



WFP EVALUATION

Thematic Evaluation of Supply Chain Outcomes in the Food System in Eastern Africa from 2016 to 2021

Supplementary Report: Kenya Country Case-Study

Final Report
WFP Regional Bureau Nairobi

15 June 2022



World Food Programme

SAVING
LIVES
CHANGING
LIVES

Key personnel for the evaluation

WFP REGIONAL BUREAU NAIROBI

Aude Mommeja, Evaluation Manager

Nikki Zimmerman, Regional Evaluation Officer

Wanjiku Guchu, Regional Logistics Evaluation Focal Point

PREPARED BY

Muriel Visser, Team Leader

Tikhwi Jane Muyundo, Fieldwork Lead and Supply Chain Expert

Jacob Juma, Research Assistant

Acknowledgements

The Evaluation Team expresses its gratitude to the WFP Regional Bureau staff in Nairobi for their support to this evaluation, particularly our Evaluation Managers, Aude Mommeja and Nikki Zimmerman, as well as Wanjiku Guchu, the focal point from the Regional Supply Chain Unit for this evaluation, and those sitting on the Evaluation Reference Group, particularly Barbara Van Logchem (WFP RBN Logistics) and Robert O'Neill (WFP RBN Procurement). We thank Josefa Zueco (Head of Supply Chain, Kenya) who was the WFP evaluation focal point for this case-study and provided important technical and logistical support to the Evaluation Team, along with the Kenya Country Office team. We also extend our thanks to all WFP staff in Kenya, as well as WFP supply chain partners and sectoral experts, and beneficiaries, who gave their valuable time as key informants to the Evaluation Team.

Disclaimer

The opinions expressed in this report 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 designation employed and the presentation of material in 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.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Overview of Country and WFP Context.....	1
3. Process/Methodology/Limitations for Country Study	2
4. Findings	3
5. Discussion and Conclusions.....	13
Annex 1. Fieldwork overview	18
Bibliography	21
Acronyms	22

List of tables

Table 1 Kenya areas of interest and outcomes as identified with FGD with WFP staff.....	2
Table 2 Assessment against evaluation questions	13
Table 3 List of people interviewed	18
Table 4 Kenya fieldwork agenda.....	19

List of boxes

Box 1 Direct stakeholders that have been affected by enhanced efficiencies in food handling	5
Box 2 Direct stakeholders that have been affected by digitalization efforts	5
Box 3 Direct stakeholders that have benefitted from WFPs investment in recycling and waste management.....	6
Box 4 Direct stakeholders that have been affected by interventions in Kakuma	9
Box 5 Direct stakeholders affected by market strengthening activities	10

1. Introduction

1. This Kenya case study was intended to support the thematic evaluation of supply chain outcomes in the food system in Eastern Africa. This report is a supplementary publication to be read in conjunction with the regional Evaluation Report.
2. The primary objective of this evaluation was to identify and assess the nature and extent of the effects of supply chain activities on food systems and their components, to differentiate effects according to gender or other groups when appropriate, and thereby to achieve greater awareness of these effects that can inform the design of future interventions. To this end the evaluation focuses on clearly discernible outcomes that are well supported by available evidence. The evaluation spans the period from January 2016 to December 2020 and covers all nine country offices (COs) supported by the WFP Regional Bureau in Eastern Africa (RBN), namely Burundi, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan and Uganda. It includes urban, peri-urban and rural areas where supply chain activities have been implemented. A broad regional-level assessment was complemented by three focal country case studies in Kenya, Somalia and South Sudan.
3. By conducting a deeper dive into selected thematic areas in Kenya, it was expected that the underlying causes and key factors affecting the most common food system outcomes would be revealed in greater detail. This would lead to a better understanding of the ways in which supply chain interventions affect food systems across the whole region. The case study would also provide comparisons with results from other countries and thus highlight the extent to which outcomes might be affected by country context. The purpose of the Kenya case study was to conduct an assessment of distribution and quality assurance activities in Kenya, including the effects of contracting on the costs and efficiencies of commodity handling, transport and storage as well as the effects of quality assurance practices upon prices, markets and stakeholder dynamics. The geographical areas of interest for the Kenya case study were Kakuma, in the North-Western Turkana County, and the coastal city of Mombasa in the South-East.

