator | Base value | 2017 Follow up | 2018 Follow up | 2019 Follow up | 2019 target | 2020 Follow up | 2020 target | CSP end target |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| Overall | 65 | | | 65 | 60 | 51 | 60 | 60 |
| Livelihood-based coping strategy index (percentage of households using coping strategies)/percentage of households not using livelihood based coping strategies | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 47 | | | 47 | 57 | 54 | 57 | 57 |
| Male | 46 | | | 46 | 57 | 54 | 57 | 57 |
| Overall | 47 | | | 47 | 57 | 54 | 57 | 57 |
| Livelihood-based coping strategy index (percentage of households using coping strategies)/percentage of households using crisis coping strategies | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 18 | | | 18 | 15 | 23 | 15 | 15 |
| Male | 16 | | | 16 | 15 | 21 | 15 | 15 |
| Overall | 17 | | | 17 | 15 | 23 | 15 | 15 |
| Livelihood-based coping strategy index (percentage of households using coping strategies)/percentage of households using emergency coping strategies | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 9 | | | 9 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 8 |
| Male | 14 | | | 14 | 8 | 12 | 8 | 8 |
| Overall | 11 | | | 11 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 8 |
| Livelihood-based coping strategy index (percentage of households using coping strategies)/percentage of households using stress coping strategies | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 26 | | | 26 | 20 | 14 | 20 | 20 |
| Male | 24 | | | 24 | 20 | 13 | 20 | 20 |
| Overall | 25 | | | 25 | 20 | 14 | 20 | 20 |
| Number of national food security and nutrition policies, programmes and system components enhanced as a result of WFP capacity strengthening (new) | | | | | | | | |
| Overall | 0 | | | 14 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 10 |
| Proportion of targeted communities where there is evidence of improved capacity to manage climate shocks and risks | | | | | | | | |
| Overall | 4.04 | | | 4.04 | 5 | 94 | 5 | 10 |
| Proportion of the population in targeted communities reporting benefits from an enhanced asset base | | | | | | | | |
| Overall | 85 | | | | | 85 | 85 | 85 |

Source: COMET, ACRs

Strategic outcome 2 performance

16. SO 2 comprises only one activity (Activity 3). Outcome data coverage for Activity 3 is good throughout the country strategic plan implementation period. As noted above, four new indicators were added in 2019, but most of the indicators have remained unchanged.

17. It is difficult to analyse outcome data for Activity 3 due to changes in the target population and geographical coverage. In 2019 Activity 3 included the Cyclone Idai response (Manica and Sofala), Cyclone Kenneth response (Cabo Delgado), and lean season response (Gaza, Inhambane, Nampula, Tete, Zambezia, Maputo, Manica, Sofala, and Cabo Delgado). In 2020/2021, the same activity covered the lean season response (Zambezia, Tete, Manica, Sofala, Inhambane, Gaza and Maputo), Level 2 response to internally displaced people (Cabo Delgado and Nampula), and COVID-19 response (Tete and Zambezia).

18. These changes can affect recorded performance. As noted in the endline outcome survey from May 2021, the values for the consumption-based coping strategies index (rCSI) and livelihood-based coping strategies index (LCSI) in May 2021 are lower compared to the values recorded in November 2020 (those reflected in Table 41 below) as a result of having included internally displaced people from Cabo Delgado in the sampling.

19. Moreover, in 2020, it was not possible to conduct this endline survey through face-to-face interviews due to COVID-19 restrictions.¹¹ Instead, data was collected remotely through phone calls. This meant questionnaires had to be changed (reduced) and sample sizes had to be cut. As a result of this, it was no longer possible to check if differences with the baseline are statistically significantly different. Moreover, no control group was used.

20. A better picture of the SO 2 performance can be built through the existing outcome monitoring reports and surveys. However, it is not always possible to isolate different target populations. These surveys are only available starting in November 2019.

TABLE 41. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN STRATEGIC OUTCOME 2 OUTCOME INDICATORS PER ACTIVITY

| SO/Activity/Indicator | Base value | 2017 Follow up | 2018 Follow up | 2019 Follow up | 2019 target | 2020 Follow up | 2020 target | CSP end target |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| Act. 3 – URT 1: 03. Provide cash and/or food transfers to vulnerable households affected by crisis | | | | | | | | |
| Consumption-based coping strategy index (average) | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 16.6 | 16.6 | 10.1 | 8.2 | 15 | 11.7 | 15 | 15 |
| Male | 17.6 | 17.6 | 9.67 | 8.8 | 15 | 8.8 | 15 | 15 |
| Overall | 17.3 | 17.3 | 9.79 | 8.5 | 15 | 9.6 | 15 | 15 |
| Food consumption score – nutrition/percentage of households that consumed heme iron rich food daily (in the last 7 days) | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 4.1 | 4.1 | 2.9 | 9 | 11 | 13.67 | 11 | 11 |
| Male | 7.6 | 7.6 | 9.8 | 18 | 11 | 14.33 | 11 | 11 |
| Overall | 5.4 | 5.4 | 8 | 13 | 11 | 14.33 | 11 | 11 |
| Food consumption score – nutrition/percentage of households that consumed vitamin A rich food daily (in the last 7 days) | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 47.1 | 47.1 | 38.1 | 52 | 47.5 | 37.33 | 50 | 50 |
| Male | 44 | 44 | 48.8 | 46 | 47.5 | 30 | 44 | 44 |
| Overall | 45.9 | 45.9 | 46 | 49 | 47.5 | 32 | 47 | 47 |
| Food consumption score – nutrition/percentage of households that consumed protein rich food daily (in the last 7 days) | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 18.1 | 18.1 | 23.8 | 31 | 30 | 37.33 | 30 | 30 |
| Male | 24.1 | 24.1 | 36.6 | 46 | 30 | 52 | 30 | 30 |
| Overall | 20.3 | 20.3 | 33.3 | 39 | 30 | 39.33 | 30 | 30 |
| Food consumption score – nutrition/percentage of households that never consumed heme iron rich food (in the last 7 days) | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 48.3 | 48.3 | 61.9 | 38 | 30 | 37.67 | 19 | 19 |
| Male | 34.3 | 34.3 | 44.7 | 30 | 30 | 27.67 | 19 | 19 |
| Overall | 43.3 | 43.3 | 49.3 | 34 | 30 | 30.67 | 19 | 19 |
| Food consumption score – nutrition/percentage of households that never consumed protein rich food (in the last 7 days) | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 30.3 | 30.3 | 30.5 | 17 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 10 |
| Male | 18.7 | 18.7 | 21 | 11 | 10 | 3.33 | 10 | 10 |
| Overall | 26.1 | 26.1 | 23.5 | 14 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 10 |
| Food consumption score – nutrition/percentage of households that never consumed vitamin A rich food (in the last 7 days) | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 7.3 | 7.3 | 25.7 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| Male | 5.4 | 5.4 | 11.5 | 13 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 5 |
| Overall | 6.6 | 6.6 | 15.3 | 11 | 0 | 6.33 | 5 | 5 |

¹¹ See the baseline outcome survey for the lean season response dated November 2020.

| SO/Activity/Indicator | Base value | 2017 Follow up | 2018 Follow up | 2019 Follow up | 2019 target | 2020 Follow up | 2020 target | CSP end target |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| Food consumption score – nutrition/percentage of households that sometimes consumed heme iron rich food (in the last 7 days) | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 47.6 | 47.6 | 35.2 | 53 | 59 | 48 | 70 | 70 |
| Male | 58.1 | 58.1 | 45.4 | 52 | 59 | 57.67 | 70 | 70 |
| Overall | 51.4 | 51.4 | 42.8 | 53 | 59 | 54.67 | 70 | 70 |
| Food consumption score – nutrition/percentage of households that sometimes consumed protein rich food (in the last 7 days) | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 51.6 | 51.6 | 45.7 | 51 | 60 | 55.67 | 60 | 60 |
| Male | 57.1 | 57.1 | 42.4 | 43 | 60 | 45.33 | 60 | 60 |
| Overall | 53.6 | 53.6 | 34.3 | 47 | 60 | 55.67 | 60 | 60 |
| Food consumption score – nutrition/percentage of households that sometimes consumed vitamin A rich food (in the last 7 days) | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 45.6 | 45.6 | 36.2 | 39 | 52.5 | 58.67 | 45 | 45 |
| Male | 50.6 | 50.6 | 39.7 | 41 | 52.5 | 63 | 50 | 50 |
| Overall | 47.4 | 47.4 | 38.8 | 40 | 52.5 | 62 | 48 | 48 |
| Food consumption score/percentage of households with acceptable food consumption score | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 39 | 39 | 33.3 | 68 | 45 | 55 | 55 | 55 |
| Male | 39.1 | 39.1 | 48.1 | 74 | 45 | 64 | 55 | 55 |
| Overall | 39.1 | 39.1 | 44.3 | 72 | 45 | 62.33 | 55 | 55 |
| Food consumption score/percentage of households with borderline food consumption score | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 42.5 | 42.5 | 36.2 | 18 | 37.5 | 37 | 30 | 30 |
| Male | 37.3 | 37.3 | 30.8 | 14 | 37.5 | 28 | 30 | 30 |
| Overall | 39 | 39 | 32.3 | 15 | 37.5 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| Food consumption score/percentage of households with poor food consumption score | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 18.5 | 18.5 | 30.5 | 14 | 17.5 | 8 | 15 | 15 |
| Male | 23.4 | 23.4 | 21 | 12 | 17.5 | 8 | 15 | 15 |
| Overall | 21.9 | 21.9 | 23.5 | 13 | 17.5 | 7.67 | 15 | 15 |
| Food expenditure share | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 85.8 | 85.8 | 32.7 | 38 | 75 | | 75 | 75 |
| Male | 84.2 | 84.2 | 34.7 | 34 | 75 | | 75 | 75 |
| Overall | 84.7 | 84.7 | 34.2 | 36 | 75 | | 75 | 75 |
| Livelihood-based coping strategy index (percentage of households using coping strategies)/percentage of households not using livelihood-based coping strategies | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 27 | | | 50 | 47 | 28 | 50 | 50 |
| Male | 26 | | | 48 | 47 | 38 | 50 | 50 |
| Overall | 27 | | | 49 | 47 | 35 | 50 | 50 |
| Livelihood-based coping strategy index (percentage of households using coping strategies)/percentage of households using crisis coping strategies | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 14 | | | 16 | 14 | 16 | 12.5 | 12.5 |
| Male | 14 | | | 10 | 14 | 17 | 12.5 | 12.5 |
| Overall | 14 | | | 13 | 14 | 17 | 12.5 | 12.5 |
| Livelihood-based coping strategy index (percentage of households using coping strategies)/percentage of households using emergency coping strategies | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 47 | | | 25 | 25 | 24 | 25 | 25 |
| Male | 45 | | | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Overall | 45 | | | 25 | 25 | 24.67 | 25 | 25 |
| Livelihood-based coping strategy index (percentage of households using coping strategies)/percentage of households using stress coping strategies | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 12 | | | 9 | 14 | 32 | 12.5 | 12.5 |
| Male | 15 | | | 17 | 14 | 21 | 12.5 | 12.5 |
| Overall | 14 | | | 13 | 14 | 23.33 | 12.5 | 12.5 |
| MAM treatment default rate | | | | | | | | |

