



World Food Programme

SAVING LIVES  
CHANGING LIVES

# Evaluation of the United Republic of Tanzania Country Strategic Plan 2017 - 2021

## CONTEXT

The United Republic of Tanzania is a resource-rich, lower-middle-income country with a population of 63.5 million that is predominantly rural and young. Food security is a major economic and social problem, and the country is vulnerable to climate change.

The country hosts refugees and asylum-seekers, mostly from Burundi and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In 2018 the Government withdrew from the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework.

## SUBJECT AND FOCUS OF THE EVALUATION

The Country Strategic Plan (CSP) articulates the shift from short-term humanitarian assistance to increased technical support for Government-led programmes and processes with five strategic outcomes focused on food insecure people, nutrition, access to markets, climate change, disaster risk reduction, social protection and supply chains and innovation.

The CSP had an original budget of USD 455.67 million and aimed to reach 591,331 beneficiaries, it was revised six times (as of May 2021), resulting in a decrease of the budget to USD 420.79 million and a decrease in planned beneficiaries to 508,828. The CSP was 48.45 percent funded as of September 2021.

## OBJECTIVES AND USERS OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation was commissioned by the independent Office of Evaluation to provide evaluative evidence for accountability and learning to inform the design of the next CSP. It covered WFP activities implemented between 2015 and mid-2021 and was conducted between March and November 2021. It assesses WFP's strategic positioning and role, WFP's contribution to outcomes, efficiency and factors that explain WFP performance.

The primary users of the evaluation are the WFP country office, the Government of Tanzania and other WFP Tanzania stakeholders, the WFP Regional Bureau for Southern Africa, and WFP headquarters technical divisions.

## KEY EVALUATION FINDINGS

### WFP's strategic position, role and specific contribution based on country priorities and people's needs as well as WFP's strengths

The evaluation found that the CSP was aligned with national policies and supported government policy implementation. During the course of the CSP, WFP grew as a strategic player and an important government partner in nutrition and social protection.

The evaluation revealed that geographic targeting was broadly appropriate and that the targeting of direct support activities addressed the needs of vulnerable people within the project areas. However, at the time of the CSP design, there was limited assessment of the needs of the most vulnerable and the underlying causes of food and nutrition insecurity and insufficient focus on gender and broader inclusion.

### Extent and quality of WFP's specific contribution to CSP outcomes in the United Republic of Tanzania

**Under strategic outcome 1**, activities aimed at ensuring that refugees, and other acutely food insecure people, were able to meet their basic food and nutrition requirements by providing cash and /or food transfers. During the first years of the CSP WFP delivered timely assistance to refugees; however, following significant budget cuts in 2020, WFP began to reduce rations leading to a 68 percent basket in December 2020 with mixed results for nutrition indicators. Nonetheless around 80 percent of households in the refugee camps consistently reported an acceptable food consumption score, showing that WFP maintained a strong pipeline to the camps and maximized the efficiency and effectiveness of refugee feeding despite funding cuts and the inability to make progress with cash and livelihood activities.

**Under strategic outcome 2**, WFP supported a range of nutrition activities. Evidence shows a change of mindset of targeted communities on using locally available foods through nutrition-sensitive agriculture practices. While some nutrition targets were met or exceeded, others fluctuated over the implementation period.

Full and summary reports of the evaluation and the Management Response are available at <http://www.wfp.org/independent-evaluation>

For more information please contact the Office of Evaluation [wfp.evaluation@wfp.org](mailto:wfp.evaluation@wfp.org)

**Under strategic outcome 3**, WFP aimed to increase smallholder access to well-functioning markets. Despite consistent underfunding post-harvest losses decreased considerably and there was an improvement in the volume purchased from farmers.

**Under strategic outcome 4**, WFP aimed to strengthen disaster management and social protection systems to ensure that they addressed the basic food and nutrition needs of the poorest. Supply chain strengthening was also a focus and the rehabilitation of railroad cars to augment regional food distribution capacity was considered a key success. Another strength observed was the support provided to the Government through the Tanzania Social Action Fund partnership. However there was limited progress with disaster risk reduction activities.

**Under strategic outcome 5**, WFP aimed to facilitate and scale up innovations that contributed to the achievement of the sustainable development goals (SDGs). Activities demonstrated the potential relevance of technology-specific innovations but were not sufficiently integrated with existing programme interventions.

**Cross-cutting issues:** The CSP incorporated a strong commitment to gender and there were positive separate initiatives. However, gender analysis needs to be improved and move beyond a focus on male/female participation. For this purpose, the country office has recently signed on to the WFP transformation Programme.

Consultation and provision of information were largely effective in the camps. A complaint and feedback mechanism was in place, but issues with equitable access to the mechanism, and ensuring that feedback was adequately captured, remained.

#### **WFP's efficient use of resources in contributing to CSP outputs and strategic outcomes**

While timeliness of some key activities was affected by funding shortfalls, pipeline breaks, and challenges with cooperating partners, the use of resources was generally efficient, and cost-efficiency for nutrition activities started to improve in 2019. This was largely due to WFP taking on the cooperating partner's role.

#### **Factors that explain WFP performance and the extent to which it has made the strategic shift expected by the CSP**

**Funding:** a challenging funding environment and donor earmarking at the activity level limited the ability to fund the CSP to the intended level.

**Staffing:** insufficient technical staffing, high turnover, and reliance on short-term staff affected CSP implementation and the ability of the country office to undertake analyses and generate essential learning.

**CSP-design:** the expected outputs of the CSP were too ambitious given country office capacity. The CSP called for too many new and simultaneous activities and was not realistic about what could be achieved in a single cycle.

**Partnerships:** WFP is widely considered an approachable partner with proficiency in a wide range of sectors and issues and partnerships have proven instrumental across the CSP.

**Monitoring:** regular monitoring was conducted; however rigorous examination of available monitoring data and its use for programme improvements were not consistent across activities.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Overall Assessment**

The CSP aligned with national objectives including SDGs. Significant changes in context, national strategies and population needs took place over the CSP period, and WFP adapted its programming well to respond.

Gender considerations were evident across all strategic outcomes, though not yet fully developed into a gender transformative approach.

Positive results were observed in areas in which WFP has an established position and credibility, such as food assistance to refugees, nutrition and agriculture. Support to refugees faced challenges due to shifting government policies but WFP pivoted and continued providing food assistance.

Parts of the CSP were less effective due to a combination of internal and external factors. Disaster risk reduction, social protection and innovation were new initiatives, and were the areas in which WFP struggled most.

In terms of targeting, the needs of specific vulnerable populations require more attention, including more needs analysis and customization for women and people with disabilities.

Opportunities to strengthen performance measurement and analysis were not fully taken. The strategic outcomes for agriculture, disaster risk reduction, social protection and innovation all had limited performance datasets at the output and outcome levels, affecting the ability of the country office to reflect meaningfully on progress.

The use of resources was generally efficient. The country office responded appropriately to circumstances beyond its control that affected resource availability and timeliness.

### **Recommendations**

**Recommendation 1.** Focus on thematic areas where the country office has demonstrated that it can add value – refugees, nutrition and agriculture – and apply a long-term view.

**Recommendation 2.** Improve the definition of change pathways across the country strategic plan.

**Recommendation 3.** Set up an operational framework for analysing performance data regularly in order to make effective adaptive management decisions using a structured approach.

**Recommendation 4.** Assess operating model readiness in order to understand the risks and opportunities that should be reflected in programme design.