2. Overview of Country and WFP Context

4. Kenya is a country impacted by regional instability, and despite acquiring lower-middle-income status, it is a country beset by its own socio-economic challenges and food and nutrition insecurity, as a result of rapid population growth, frequent climate shocks, and inefficiencies in food systems, as well as social, economic and gender disparities.
5. Kenya represents one of the largest portfolios of WFP, with a budget of USD 1.1 billion for the Country Strategic Plan (CSP) 2018-2023¹. WFP has supported interventions in Kenya since the 1980s, with an increasing shift from short-term interventions to efforts focused on resilience-building. A specific focus of the work of WFP is given to more efficient refugee interventions, building national capacities and systems for social protection, providing direct relief assistance, and increasing resilience by focusing on food systems “through the development and modelling of integrated solutions along the food production, transformation and consumption chain”². The introduction by WFP Kenya of a food system approach into the CSP signalled an important paradigm shift in its strategy. Kenya CO has articulated a draft (2018) Sustainable Food Systems Strategy³ to guide its Strategic Outcome 2 (SO2), which targets food insecure and vulnerable populations who are expected to benefit from sustainable, inclusive food systems and increased resilience to climate shocks to meet food and nutrition needs by 2023.
6. WFP’s operations are managed from the Kenya CO which maintains linkages with the Regional Bureau (both based in Nairobi). Of relevance to the case study is that WFP maintains an office in Kakuma to support its refugee

¹ WFP (2018) Kenya Country Strategic Plan

² WFP (2018) Kenya Country Strategic Plan

³ WFP (2018). WFP Kenya Country Strategic Plan: Implementation Strategy for Outcome 2 (Sustainable Food Systems) (2018 – 2023). August 2018. (Draft)

operations in the camps, as well as another office in Mombasa, which provides supply chain services to support CSP implementation and the lower Horn of Africa Corridor.

7. WFP Kenya has various commitments to gender. The Kenya CSP is based on the Government of Kenya’s 2018 National Zero Hunger Review⁴ which elaborated on the government priorities for achieving food security and food systems, including recognizing and reducing gender inequalities as key to achieving sustainable food security and nutrition. Furthermore, the key elements of the strategy of WFP to accelerate its shift from the direct provision of transfers and services to the strengthening of national systems and capacities to deliver food, includes promoting a gender-transformative approach to food security and nutrition programmes. WFP also has commitments to disability as formulated in its recent guidance.⁵

3. Process/Methodology/Limitations for Country Study

8. The Kenya case study combined remote scoping and data collection with in-country field work in Kakuma and Mombasa (two days at each location). A preliminary identification of areas of change (outcomes) was done through remote Focus Group Discussions (FGD) with WFP staff from Kakuma and Mombasa. The following outcomes in Table 1 below were identified through this process.

Table 1 Kenya areas of interest and outcomes as identified with FGD with WFP staff

Areas of interest		Outcomes
Mombasa – Port operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capacity strengthening: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o warehousing management o capacity building of freight forwarders – Clearing and Forwarding (C&F) Agents, Fumigation companies o private sector partners – Transporters o Government departments – Kenya Ports Authority (KPA), Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) - Contracting and impact on local market - Introduction of technology that enhances efficiency - Port mechanisation – introduction of Jumbo bags - forklift to uplift increased tonnage from vessels, promotion of recycling - Innovations – Disposal of oil. - Environmental control/Protection - Safe disposal of damaged commodities - Economic development impact through job creation, WFP presence at the Port, revenue stream for the Government of Kenya. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhanced efficiencies of port operations (faster clearance) increasing speed with which food reaches beneficiaries - Sustaining and generating employment, including income opportunities for women - Economic growth
Kakuma – Refugees and surrounding community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local production - buy directly from smallholders and build capacity to produce quality food - Improvement of transport infrastructure - Market strengthening - Market linkages; connecting retailers to smallholder farmers, sensitization on markets - Enhancing food safety and quality in markets - Capacity strengthening for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o market actors o government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Diversification of income generating activities - More sustainable food supply through market strengthening - Economic development and improved livelihoods.

⁴ GoK (2018) Towards Zero Hunger Strategic Review: Kenya. 1 May 2018.

⁵ WFP Kenya (2021). WFP Kenya Disability Inclusion Plan.