| SO/Activity/Indicator | Base value | 2017 Follow up | 2018 Follow up | 2019 Follow up | 2019 target | 2020 Follow up | 2020 target | CSP end target |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| Female | 25.6 | 25.6 | 10.5 | 10.6 | 15 | 7.7 | 15 | 15 |
| Male | 22.2 | 22.2 | 9.6 | 10.6 | 15 | 7.9 | 15 | 15 |
| Overall | 24 | 24 | 10.1 | 10.3 | 15 | 7.8 | 15 | 15 |
| MAM treatment mortality rate | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 2 | 2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 3 | 0.1 | 3 | 3 |
| Male | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 3 | 0.1 | 3 | 3 |
| Overall | 1 | 1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 3 | 0.1 | 3 | 3 |
| MAM treatment non-response rate | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 2.1 | 15 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Male | 2.1 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 1.9 | 15 | 1.2 | 2 | 2 |
| Overall | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1 | 0.8 | 15 | 1.2 | 1 | 1 |
| MAM treatment recovery rate | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 70 | 70 | 87 | 84.9 | 75 | 88.7 | 75 | 75 |
| Male | 72.9 | 72.9 | 87.69 | 84 | 75 | 89.6 | 75 | 75 |
| Overall | 71.4 | 71.4 | 87.35 | 85.8 | 75 | 89.2 | 75 | 75 |
| Proportion of eligible population that participates in programme (coverage) | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 31 | 31 | | 53 | 30 | 40.2 | 30 | 30 |
| Male | 28 | 28 | | 47 | 30 | 41.3 | 30 | 30 |
| Overall | 30 | 30 | | 100 | 30 | 40.8 | 30 | 30 |
| Proportion of the population in targeted communities reporting benefits from an enhanced livelihood asset base | | | | | | | | |
| Overall | 15 | | 15 | 18 | 30 | 23 | 30 | 30 |

Source: COMET, ACRs

Strategic outcome 3 performance

21. SO 3 includes only one activity in relation to the national school feeding programme. Data presented in Table 42 below show a positive trend over the period 2017-2019. Data from 2020 are not available for three out of the four indicators due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Enrolment rate data were first collected in 2019 and are the only indicators recorded in 2020. Data collected in 2020 are worse than in 2019, but they are above the annual target. The SABER school feeding assessment has not been conducted.

22. No outcome monitoring survey or report is available to interpret these results.

23. In addition, as pointed out in SO 1, the outcome indicators fail to capture capacity strengthening components of Activity 4.

TABLE 42. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN STRATEGIC OUTCOME 3 OUTCOME INDICATORS PER ACTIVITY

| SO/Activity/Indicator | Base value | 2017 Follow up | 2018 Follow up | 2019 Follow up | 2019 target | 2020 Follow up | 2020 target | CSP end target |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| SMP 1: 04. Strengthen the capacity of the government bodies responsible for the national home-grown school feeding programme | | | | | | | | |
| Attendance rate (new) | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 93.5 | 93.5 | | 93.1 | 93 | | 93.1 | 93.1 |
| Male | 93.1 | 93.1 | | 93.4 | 93 | | 93.4 | 93.4 |
| Overall | 93.3 | 93.3 | | 93.3 | 93 | | 93.3 | 93.3 |
| Enrolment rate | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 15.6 | | | 15.6 | 16 | 12 | 10 | 20 |
| Male | 13 | | | 13 | 16 | 11 | 10 | 20 |
| Overall | 14.3 | | | 14.3 | 16 | 12 | 10 | 20 |
| Pass rate | | | | | | | | |

| SO/Activity/Indicator | Base value | 2017 Follow up | 2018 Follow up | 2019 Follow up | 2019 target | 2020 Follow up | 2020 target | CSP end target |
|----------------------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| Female | 75.9 | 75.9 | 84.2 | 82 | 80 | | 80 | 90 |
| Male | 76.4 | 76.4 | 83.2 | 81 | 80 | | 80 | 90 |
| Overall | 76.2 | 76.2 | 83.6 | 81.2 | 80 | | 80 | 90 |
| Retention rate | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 94 | 94 | 96.1 | 96 | 95 | | 95 | 95 |
| Male | 93 | 93 | 96.9 | 96 | 95 | | 95 | 95 |
| Overall | 94 | 94 | 96.3 | 96 | 95 | | 95 | 95 |
| SABER school feeding national capacity (new) | | | | | | | | |
| Overall | | | | | | | | 2 |

Source: COMET, ACRs

Strategic outcome 4 performance

24. SO 4 comprises one activity (Activity 5) on strengthening the capacity of government entities implementing the national strategy to combat stunting and micronutrient deficiencies. While Activity 5 mainly focuses on capacity strengthening, the indicators are not adequate to provide a good overview of performance. In terms of capacity strengthening activities, outcome data show WFP has met the target in terms of policies and systems supported in 2020, however there is limited information about the results.

25. Two additional indicators try to capture the effects. Data collection started in 2019 and shows progress on dietary diversity for women. At the same time, data show a worsening trend in the proportion of children who receive a minimum acceptable diet. These two indicators are hard to interpret as they are influenced by several factors beyond the control of WFP activities. In addition, there is no outcome monitoring survey or report available to help interpret the data.

TABLE 43. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN STRATEGIC OUTCOME 4 OUTCOME INDICATORS PER ACTIVITY

| SO/Activity/Indicator | Base value | 2017 Follow up | 2018 Follow up | 2019 Follow up | 2019 target | 2020 Follow up | 2020 target | CSP end target |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| NPA1: 05. Provide capacity strengthening and technical assistance to government entities implementing the national strategy to combat stunting and micronutrient deficiencies | | | | | | | | |
| Minimum dietary diversity – women | | | | | | | | |
| Overall | 18.7 | | | 18.7 | 20 | 26 | 20 | 30 |
| Number of national food security and nutrition policies, programmes and system components enhanced as a result of WFP capacity strengthening (new) | | | | | | | | |
| Overall | 0 | | | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| Proportion of children 6–23 months of age who receive a minimum acceptable diet | | | | | | | | |
| Female | | | | | | | 20 | 30 |
| Male | | | | | | | 20 | 30 |
| Overall | 11.6 | | | 11.6 | 15 | 8.6 | 20 | 30 |

Source: COMET, ACRs

Strategic outcome 5 performance

26. SO 5 includes one activity focusing on supporting smallholder farmers (Activity 6). For several of the outcome indicators for Activity 6, data collection started in 2019. Comprehensive data collection took place in 2020. In 2020, it is possible to observe a positive trend compared to baseline values and targets especially for the food consumption score and livelihood-based coping strategies index indicators. More variability is observed in the “percentage of targeted smallholders selling through WFP-supported farmer aggregation systems”. At the same time, the value and volume of smallholder sales through WFP-supported aggregation systems increased several times in 2020 compared to 2019 and previous values.

27. There is no outcome monitoring survey or report available to help interpret the data. Similarly, there is no information about whether it could have been impacted by COVID-19.

TABLE 44. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN STRATEGIC OUTCOME 5 OUTCOME INDICATORS PER ACTIVITY

| SO/Activity/Indicator | Base value | 2017 Follow up | 2018 Follow up | 2019 Follow up | 2019 target | 2020 Follow up | 2020 target | CSP end target |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| SMS1: 06. Enhance the aggregation, marketing and decision making capacities of smallholder farmers, with focus on women | | | | | | | | |
| Food consumption score/percentage of households with acceptable food consumption score | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 75 | | | 75 | 90 | 74.8 | 90 | 90 |
| Male | 86 | | | 86 | 90 | 78.35 | 90 | 90 |
| Overall | 81 | | | 81 | 90 | 76.36 | 90 | 90 |
| Food consumption score/percentage of households with borderline food consumption score | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 24 | | | 24 | 9 | 21.95 | 9 | 9 |
| Male | 13 | | | 13 | 9 | 21.65 | 9 | 9 |
| Overall | 18 | | | 18 | 9 | 21.82 | 9 | 9 |
| Food consumption score/percentage of households with poor food consumption score | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | 1 | 1 |
| Male | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Overall | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1.82 | 1 | 1 |
| Livelihood-based coping strategy index percentage of households using coping strategies/percentage of households not using livelihood-based coping strategies | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 39 | | | 39 | 50 | 66.67 | 50 | 50 |
| Male | 41 | | | 41 | 50 | 63.92 | 50 | 50 |
| Overall | 40 | | | 40 | 50 | 65.45 | 50 | 50 |
| Livelihood-based coping strategy index (percentage of households using coping strategies)/percentage of households using crisis coping strategies | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 20 | | | 20 | 15 | 5.69 | 15 | 15 |
| Male | 20 | | | 20 | 15 | 3.09 | 15 | 15 |
| Overall | 20 | | | 20 | 15 | 4.55 | 15 | 15 |
| Livelihood-based coping strategy index (percentage of households using coping strategies)/percentage of households using emergency coping strategies | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 27 | | | 27 | 25 | 20.33 | 25 | 25 |
| Male | 23 | | | 23 | 25 | 23.71 | 25 | 25 |
| Overall | 25 | | | 25 | 25 | 21.82 | 25 | 25 |
| Livelihood-based coping strategy index (percentage of households using coping strategies)/percentage of households using stress coping strategies | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 13 | | | 13 | 10 | 7.32 | 10 | 10 |
| Male | 16 | | | 16 | 10 | 9.28 | 10 | 10 |
| Overall | 15 | | | 15 | 10 | 8.18 | 10 | 10 |
| Number of national food security and nutrition policies, programmes and system components enhanced as a result of WFP capacity strengthening (new) | | | | | | | | |
| Overall | 0 | | | 7 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 10 |
| Percentage of targeted smallholders selling through WFP-supported farmer aggregation systems | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 8 | 8 | | 18 | 21 | 36.4 | 25 | 25 |
| Male | 13 | 13 | | 40 | 21 | 13.14 | 25 | 25 |
| Overall | 21 | 21 | | 58 | 21 | 47.04 | 21 | 21 |
| Rate of smallholder post-harvest losses | | | | | | | | |
| Overall | 30 | | | 30 | 28 | | 28 | 20 |
| Value and volume of smallholder sales through WFP-supported aggregation systems/value (USD) | | | | | | | | |
| Overall | 195768 | 195768 | 174667 | 20266.28 | 33320 | 3703841 | 33320 | 166600 |
| Value and volume of smallholder sales through WFP-supported aggregation systems/volume (MT) | | | | | | | | |
| Overall | 2719 | 2719 | 1485 | 187.77 | 340 | 16077 | 700 | 1700 |

Source: COMET, ACRs

Strategic outcome 6 performance and strategic outcome 7 performance

28. There is only one outcome indicator reported under Activity 7 and Activity 8 (user satisfaction). There is some variability across years for Activity 7, but in both cases, performance can be considered acceptable when compared with annual targets.

TABLE 45. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN STRATEGIC OUTCOME 6 AND STRATEGIC OUTCOME 7 OUTCOME INDICATORS PER ACTIVITY

| SO/Activity/Indicator | Base value | 2017 Follow up | 2018 Follow up | 2019 Follow up | 2019 target | 2020 Follow up | 2020 target | CSP end target |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| Strategic Outcome 06 - Humanitarian and development partners in Mozambique are reliably supported by efficient and effective supply chain and ICT services and expertise. | | | | | | | | |
| CPA1: 07. Provide supply chain services to humanitarian and development partners | | | | | | | | |
| User satisfaction rate | | | | | | | | |
| Overall | 75 | 75 | 100 | 75 | 75 | 100 | 80 | 100 |
| Strategic Outcome 07 - Government and humanitarian partners in Mozambique have access to effective and reliable services during times of crisis. | | | | | | | | |
| CPA1: 08. Provide services through the logistics cluster to government and other humanitarian and development partners | | | | | | | | |
| User satisfaction rate | | | | | | | | |
| Overall | 97.78 | | | 97.8 | 98 | | | 100 |

Source: COMET, ACRs

OUTPUT INDICATORS PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW

29. This section presents WFP output data for the country strategic plan. It is broken down in different subsections, one for each of the strategic outcomes. It also contains several tables with a summary of the performance. To facilitate reading, where performance values against target values are available, WFP performance has been coloured using the WFP colour-coding system used in COMET:

- Green for performance >90 percent
- Orange for performance >50 percent & <90 percent
- Red for performance <50 percent

30. It is worth noting that starting in 2019, WFP has compiled “output process monitoring reports” covering six months of implementation. The reports mostly focus on Activity 3, but one of these reports includes Activity 2. The output reports tend to focus on process, distribution and support modalities (cash-based transfer, food, etc.) and do not discuss output indicators presented in this section.

Strategic outcome 1 performance

31. Output indicators have evolved substantially after the introduction of the country strategic plan. Consequently, the performance assessment is often limited to comparing 2019 and 2020. In 2018 and 2017, COMET showed no reported values against targets for the Activities under SO 1. In 2019, there are four reported values against targets in Activity 1 and three reported values against targets in Activity 2. In 2020, the same four indicators are reported for Activity 1. For Activity 2, four additional indicators are reported against target values, bringing the total to seven.

32. Output indicator values for Activity 1 indicate that overall performance seems to have deteriorated slightly between 2019 and 2020. It is very likely that COVID-19 restrictions impacted the implementation of training activities.

33. For Activity 2, the performance has also deteriorated in 2020 compared to the previous year. In 2019, WFP exceeded all targets, but in 2020 several indicators failed to meet the target. As mentioned above, it is very likely that COVID-19 restrictions impacted the delivery of trainings and similar outputs.

34. It is worth noting that starting in 2019, WFP has compiled “output process monitoring reports” covering 6 months of implementation. The reports mostly focus on Activity 3, but one of these reports includes Activity 2, but figures are reported aggregately with Activity 3. Due to the larger size of Activity 3 in terms of budget and beneficiaries and the lack of disaggregated data it is not possible to draw specific conclusions for Activity 2.

TABLE 46. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN STRATEGIC OUTCOME 1 OUTPUT INDICATORS PER ACTIVITY

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|
| CS11: Provide capacity strengthening to prepare for, respond to and recover from weather-related shocks, to the Government at national, subnational and community levels | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of counterparts staff members trained in food security monitoring systems | | | | | 4 | | | | | | | |
| Number of disaster preparedness and risk management tools (contingency plans, early warning systems, food security monitoring systems, weather and climate-related tools and services) incorporated in government core functions and budget | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | |
| Number of food security monitoring systems in place | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | |
| Number of government counterparts trained in emergency needs assessment | | | | | 29 | | | | | | | |
| Number of government/national partner staff receiving technical assistance and training | 0 | | | 0 | | | 83 | 58 | 69.9 | 117 | 40 | 34.2 |
| Number of guidance document developed and circulated | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | |
| Number of people trained | | | | | 32 | | | | | | | |
| Number of people trained (skills: environmental protection) | | 808 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of technical assistance activities provided | 0 | 1 | | 0 | | | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 2 | 3 | 150.0 |

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|
| Number of tools or products developed | 0 | | | 0 | | | 4 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 12 | |
| Number of training sessions/workshop organized | 0 | 28 | | 0 | | | 4 | 4 | 100.0 | 4 | 3 | 75.0 |
| CSI2: Provide technical assistance to the government in making social protection programmes shock-responsive and hunger-sensitive | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of assets built, restored or maintained by targeted communities | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of community agriculture extension centres rehabilitated/constructed | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Number of government/national partner staff receiving technical assistance and training | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 20 | 20 | 100.0 |
| Number of national coordination mechanisms supported | 0 | | | 0 | | | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 2 | 5 | 250.0 |
| Number of participants in beneficiary training sessions (livelihood-support/agriculture & farming/income generating activity) | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 2000 | 8 | 0.4 |
| Number of people insured through African Risk Capacity (ARC) replica or any other macro-insurance schemes (male) | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 2600 | | |
| Number of people provided with direct access to information on climate and weather risks (male) | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 8000 | 4277 | 53.5 |
| Number of people trained | | 37 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of storage equipment distributed | | | | | 3 | | | | | | | |
| Number of technical assistance activities provided | 3 | | | 0 | | | 3 | 3 | 100.0 | 5 | 2 | 40.0 |

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|
| Number of tools or products developed | 0 | | | 0 | | | 1 | 3 | 300.0 | 1 | 2 | 200.0 |
| Number of training sessions for beneficiaries carried out (livelihood-support/agriculture & farming/IGA) | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 3000 | 10 | 0.3 |
| Number of training sessions/workshop organized | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 4 | | |
| Number of water reservoirs built/rehabilitated | | | | | 7 | | | | | | | |
| Quantity of food provided | | 16 | | | | | | | | | | |
| USD value of assets and infrastructure handed over to national stakeholders as a result of WFP capacity strengthening support (new) | | | | | | | | | | | 13000 | |
| Value of non-food items distributed | | 20600 | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: COMET

Strategic outcome 2 performance

35. Output indicators for Activity 3 under SO 2 show a significant variability over the implementation of the country strategic plan. Moreover, reported values against targets are only available from 2019 onwards, making it difficult to assess performance over time. In 2020, WFP reported on a total 26 indicators against value targets. In 2019, the figure was 18.

36. Due to the difference in the number of reported indicators, it is difficult to assess performance over time. In 2020, 24 out of the 26 indicators met at least 90 percent of the target value (green). Only two indicators failed to meet the target (both orange).