Areas of interest		Outcomes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ private sector - Empowerment - Diversification 	

9. The field data collection was centred around individual and group interviews with stakeholders in Mombasa, Kakuma and Nairobi who were selected in consultation with WFP to reflect the main activities and outcomes as per table above. The evaluation team was able to interview 57 participants in total of whom 37 percent were female. This included those from government establishments (Kenya Ports Authority, Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service, and Refugee Affairs Secretariat), private sector service providers in the port, refugee traders and retailers and 33 WFP staff (See Annex 1).
10. In addition, the evaluation team was able to visit locations of relevance to the outcomes. This included a visit to the Mombasa port warehouse and the cargo ship destined for Mogadishu. For the field work in Mombasa the evaluation team was joined by a member of the Regional Bureau in Nairobi who participated as an observer in the external interviews and participated in introductions to the evaluation process for the internal interviews.
11. Individual and group interviews were guided by a semi-structured interview guide and the written notes were analysed to draw out the evidence against the different outcome areas. The case study draws on interview evidence as the primary source. Information was triangulated to the extent possible between interview sources, as well as with documentary evidence (reports and data that was provided by WFP).
12. **Limitations:**
- The short duration of the field work limited the amount of feedback and the number of interviews that could be conducted.
 - Evidence was collected primarily through interviews. There was limited documentation of supply chain effects on the food chain and limited data on the effects of WFPs supply chain practices on key stakeholders in the food system. As a result, much of the analysis draws on anecdotal evidence.
 - Triangulation of all the evidence was not feasible within the short time-frame for this study. Because of the nature of the exercise much of the information was collected from WFP informants.

4. Findings

Key Areas of Change: Mombasa

13. The findings from the Mombasa case study are presented in this section. The discussion is structured under thematic areas and by outcomes. Two thematic areas were identified as follows:
- Thematic area 1 – Improved port operations in Mombasa
 - Thematic area 2 - Income opportunities in Mombasa and surrounding rural areas
14. Four areas of outcome were identified for the Mombasa operations as follows:
- Outcome 1 – Enhanced efficiencies in food handling
 - Outcome 2 – Improvements in timeliness and delivery of food through technological innovations
 - Outcome 3 - Reduced wastage and decreased environmental impact of WFP's operations; and
 - Outcome 4 - Generating and sustaining employment, including for women.
15. Each outcome is discussed below highlighting the nature and the process behind the change, the stakeholders that were affected, any unintended changes that were identified, and reflections on the likely sustainability of the change.

Thematic area 1: Improved port operations in Mombasa

16. WFP Mombasa is a logistical hub that has been in operation for nearly 29 years, serving Kenya, and other countries in the region including Uganda, South Sudan, Tanzania, Rwanda, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Ethiopia, and Somalia. The port of Mombasa is the primary port for the northern corridor providing access

to East and Central Africa and with infrastructure and capacity that is linked to sea, road, rail and air transportation. Through Mombasa WFP functions as a logistics hub for other countries including Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Eritrea, and Djibouti. WFPs use of the Port of Mombasa involves 30 million USD yearly invested in transport with over 70 transporters working for WFP.