TABLE 47. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN STRATEGIC OUTCOME 2 OUTPUT INDICATORS PER ACTIVITY

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % | 2021 Targ* | 2021 Act* | 2021 %* |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|---------|------------|-----------|---------|
| URT 1: Provide cash and/or food transfers to vulnerable households affected by crisis | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Community common centres established/rehabilitated | | | | | | | | | | | 2335 | | 3357 | 343 | 96.1 |
| Hectares (ha) of agricultural land benefitting from new irrigation schemes (including irrigation canal construction, specific protection measures, embankments, etc) | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 11 | | 0 | | | 2 | 773 | 41117.0 | | | |
| Hectares (ha) of agricultural land benefitting from rehabilitated irrigation schemes (including irrigation canal repair, specific protection measures, embankments, etc) | | | | | 18 | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Hectares (ha) of agricultural land benefitting from rehabilitated irrigation schemes (including irrigation canal | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | |

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % | 2021 Targ* | 2021 Act* | 2021 %* |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|------------|-----------|---------|
| repair, specific protection measures, embankments, etc.) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hectares (ha) of community woodlots/forest planted, maintained or protected | | | | | | | | | | 35 | | | 97.8.5 | 88.5.9 | 90.5 |
| Hectares (ha) of cultivated land treated and conserved with physical soil and water conservation measures only | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | 400.00 | 409.96 | 102.5 | | | |
| Hectares (ha) of degraded hillsides and marginal areas rehabilitated with physical and biological soil and water conservation measures, planted with trees and protected (e.g. closure, etc) | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hectares (ha) of fodder banks established | 0 | | | 0 | | | 50 | 50 | 100.0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Hectares (ha) of gardens created | 0 | | | 0 | 15 | | 50 | 44.8 | 89.6 | 5 | | | 83.3 | 64.3 | 77.2 |
| Hectares (ha) of land brought under plantation | | | | | | | | | | 13 | | | 33.6 | 31.1.6 | 92.7 |
| Hectares (ha) of land cleared | 0 | | | 0 | 44 | | 35.00 | 35.30 | 100.9 | 160.00 | 144.25 | 90.2 | 55 | 46.3 | 84.14 |
| Hectares (ha) of land cleared of garbage | | | | | 70 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hectares (ha) of land cultivated | | | | | 52 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hectares (ha) of land planted with forage seeds | | | | | 16 | | | | | | | | | | |

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % | 2021 Targ* | 2021 Act* | 2021 %* |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|------------|-----------|---------|
| Hectares (ha) of land protected with shelterbelts and windbreaks | | | | | 60 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hectares (ha) of land under orchards established | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 17 | | 0 | | | 10250 | | | | | |
| Hectares (ha) of orchards improved/maintained | | | | | 40 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hectares (ha) of staple food planted | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 9600 | | | | | |
| Kilograms (kg) of fresh fodder hydroponically produced | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| Kilometres (km) of feeder roads built | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Kilometres (km) of feeder roads maintained | | | | | 0 | | | | | | 50 | | | | |
| Kilometres (km) of feeder roads rehabilitated | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 742 | | 1000 | 998 | 99.8 | 5000 | 5490 | 109.8 | | | |
| Kilometres (km) of footpaths, tracks or trails rehabilitated | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 609.8 | 557.9 | 91.5 |
| Kilometres (km) of irrigation canals constructed | 0 | | | 0 | 12 | | 2 | 1 | 45.0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Kilometres (km) of live fencing maintained | | | | | | | | | | | 160 | | 37.9 | 34.78 | 91.8 |
| Length (m) of drainage canals constructed / rehabilitated | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 823000 | 780000 | 94.8 | | | |
| Metres (m) of concrete/masonry dam/dike/water reservoir constructed | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Metres (m) of concrete/masonry dam/dike/water | | | | | | | | | | | 5950 | | | | |

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % | 2021 Targ* | 2021 Act* | 2021 %* |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|----------|
| reservoir rehabilitated | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of assets built, restored or maintained by targeted communities | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 28 | | 0 | | | 50 | 121 273 2 | 242 546 4.6 | 29 15 3 | 29 15 7 | 10 0 |
| Number of community water ponds for irrigation/livestock use constructed (8000-15000 cbmt) | 0 | | | 0 | 1 | | 0 | | | 2 | 10 | 480 .0 | | | |
| Number of animal diptanks rehabilitated | | | | | | | | | | | 9 | | | | |
| Number of animal handling (cattle crush) facilities established | 0 | | | 0 | 29 | | 0 | | | 2 | 591 | 295 50. 0 | 42 6 | 33 1 | 77. 7 |
| Number of animal shelters constructed | | | | | | | | | | | 156 | | 37 8 | 36 2 | 95. 8 |
| Number of assisted communities with improved physical infrastructures to mitigate the impact of shocks, in place as a result of project assistance | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of bales of hay produced | | | | | | | | | | | 292 1 | | | | |
| Number of boreholes for agriculture or livestock created | | | | | 10 | | | | | | | | 13 6 | 66 | 48. 5 |
| Number of caregivers (women) who received messages/training on health and nutrition | | | | | 43 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of caregivers (men) who received | | | | | 77 2 | | | | | | | | | | |

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % | 2021 Targ* | 2021 Act* | 2021 %* |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|---------|------------|-----------|---------|
| messages/training on health and nutrition | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of cereal banks established | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 10 | | | | | |
| Number of chicken houses constructed | | | | | | | | | | | 1450 | | | | |
| Number of community gardens established | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 23 | | 0 | | | 25 | 10321 | 41284.0 | 2552 | 2364 | 92.6 |
| Number of community post-harvest structures built | | | | | 144 | | | | | | 1385 | | | | |
| Number of community water ponds for domestic use constructed (3000-8000 cbmt) | | | | | | | | | | | 8 | | 9 | 9 | 100 |
| Number of community water ponds for domestic use rehabilitated/maintained (3000-8000 cbmt) | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 81 | 74 | 91.4 | | | |
| Number of community water ponds for irrigation/livestock use constructed (3000-8000 cbmt) | | | | | | | | | | | 44 | | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| Number of concrete bridges constructed | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 27 | 27 | 100.0 | 44 | 44 | 100 |
| Number of concrete bridges rehabilitated | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of culverts and drainage systems built (between 4-6m in width) | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 356 | 324 | 91.0 | | | |
| Number of family gardens established | | | | | 1200 | | | | | | 2826 | | | | |

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % | 2021 Targ* | 2021 Act* | 2021 %* |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|------------|-----------|---------|
| Number of feed storage facilities constructed | | | | | | | | | | 30 | | | | | |
| Number of fishponds constructed | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 15 | | 5 | 5 | 100.0 | 42 | 41 | 97.6 | 14 | 11 | 78.6 |
| Number of fuel-efficient stoves distributed | 0 | | | 0 | | | 1200 | 1159 | 96.6 | 950 | 8690 | 91.5 | 2050 | 1609 | 78.5 |
| Number of goat houses constructed | | | | | | | | | | 15 | | | | | |
| Number of greenhouses constructed | | | | | 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of hand washing facilities created | | | | | | | | | | 177 | 174 | | 61 | 62 | 100.8 |
| Number of health centres/sites assisted | 0 | 479 | | 0 | 146 | | 475 | 475 | 100.0 | 310 | 348 | 112.3 | | | |
| Number of hives distributed | 0 | | | 0 | 40 | | 0 | | | 84 | 76 | 90.5 | 26 | 26 | 100 |
| Number of latrines constructed | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 81 | | 1500 | 1468 | 97.9 | 21000 | 21417 | 102.0 | 8548 | 8452 | 98.9 |
| Number of latrines rehabilitated | | | | | | | | | | 545 | | | | | |
| Number of livestock watering points built/restored | | 0 | | | 10 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of manual typewriters distributed | | | | | 960 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of men receiving WFP-supported nutrition counselling | | | | | 2280 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of non-food items distributed (tools, milling machines, pumps, etc.) | | | | | | | | | | 205 | 175 | | 13 | 13 | 100 |
| Number of nutrition information products distributed | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 11228 | | 19000 | 17993 | 94.7 | | | |

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % | 2021 Targ* | 2021 Act* | 2021 %* |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|----------|------------|-----------|---------|
| Number of people reached through interpersonal SBCC approaches (women) | 0 | | | 0 | | | 31344 | 33841 | 108.0 | 7769 | 27331 | 351.8 | | | |
| Number of people reached through interpersonal SBCC approaches (men) | 0 | | | 0 | | | 500 | 472 | 94.4 | 690 | | | | | |
| Number of plant nurseries constructed/rehabilitated | | 0 | | | 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of primary schools assisted by WFP | | 363 | | | 89 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of retailers participating in cash-based transfer programmes | | 8 | | | 5 | | | | | | 3 | | | | |
| Number of roof catchments constructed | | | | | 11 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of shallow wells constructed | | | | | 52 | | | | | | | | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| Number of social infrastructures and income generating infrastructures constructed (school building, facility centre, community building, market stalls, etc.) | 0 | | | 0 | 23 | | 160 | 96 | 60.0 | 1448 | 278600 | 19240.3 | 3336 | 3321 | 99.6 |
| Number of social infrastructures and income generating infrastructures rehabilitated (school building, facility centre, community | 0 | | | 0 | 14 | | 0 | | | 1 | 1735 | 173500.0 | 137 | 131 | 95.6 |

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % | 2021 Targ* | 2021 Act* | 2021 %* |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|------------|-----------|---------|
| building, market stalls, etc.) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of sub-surface dams built/repared | | 0 | | | 15 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of tanks constructed | | | | | 6 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of tree seedlings produced/provided | | | | | 84 75 | | | 20 01 00 | | | | | | | |
| Number of water control structures constructed | | | | | 7 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of water reservoirs built/rehabilitated | | 0 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of water tanks/tower constructed for irrigation/livestock/domestic use (0 - 5000cbmt) | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 2 | 2 | 90.9 | | | |
| Number of wells or shallow wells built for domestic use | | | | | 7 | | | 2 | | | 16 | | | | |
| Number of wells or shallow wells rehabilitated for domestic use | 0 | | | 0 | | | 23 | 23 | 100.0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Number of women exposed to WFP-supported nutrition messaging | | | | | 11 94 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of women receiving WFP-supported nutrition counselling | | | | | 24 00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of woodpost bridges rehabilitated | | | | | 5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quantity of food provided | | 448 5 | | | 11 51 | | | | | | | | | | |

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % | 2021 Targ* | 2021 Act* | 2021 %* |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|------------|-----------|---------|
| Quantity of fortified food provided | 0 | | | 0 | | | 5000 | 4868 | 97.4 | 0 | | | | | |
| Quantity of inputs for nutrition activities distributed | 0 | | | 0 | | | 35000 | 33475 | 95.6 | 79297 | 51685 | 65.2 | | | |
| Quantity of motorbikes/vehicles distributed | 0 | | | 0 | | | 2 | 3 | 150.0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Quantity of specialized nutritious foods provided | 0 | 284 | | 0 | 0 | | 17006 | 1903 | 11.2 | 1000 | 888 | 88.8 | | | |
| Quantity of tree seedlings produced provided to individual households | | | | | 22800 | | | | | | | | 20750 | 19815 | 95.5 |
| Quantity of tree seedlings produced used for afforestation, reforestation and vegetative stabilization | | 0 | | | 219 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Square metres (m ²) of existing nurseries supported | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 220000 | 2014718 | 91.6 | | | |
| Square metres (m ²) of new nurseries established | | | | | | | | | | | 176288 | | | | |
| Total amount of cash transferred to targeted beneficiaries | | 92278 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Volume (m ³) of compost produced/prepared | 0 | | | 0 | | | 35000 | 35222 | 100.6 | 0 | | | | | |
| Volume (m ³) of rock catchments constructed | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 4050 | 3736 | 92.2 | 4066 | 4066 | 100 |
| Volume (m ³) of soil excavated from newly constructed waterways and | | | | | | | | | | | 75 | | | | |

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % | 2021 Targ* | 2021 Act* | 2021 %* |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|------------|-----------|---------|
| drainage lines (not including irrigation canals) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Volume (m ³) of water harvesting systems constructed | | | | | 682 | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: COMET

*2021 Data cover Q1 only

Strategic outcome 3 performance

37. Activity 4 is the only activity within SO 3. A total of 17 output indicators were reported against target values in 2019. Most of these indicators show that the targets were met (14 out of 17 indicators met). In 2020, data has been reported for six output indicators. Only one indicator has failed to meet the target. The significant drop in the number of indicators reported is due to the impact of the COVID-19 restrictions on schools.

38. There are some indicators values reported for 2017 and 2018 but they do not include targets and it is not possible to assess performance.

TABLE 48. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN STRATEGIC OUTCOME 3 OUTPUT INDICATORS PER ACTIVITY

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|
| SMP1: Strengthen the capacity of the government bodies responsible for the national home-grown school feeding programme | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Average number of school days per month on which multi-fortified or at least 4 food groups were provided (nutrition-sensitive indicator) | 0 | | | 0 | | | 16 | 2 | 12.5 | 16 | | |
| Feeding days as percentage of total school days | 0 | | | 0 | | | 100 | 54 | 54.4 | 100 | | |
| Number of assisted schools that procure fresh food items | 0 | 26 | | 0 | 64 | | 158 | 171 | 108.2 | 0 | | |
| Number of government/national partner staff receiving technical assistance and training | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 380 | 0 | |
| Number of hygiene kits distributed (soap) | 0 | | | 0 | | | 360 | 305 | 84.7 | 765 | 683 | 0 |
| Number of individuals (women) trained in safe food preparation and storage | 0 | | | 0 | | | 332 | 392 | 118.1 | 570 | | |
| Number of individuals (men) trained in safe food | 0 | | | 0 | | | 56 | 56 | 100.0 | 380 | | |

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|
| preparation and storage | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of institution stoves distributed | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of institutional sites assisted | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 81 | 150 | 185.2 |
| Number of kitchens or cook areas rehabilitated/constructed | | | | | 4 | | | | | | | |
| Number of parent-teacher associations (PTAs) or similar "school" governance structures supported | 0 | | | 0 | | | 391 | 391 | 100.0 | 0 | | |
| Number of participants in beneficiary training sessions (health and nutrition) | | | | | | | | 448 | | | | |
| Number of people trained | | 212 | | | 220 | | | | | | | |
| Number of primary schools assisted by WFP | 0 | 217 | | 0 | 128 | | 391 | 391 | 100.0 | 280 | | |
| Number of retailers participating in cash-based transfer programmes | 0 | | | 0 | | | 15 | 15 | 100.0 | 15 | 0 | |
| Number of schools supported through home-grown school feeding model | 0 | | | 0 | | | 158 | 171 | 108.2 | 254 | 315 | 124.0 |
| Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants trained or certified | | | | | 1151 | | | | | | | |
| Number of technical assistance activities provided | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 3 | 0 | |
| Number of water tanks delivered | | | | | | | | | | | 499 | |
| Number of WFP-assisted schools that promote health, nutrition and hygiene education | 0 | | | 0 | | | 80 | 80 | 100.0 | 254 | 0 | |
| Quantity of agricultural tools distributed | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quantity of equipment (computers, furniture) distributed | | | | | 16 | | | | | | | |
| Quantity of food provided | | 676 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quantity of fuel efficiency stoves distributed | 0 | | | 0 | 6 | | 24 | 24 | 100.0 | 0 | | |
| Quantity of kitchen utensils distributed (plates, spoons, cooking pots etc.) | 0 | | | 0 | 86747 | | 424759 | 423109 | 99.6 | 88388 | 206275 | 233.4 |
| Quantity of motorbikes/vehicles distributed | 0 | | | 0 | 6 | | 32 | 32 | 100.0 | 3 | 3 | 100.0 |
| Quantity of tablets/phones distributed | 0 | | | 0 | 2 | | 50 | 62 | 124.0 | 0 | | |

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|------------|------------|--------|-----------------|------------|--------|
| Quantity of weighing scales distributed | 0 | | | 0 | 4 | | 18 | 18 | 100.0 | 190 | 277 | 145.8 |
| Total value (USD) of capacity strengthening transfers | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 764 286 | | |
| USD value of assets and infrastructure handed over to national stakeholders as a result of WFP capacity strengthening support (new) | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 194 949 4 | | |
| Value of non-food items distributed | 0 | | | 0 | | | 355 287 | 355 287 | 100.0 | 830 668 | 536 714 | 64.6 |

Source: COMET

Strategic outcome 4 performance

39. In 2020, WFP reported a total of six indicators against target values. Four out of the six indicators met the targets. A further two indicators failed to meet the target in 2020. These two indicators are related to training and interpersonal approaches and were most likely affected by restrictions related to the COVID-19 pandemic. It is difficult to assess progress over time because there is only one indicator reported against targets in previous years (in 2019).

TABLE 49. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN STRATEGIC OUTCOME 4 OUTPUT INDICATORS PER ACTIVITY

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|-----------|--------|
| NPA1: Provide capacity strengthening and technical assistance to government entities implementing the national strategy to combat stunting and micronutrient deficiencies | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of government/national partner staff receiving technical assistance and training | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 545 | 580 | 106.4 |
| Number of men exposed to WFP-supported nutrition messaging | | 730 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of people reached through interpersonal SBCC approaches (women) | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 887 9 | 182 22 | 205.2 |
| Number of people reached through interpersonal SBCC approaches (men) | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 436 4 | 363 1 | 83.2 |
| Number of people trained | | 146 0 | | | 151 2 | | | | | | | |
| Number of technical assistance activities provided | 0 | | | 0 | 476 | | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 3 | 3 | 100.0 |
| Number of tools or products developed | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 15 | 21 | 140.0 |
| Number of training sessions/workshop organized | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 23 | 17 | 73.9 |

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|
| Number of women exposed to WFP-supported nutrition messaging | | 730 0 | | | 121 | | | | | | | |

Source: COMET

Strategic outcome 5 performance

40. Activity 6 reported against ten output indicators in 2019. In 2020, the figure drops to seven indicators. In previous years there are no value reported against targets. Indicators suggest that performance in 2020 was lower than in 2019. In 2019, nine out of the ten indicators were met and one indicator was orange. In 2020, only four of the seven indicators met the targets. Of the remaining three indicators, two were orange and one is red. Two of these indicators are related to training and capacity building activities. It is possible that implementation was affected by restrictions related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

TABLE 50. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN STRATEGIC OUTCOME 5 OUTPUT INDICATORS PER ACTIVITY

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|
| SMS1: Enhance the aggregation, marketing and decision-making capacities of smallholder farmers, with focus on women | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of demonstration gardens established | 0 | | | 0 | | | 104 | 104 | 100.0 | 104 | 174 | 167.3 |
| Number of farmer group leaders subscribed to market/price and metrological information services | 0 | | | 0 | | | 104 | 104 | 100.0 | 0 | | |
| Number of farmer organizations trained in market access and post-harvest handling skills | 0 | | | 0 | | | 16 | 75 | 468.8 | 75 | 37 | 49.3 |
| Number of farmers receiving hermetic storage equipment | 0 | | | 0 | | | 2000 | 2000 | 100.0 | 1300 | 1034 | 79.5 |
| Number of government counterparts trained | 0 | | | 0 | | | 7 | 7 | 100.0 | 7 | 7 | 100.0 |
| Number of government/national partner staff receiving technical assistance and training | 0 | | | 0 | | | 57 | 57 | 100.0 | 57 | 34 | 59.6 |
| Number of individual farmers trained in post-harvest handling practices | 0 | | | 0 | | | 7055 | 4397 | 62.3 | 7500 | 7481 | 99.7 |
| Number of people trained (organizational skills, management and marketing skills) | | | | | 48 | | | | | | | |
| Number of smallholder farmers supported by WFP | 0 | | | 0 | | | 1061 | 1061 | 100.0 | 0 | | |

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|
| Number of technical assistance activities provided | | | | | 169 | | | | | | | |
| Number of technical assistance projects conducted by WFP to strengthen the national capacity | | 10 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of training sessions/workshops organized | | | | | | | | | | | 7 | |
| Number of training sessions/workshops organized | 0 | | | 0 | | | 80 | 75 | 93.8 | 0 | | |
| Quantity of agricultural tools distributed | | | | | | | | | | | 16832 | |
| Volume of commodities (metric tons) sold by project beneficiaries | 0 | | | 0 | | | 100 | 130 | 130.1 | 1100 | 1181 | 107.4 |

Source: COMET

Strategic outcome 6 performance

41. SO 6 comprises one activity. Data against target values was reported for four indicators in 2019 and against six indicators in 2020. In all cases, the targets have been met.

TABLE 51. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN STRATEGIC OUTCOME 6 OUTPUT INDICATORS PER ACTIVITY

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % | 2021 | 2021 Act* | 2021 %* |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|------|-----------|---------|
| CPA 1: Provide supply chain services to humanitarian and development partners | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of government/national partner staff receiving technical assistance and training | 0 | | | 0 | | | 11 | 11 | 100.00 | 29 | 53 | 182.8 | 30 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of tools or products developed | 0 | | | 0 | | | 1 | 1 | 100.00 | 3 | 3 | 100.00 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of training sessions/workshop organized | 0 | | | 0 | | | 3 | 3 | 100.00 | 1 | 1 | 100.00 | | | |
| Percentage of cargo capacity offered against total capacity requested | 0 | | | 0 | | | 100 | 100 | 100.00 | 50 | 50 | 100.00 | | | |
| Percentage of payload delivered against available capacity | | | | | | | 100 | | | | | | | | |
| Volume (m ³) of cargo transported | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 10 | 10 | 100.00 | | | |
| Volume of cargo handled through storage services | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 33 | 33 | 100.00 | | | |

Source: COMET

* 2021 data covers Q1

Strategic outcome 7 performance

42. SO 7 comprises four different activities. Data against target values was only reported in 2019. In all cases (six indicators), the targets were met.

TABLE 52. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN STRATEGIC OUTCOME 7 OUTPUT INDICATORS PER ACTIVITY

| SO/Activity/Indicator | 2017 Targ | 2017 Act | 2017 % | 2018 Targ | 2018 Act | 2018 % | 2019 Targ | 2019 Act | 2019 % | 2020 Targ | 2020 Act | 2020 % |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|
| CPA1: Provide services through the logistics cluster to government and other humanitarian and development partners | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of services provided | 0 | | | 0 | | | 3 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 3 | |
| Number of WFP-led clusters operational | 0 | | | 0 | | | 3 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | | |
| CPA2: Provide emergency telecommunications cluster services to government and other humanitarian and development partners | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of emergency telecoms and information and communications technology (ICT) systems established | 0 | | | 0 | | | 59 | 59 | 100.0 | 0 | | |
| CPA3: Provide humanitarian air services to government and other humanitarian and development partners | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of passengers transported | 0 | | | 0 | | | 590 | 590 | 100.0 | 0 | 211 | |
| Volume (m ³) of cargo transported | 0 | | | 0 | | | 614 | 614 | 100.0 | 0 | 614 | |
| CPA4: Provide accommodation, transport and other services as required to humanitarian and development partners | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Volume (m ³) of cargo transported | 0 | | | 0 | | | 2000 | 1827 | 91.4 | 0 | | |

Source: COMET

CROSS-CUTTING INDICATORS

43. Table 53 shows that in 2020 and 2019, the country strategic plan reported against ten cross-cutting indicators covering the areas of gender, protection, accountability to affected populations and environment. In 2017 no data was reported against the cross-cutting indicators. In 2018, data was only reported against four indicators.

44. For indicators that have been reported in more than one year, data suggests some progress over the implementation of the country strategic plan even if the gains are small. Remarkably, cross-cutting data seems to be reported or collected against Activity 3 only. Pre-country strategic plan operations (see below) showed a more balanced reported across project activities or components. Given that cross-cutting indicators are reported against Activity 3, it is not clear how changes to the underlying target population and beneficiaries have affected recorded values (see discussion in SO 2 outcome section).

45. Cross-cutting indicators for pre-country strategic plan operations are summarized in Table 54. Three cross-cutting indicators for previous operations are comparable to current cross-cutting indicators:

- Proportion of assisted people informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, length of assistance)
- Proportion of assisted people who do not experience safety problems travelling to, from and/or at WFP programme site
- Proportion of households where women, men, or both women and men make decisions on the use of food/cash/vouchers, disaggregated by transfer modality.

46. It is worth noting that the “process output monitoring reports” that have been published since 2019 include some additional data on beneficiaries with disability, protection issues and use of complaint mechanisms.

TABLE 53. COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN CROSS-CUTTING INDICATORS PER ACTIVITY

| Activity/indicator/breakdown | Baseline | 2017 value | 2018 value | 2019 value | 2020 value | CSP End Target |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| URT1: 03. Provide cash and/or food transfers to vulnerable households affected by crisis | | | | | | |
| Proportion of activities for which environmental risks have been screened and, as required, mitigation actions identified | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 42.19 | 50 |
| Proportion of assisted people informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, length of assistance) | | | | | | |
| Women | 0 | 0 | 22.1 | 57 | 82.5 | 80 |
| Men | 0 | 0 | 22.6 | 62 | 85.3 | 80 |
| Overall | 0 | 0 | 22.5 | 59 | 84.2 | 80 |
| Proportion of food assistance decision-making entity – committees, boards, teams, etc. – members who are women | | | | | | |
| Cash, commodity voucher, food | 0 | 0 | 56 | 49 | 51 | 50 |
| Proportion of households where women, men, or both women and men make decisions on the use of food/cash/vouchers, disaggregated by transfer modality/decisions jointly made by women and men | | | | | | |
| Cash | 27.8 | 0 | 0 | 27.8 | | 50 |
| Commodity voucher | 17 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 38.4 | 50 |
| Food | 40.34 | 0 | 0 | 40.34 | 34.1 | 50 |
| Proportion of households where women, men, or both women and men make decisions on the use of food/cash/vouchers, disaggregated by transfer modality /decisions made by men | | | | | | |
| Cash | 40.4 | 0 | 0 | 40.4 | | 20 |
| Commodity voucher | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 32.9 | 20 |
| Food | 38.33 | 0 | 0 | 38.33 | 27.2 | 20 |
| Proportion of households where women, men, or both women and men make decisions on the use of food/cash/vouchers, disaggregated by transfer modality/decisions made by women | | | | | | |
| Cash | 31.8 | 0 | 0 | 31.8 | | 30 |
| Commodity voucher | 51 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 28.8 | 30 |
| Food | 21.33 | 0 | 0 | 21.33 | 38.7 | 30 |
| Proportion of project activities for which beneficiary feedback is documented, analysed and integrated into programme improvements | | | | | | |
| Cash, commodity voucher, food | 0 | 0 | 40 | 67 | 67 | 100 |
| Proportion of targeted people accessing assistance without protection challenges | | | | | | |
| Women | 0 | 0 | 98.7 | 97 | 99.91 | 99 |
| Men | 0 | 0 | 99.2 | 96 | 100 | 99 |
| Overall | 0 | 0 | 99.1 | 96 | 99.95 | 99 |
| Proportion of targeted people having unhindered access to WFP programmes (new) | | | | | | |
| Women | 67 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 99.93 | 100 |
| Men | 64 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 100 | 100 |
| Overall | 65 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 99.96 | 100 |
| Proportion of targeted people who report that WFP programmes are dignified (new) | | | | | | |
| Women | 94 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 98.27 | 100 |
| Men | 94 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 98.24 | 100 |
| Overall | 94 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 98.25 | 100 |
| Type of transfer (food, cash, voucher, no compensation) received by participants in WFP activities, disaggregated by sex and type of activity | | | | | | |
| Cash | | | | | | |
| Women | 52.01 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| Men | 47.99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| Overall | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 100 |
| Commodity voucher | | | | | | |
| Women | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| Men | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| Overall | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 100 |

| Activity/indicator/breakdown | Baseline | 2017 value | 2018 value | 2019 value | 2020 value | CSP End Target |
|------------------------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| Food | | | | | | |
| Women | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 52 |
| Men | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| Overall | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 100 |

Source: COMET

PRE-COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN OPERATIONS

TABLE 54. CROSS-CUTTING INDICATORS FOR PRE-COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLAN OPERATIONS

| Operation/component/indicator | Baseline | 2016 Value | 2017 Value | Final target |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|------------|------------|--------------|
| 200286 | | | | |
| Assistance to vulnerable groups | | | | |
| Proportion of women beneficiaries in leadership positions of project management committees | 30 | | | 50 |
| Proportion of women project management committee members trained on modalities of food, cash, or voucher distribution | 30 | | | 60 |
| Comp.1 - Home-grown school meals | | | | |
| Amount of complementary funds provided to the project by partners (including NGOs, civil society, private sector organizations, international financial institutions and regional development banks) | 115400 | 0 | | 20000 |
| Number of partner organizations that provide complementary inputs and services | 3 | 4 | | 2 |
| Proportion of project activities implemented with the engagement of complementary partners | 100 | 100 | | 20 |
| Proportion of women beneficiaries in leadership positions of project management committees | 30 | 30 | | 50 |
| Proportion of women project management committee members trained on modalities of food, cash, or voucher distribution | 30 | 35 | | 60 |
| Comp.2 - Social protection | | | | |
| Amount of complementary funds provided to the project by partners (including NGOs, civil society, private sector organizations, international financial institutions and regional development banks) | 238400 | 0 | | 20000 |
| Number of partner organizations that provide complementary inputs and services | 3 | 3 | | 3 |
| Proportion of assisted people informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain) | 100 | 100 | | 90 |
| Proportion of assisted people who do not experience safety problems travelling to, from and/or at WFP programme site | 100 | 98.4 | | 100 |
| Proportion of households where women, men, or both women and men make decisions on the use of food/cash/vouchers, disaggregated by transfer modality/decisions jointly made by women and men | 37.9 | 10.86 | | 20 |
| Proportion of households where women, men, or both women and men make decisions on the use of food/cash/vouchers, disaggregated by transfer modality/decisions made by men | 15.7 | 39.26 | | 30 |

| Operation/component/indicator | Baseline | 2016 Value | 2017 Value | Final target |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|------------|------------|--------------|
| Proportion of households where women, men, or both women and men make decisions on the use of food/cash/vouchers, disaggregated by transfer modality/decisions made by women | 46.4 | 56.98 | | 50 |
| Proportion of project activities implemented with the engagement of complementary partners | 57 | 80 | | 20 |
| Proportion of women beneficiaries in leadership positions of project management committees | 56 | 26 | | 50 |
| Proportion of women project management committee members trained on modalities of food, cash, or voucher distribution | 61 | 36 | | 60 |
| Comp.3 - Nutrition | | | | |
| Number of partner organizations that provide complementary inputs and services | 2 | 0 | | 2 |
| Proportion of assisted people informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain) | 100 | 0 | | 90 |
| Proportion of assisted people who do not experience safety problems travelling to, from and/or at WFP programme site | 100 | 0 | | 100 |
| Proportion of households where women, men, or both women and men make decisions on the use of food/cash/vouchers, disaggregated by transfer modality/decisions jointly made by women and men | 37.5 | 0 | | 50 |
| Proportion of households where women, men, or both women and men make decisions on the use of food/cash/vouchers, disaggregated by transfer modality/decisions made by men | 15.8 | 0 | | 20 |
| Proportion of households where women, men, or both women and men make decisions on the use of food/cash/vouchers, disaggregated by transfer modality/decisions made by women | 46.7 | 0 | | 30 |
| Proportion of project activities implemented with the engagement of complementary partners | 10 | 0 | | 20 |
| Comp.4 - Risk reduction | | | | |
| Amount of complementary funds provided to the project by partners (including NGOs, civil society, private sector organizations, international financial institutions and regional development banks) | 10000 | 0 | | 20000 |
| Number of partner organizations that provide complementary inputs and services | 11 | 2 | | 4 |
| Proportion of project activities implemented with the engagement of complementary partners | 10 | 10 | | 15 |
| Proportion of women beneficiaries in leadership positions of project management committees | 56 | 50 | | 50 |
| Proportion of women project management committee members trained on modalities of food, cash, or voucher distribution | 61 | 65 | | 60 |
| Comp.5- Market access | | | | |
| Number of partner organizations that provide complementary inputs and services | 19 | 0 | | 15 |
| Proportion of project activities implemented with the engagement of complementary partners | 20 | 0 | | 100 |

| Operation/component/indicator | Baseline | 2016 Value | 2017 Value | Final target |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|------------|------------|--------------|
| Proportion of women in leadership positions of project management committees | 29.2 | 0 | | 50 |
| Proportion of women project management committee members trained on modalities of food, cash, or voucher distribution | 69.41 | 0 | | 60 |
| 200355 | | | | |
| Assistance to vulnerable groups | | | | |
| Proportion of assisted people informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, length of assistance) | | | | |
| Women | 40 | | 48.7 | 80 |
| Men | 30 | | 39.8 | 80 |
| Overall | 70 | | 42.4 | 80 |
| Proportion of assisted people who do not experience safety problems travelling to, from and/or at WFP programme site | | | | |
| Women | 100 | | 99.5 | 90 |
| Men | 100 | | 99.8 | 90 |
| Overall | 100 | | 99 | 90 |
| Proportion of households where women, men, or both women and men make decisions on the use of food/cash/vouchers, disaggregated by transfer modality/decisions jointly made by women and men | 42.8 | | 48.4 | 50 |
| Proportion of households where women, men, or both women and men make decisions on the use of food/cash/vouchers, disaggregated by transfer modality/decisions made by men | 15.4 | | 15.2 | 20 |
| Proportion of households where women, men, or both women and men make decisions on the use of food/cash/vouchers, disaggregated by transfer modality/decisions made by women | 41.8 | | 36.4 | 30 |
| Proportion of women beneficiaries in leadership positions of project management committees | 52 | | 31 | 50 |
| Proportion of women project management committee members trained on modalities of food, cash, or voucher distribution | 60 | | 41 | 60 |

Source: COMET

Annex 16: Human Resources WFP

Mozambique

1. Data in this annex come from the country office. Data are as of 31 December, with the exception of 2021, where data are as of June 2021.

TABLE 55. EVOLUTION OF HUMAN RESOURCES IN WFP MOZAMBIQUE

| | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Male | 122 | 96 | 116 | 232 | 238 | 254 |
| Female | 51 | 47 | 62 | 127 | 160 | 158 |
| National | 154 | 126 | 160 | 310 | 342 | 354 |
| International | 19 | 17 | 18 | 49 | 56 | 58 |

Source: WFP Mozambique country office

TABLE 56. WFP MOZAMBIQUE STAFF BY TYPE OF CONTRACT AND FUNCTION, 2021

| Function | WFP staff | Service contract | Special service agreement | Consultant | Volunteer |
|------------------------------------|-----------|------------------|---------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Administration | 13 | 38 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Business support | 2 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Communications | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Evaluation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Field operations management | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Finance | 4 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Human resources | 3 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Information management & reporting | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Information technologies | 1 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Logistics | 5 | 31 | 6 | 3 | 0 |
| Nutrition | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Partnerships | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Procurement | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Programme & policy | 11 | 115 | 38 | 24 | 48 |
| Resource management | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Security | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Supply chain | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Grand total | 50 | 226 | 60 | 45 | 48 |

Source: WFP Mozambique country office

FIGURE 18. WFP MOZAMBIQUE STAFF BY FUNCTIONAL AREA AND OFFICE

| Function | Beira | Chimoio | Inhamitanga | Maputo | Nampula | Pemba | Quelimane | Tete | Xai-Xai |
|-----------------------------|-------|---------|-------------|--------|---------|-------|-----------|------|---------|
| Administration | 11 | 4 | | 25 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| Business support | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Communications | | | | 6 | | | | | |
| Evaluation | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| Field operations management | 1 | | | 2 | | 1 | | | |

| Function | Bei ra | Chi- moio | Inham- bane | Mapu -to | Nam- pula | Pem ba | Queli- mane | Te te | Xai- Xai |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|-------------|
| Finance | 2 | 1 | | 9 | | 2 | | 1 | 1 |
| Human resources | 1 | 1 | | 9 | | | | | |
| Information management & reporting | 1 | | | 2 | | | | | |
| Information technologies | 2 | 1 | | 7 | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Logistics | 13 | 4 | | 11 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| Nutrition | | | | 2 | | | | | |
| Partnerships | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| Procurement | | | | 6 | | | | | |
| Programme & policy | 35 | 13 | 2 | 78 | 20 | 28 | 18 | 26 | 16 |
| Resource management | | | | 4 | | | | | |
| Security | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Supply chain | | | | 3 | | | | | |
| Grand total | 68 | 25 | 3 | 174 | 28 | 48 | 23 | 37 | 23 |

Source: WFP Mozambique country office

Annex 17: Findings-Conclusions-Recommendations Mapping

| Recommendation [in numerical order] | Conclusions [by number(s) of conclusion] | Findings [by number of finding] |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Recommendation 1: Keep the strategic direction of the new CSP in humanitarian assistance alongside with development interventions with a long-term vision, focusing on areas where WFP can better position itself. | Conclusion 1 | 1.1a; 1.1b; 1.1c; 1.1d; 1.1e; 1.2a; 1.2b; 1.3b |
| | Conclusion 3 | 2.1b; 2.1d; 2.1i; 2.1j; 2.1k; 2.1l; 2.1m |
| | Conclusion 4 | 2.1a; 2.1c; 2.1e; 2.1h; 2.1q; 4.5e; 4.5f |
| Recommendation 2: Place WFP as a booster to move forward and strengthen the humanitarian-development-peace nexus in Mozambique | Conclusion 6 | 1.3a; 2.4a; 2.4b; 2.4c |
| | Conclusion 11 | 3.3a; 3.3b; 3.3c; 3.3d; 3.3e; 3.3f 3.4a; 3.4b |
| Recommendation 3: Continue strengthening and diversifying strategic partnerships with a range of national and international actors to enhance efficiency and effectiveness of the new CSP | Conclusion 2 | 1.3c; 1.4a; 2.1g |
| | Conclusion 14 | 1.4b; 4.3a; 4.3b; 4.3c |
| Recommendation 4: Enhance the organizational readiness of country | Conclusion 5 | 2.1n; 2.1o; 2.1p |
| | Conclusion 7 | 2.2a; 2.2b; 2.2c; 2.2d; 2.2e; 2.2f |

| | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| offices to play a more catalytic role in delivering the CSP | Conclusion 9 | 2.1f; 3.1a; 3.1b; 3.1c; 3.2a; 3.2b; 3.2c |
| | Conclusion 12 | 2.3a; 2.3b; 2.3c |
| | Conclusion 13 | 4.1a; 4.1b; 4.2a; 4.2b; 4.2c; 4.4a; 4.4b; 4.5c |
| Recommendation 5: Define a fundraising and advocacy strategy centred on donors and IFIs | Conclusion 8 | 2.3a; 2.3b; 2.3c |
| | Conclusion 10 | 4.1a; 4.1b; 4.2a; 4.2b; 4.2c; 4.4a; 4.4b; 4.5c |
| | Conclusion 15 | 4.4c; 4.4d; 4.2d |

Acronyms

| | |
|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| AAP | Accountability to Affected Populations |
| ABC | Brazilian Cooperation Agency |
| ACR | Annual Country Reports |
| ADA | Austrian Development Agency |
| AfDB | African Development Bank |
| AIDS | Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome |
| ANE | National Road Administration |
| BR | Budget Revision |
| CBT | Cash-Based Transfers |
| CCA | Climate Change Adaptation |
| CCS | Country Capacity Strengthening |
| CD | WFP Country Director |
| CEQAS | Centralized Evaluation Quality Assurance System |
| CERF | United Nations Central Emergency Response Fund |
| CFM | Complaints and Feedback Mechanism |
| CMAM | Community Management of Acute Malnutrition |
| CNCS | National AIDS Council |
| CO | WFP Country Office |
| CoE | Centre of Excellence against Hunger in Brazil |
| COHA | Cost of Hunger in Africa |
| COMET | Country Office Monitoring and Evaluation Tool |
| CONSAN | Conselho Nacional de Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional ((national council on food and nutrition security) |
| CP | Country Programme |
| CPB | Country Portfolio Budget |
| CPP | Corporate Planning and Performance Division |
| CRF | Corporate Results Framework |
| CSB | Corn and Soy Blend |
| CSI | Coping Strategy Index |
| CSP | Country Strategic Plan |
| CSPE | Country Strategic Plan Evaluations |
| CU5 | Child Under Five |
| D/CPP | Director / WFP Corporate Planning and Performance Division |
| DAC | Development Assistance Committee |
| DCD | Deputy Country Director |
| DFID | Department for International Development |
| DHS | Demographic and Health Survey |
| DoE | Director of Evaluation |
| DSC | Direct Support Costs |
| EB | Executive Board |
| ECHO | European Commission's Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Department |
| EM | Evaluation Manager |
| EMG | Evaluation Management Group |

| | |
|--------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| EMOP | Immediate Response Emergency Operation |
| EQ | Evaluation Question |
| ER | Evaluation Report |
| ESAN | Food and Nutrition Security Strategy |
| ESF | Emergency School Feeding |
| ET | Evaluation Team |
| FAMOD | Forum for Mozambican Disabled Associations |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization |
| FCDO | Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office |
| FCS | Food Consumption Score |
| FDI | Foreign Direct Investment |
| FES | Food Expenditure Share |
| FFA | Food Assistance for Assets |
| FNG | Fill the Nutrient Gap |
| FNS | Food and Nutrition Security |
| FUNAE | National Fund for Energy |
| GAIN | Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition |
| GAM | Global Acute Malnutrition |
| GBV | Gender-Based Violence |
| GCMF | Global Commodity Management Facility |
| GDP | Gross Domestic Product |
| GEWE | Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment |
| GFD | General Food Distribution |
| GHI | Global Hunger Index |
| GII | Gender Inequality Index |
| GNI | Gross National Income |
| GoM | Government of Mozambique |
| GTNS | Gender Transformative and Nutrition-Sensitive |
| HCT | Humanitarian Country Team |
| HDI | Human Development Index |
| HDP | Humanitarian-Development-Peace |
| HIV | Human Immunodeficiency Virus |
| HoP | Head of Programme |
| HQ | WFP Headquarters |
| HRP | Humanitarian Response Plan |
| IAHE | Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation |
| IASC | Inter-Agency Standing Committee |
| ICA | Integrated Context Analysis |
| ICRC | International Committee of the Red Cross |
| ICRM | Integrated Climate Risk Management |
| ICT | Information and Communications Technology |
| IDP | Internally Displaced People |
| IFAD | International Fund for Agricultural Development |
| IFI | International Financial Institutions |
| ILO | International Labour Organization |

| | |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| INAM | National Meteorology Institute |
| INAS | National Institute of Social Action |
| INE | National Statistics Institute |
| INFOCOM | Market Information System |
| INGD | National Institute for Disaster Risk Reduction and Management |
| IOF | Inquérito de Orçamentos Familiares - Family Budget Survey |
| IOM | International Organization for Migration |
| IPC | Integrated Food Security Phase Classification |
| IPP | Import Parity Price |
| IR | Inception Report |
| IRAM | Institute of Research and Application of Development Methods |
| IRM | Integrated Road Map |
| ISCAP | Islamic State in Central Africa Province |
| KM | Knowledge Management |
| LCSI | Livelihood-based Coping Strategy Index |
| LIC | Low Income Country |
| LTA | Long Term Agreement |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MADER | Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development |
| MAM | Moderate Acute Malnutrition |
| MDD-W | Minimum Dietary Diversity for Women |
| MDG | Millennium Development Goal |
| MGCAS | Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Action |
| MIC | Ministry of Industry and Trade |
| MICS | Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey |
| MINEDH | Ministry of Education and Human Development |
| MISAU | Ministry of Health |
| MoU | Memorandum of Understanding |
| MTR | Mid-term Review |
| MZN/MT | Metical (Mozambique unit of currency) |
| NBP | Needs-Based Plan |
| NFI | Non-Food Item |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organization |
| NSAG | Non-State Armed Groups |
| NWOW | New Way of Working |
| OCHA | United Nations Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs |
| OECD | Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development |
| OEV | WFP Office of Evaluation |
| PAMRDC | Plan of Action and the Multisectoral Plan of Action for the Reduction of Chronic Malnutrition |
| PASD | Social Direct Support Programme |
| PDNA | Post-Disaster Needs Assessment |
| PEDSA | Strategic Plan for the Development of the Agricultural Sector |
| PHL | Post-Harvest Loss |
| PHLC | Post-Harvest Loss Component |

| | |
|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| PLW | Pregnant and Lactating Women |
| PNISA | National Agriculture Investment Plan |
| PPT | PowerPoint Presentation |
| PQG | Five-Year Government Programme |
| PRA | Prevention and Resilience Allocation |
| PRM | USA Bureau of Population Refugees and Migrants |
| PRO-ACT | Pro-Resilience Action |
| PRONAE | National School Feeding Programme |
| PRRO | Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation |
| PSEA | Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse |
| RB | Regional Bureau |
| RBA | Rome-Based Agencies |
| RBJ | WFP Regional Bureau Johannesburg |
| rCSI | Reduced Coping Strategy Index |
| RGA | Rapid Gender Analysis |
| RUTF | Ready-to-Use Supplementary Food |
| SABER | Systems Approach for Better Education Results |
| SBCC | Social Behaviour Change Communication |
| SDAE | District Services for Economic Activities |
| SDG | Sustainable Development Goal |
| SEA | Sexual Exploitation and Abuse |
| SER | Summary Evaluation Report |
| SETSAN | Technical Secretariat for Food and Nutrition Security |
| SMART | Standardized Monitoring and Assessment for Relief and Transition |
| SO | Strategic Outcomes |
| SOP | Standard Operational Procedure |
| SPAE | Provincial Services for Economic Activities |
| SPR | Standard Project Report |
| SRAC | Strategic Resource Allocation Committee |
| SUN | Scaling-Up Nutrition |
| THR | Take Home Rations |
| TL | Team Leader |
| ToC | Theory of Change |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |
| UK | United Kingdom |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNAIDS | Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS |
| UNCT | United Nations Country Team |
| UNDAF | United Nations Development Assistance Framework |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNDSS | United Nations Department of Safety and Security |
| UNEG | United Nations Evaluation Group |
| UNFPA | United Nations Population Fund |
| UNHCR | United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees |
| UNICEF | United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund |

| | |
|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| UNOPS | United Nations Office for Project Services |
| UNSDCF | United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework |
| USA | United States of America |
| USAID | United States Agency for International Development |
| USD | United States Dollar |
| VAM | Vulnerability Assessment and Mapping |
| VFM | Virtual Farmers Market |
| WB | World Bank |
| WFP | World Food Programme |
| WFP-FO | World Food Programme-Field Office |
| WHO | World Health Organization |
| ZHSR | Zero Hunger Strategic Review |
| ZPHL | Zero Post-Harvest Loss Initiative |

Office of Evaluation

World Food Programme

Via Cesare Giulio Viola 68/70

00148 Rome, Italy

T +39 06 65131 wfp.org/independent-evaluation