Outcome 1: Enhanced efficiencies in food handling

17. Enhanced efficiencies in food handling have been achieved by a combination of port mechanization efforts, training of Government staff on sampling, training of Clearing & Forwarding (C&F) Agents, and the adoption of performance management tools. Each is discussed in turn below.
18. **The introduction of spreader bars to discharge jumbo bags** took place at the height of the COVID-19 Pandemic in 2020. This innovation was motivated by the imperative to ensure social distancing. The introduction of this technology reduced handling challenges that are associated with single units (which are more expensive) and also reduced the loss of food which results from breaks and spillage when smaller units are moved manually.
19. WFP sources cite a four-fold increase in vessel discharge efficiency and gains in handling costs of USD 50,000, with truck loading time being reduced from 45 minutes to 10-15 minutes (i.e., 70 percent faster with knock on benefits of reducing vessel exposure to potential demurrage by at least 3 days and improved truck turn around). WFP sources explain that manual discharge prior to the introduction of the spreader bars required eight personnel while one Spreader Bar requires three personnel, thus reducing personnel by approximately 60 percent, and allowing social distancing while achieving higher efficiency.⁶
20. Enhanced efficiencies have also been obtained by WFPs efforts in providing **training to Government of Kenya staff on better sampling**. Formerly sampling processes of food arriving from abroad focused on collecting large quantities at the port on arrival and taking these away to separate facilities. This led to lengthy processes and food loss. Through training, sampling now takes place in the warehouse upon discharge of the goods from the vessel and involves much smaller quantities of food. WFP and Port Authorities affirmed that this has produced increases in efficiency, reduced losses and removed the risk of incurring demurrage charges.
21. A further area of focus of WFP has been **the training of C&F Agents and new service providers to meet WFP quality of service**. The training has focussed on stringent performance monitoring on import, export, warehousing and commodity accounting processes in line with WFPs requirements and standards. WFPs performance tracking tool has also been reinforced by processes that have led to the temporary suspension or denial of business for non-performing agents. For example, the company Bollore was blacklisted for one year due to poor performance and re-engaged a year later with anecdotal evidence of much increased performance, and they continue to serve WFP. WFP training has focused on warehousing, port clearance, fumigation, and documentation flow. External informants reported that the **unintended effect** of the training that WFP has provided to port operators has been that it has heightened the level of excellence at the Mombasa Port, as the companies that have benefitted from the training have applied the same WFP standards to other clients. For example, fumigation services by private service providers now follow WFPs requirements and are applied to other goods pertaining to other organizations and which also arrive at Mombasa Port. Government departments e.g., KEPHIS are proposing to adopt best industry practice from WFP and will apply it across-board other port users.
22. A final example of influencing standards has been the development by WFP Mombasa of a **performance management tool that is used to monitor and track performance of service providers**. This digital tool has been widely adopted for service providers that cooperate with WFP and is set up in such a way that it provides learning from outcomes of the performance reviews. This has improved performance of service providers, and as is the case for the fumigation example where WFP has developed a standardized pre-fumigation assessment tool, has led to companies apply the same level of enhanced service to other clients, contributing to an overall improvement in the performance of the Port of Mombasa.
23. **Sustainability**: Indirectly these changes have effects on the food system by contributing to reducing food loss, enhancing efficiency in terms of delivery of food, and reducing costs. The evaluation's assessment is that these changes are for the most part likely to be sustained as other operators have seen the advantages of these practices and are keen to invest in order to be able to provide services to WFP.

⁶ WFP (2020). Final Report on the Mechanized Handling of the MV Universal Durban.

Box 1 Direct stakeholders that have been affected by enhanced efficiencies in food handling

- Port Authorities are able to move cargo faster, as document flow has improved through digital processes.
- Clearing agents are able to maintain the quality and safety of the commodity.
- C&F agents have adopted WFP fumigation standards.
- C&F Agents manage the warehousing better to minimize infestation, and have adopted improved fumigation processes to maintain food quality and safety resulting in fewer rejections of commodities due to infestation.

Outcome 2: Improvements in timeliness and delivery of food through technological innovations

24. Over the evaluation period, WFP has introduced digitalization of the paperwork of its operations in the Port of Mombasa. This has included the adoption of the Live Tableau Dashboard, and a DOTS Workshop Application that allows for active management and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of Port operations.
25. Digitalization is reported by WFP and the companies it works with to have improved to flow of paperwork. The process has reduced/removed previously experienced delays due to errors, missing or wrong paperwork and enhanced visibility. WFP food as a result is cleared quickly. Key gains have included:
- Faster clearance of commodities coming through the port of Mombasa
 - Reduced costs of operations
 - High level of efficiency in port operations due to training of stakeholder such as C&F agents and KPA officers. Replicated to other clients
26. The KEPHIS has acknowledged the improvement and is proposing digitalization of its own systems and featured WFP in one of its documentaries to demonstrate the advantages of digitalization.
27. As mentioned under Outcome 1, a further technological innovation has been the **introduction of Jumbo bags**. This has reduced loading and off-loading time tremendously, with knock on effects to ensuring timely delivery of commodities to partners.

Box 2 Direct stakeholders that have been affected by digitalization efforts

- Kenya Port Authority
- KEPHIS
- Clearing agents
- Warehouse operators
- Transporters

28. **Sustainability:** As noted under Outcome 1, indirectly these changes have effects on the food system by contributing to reducing food loss, enhancing efficiency in terms of delivery of food, and reducing costs. As it was the case for Outcome 1, the evaluation's assessment is that these changes are for the most part likely to be sustained as port operators have seen the advantages of these practices and are keen to invest in order to be able to provide services to WFP.

Outcome 3: Reduced wastage and decreased environmental impact of WFP's operations

29. WFP's Port Operations have had a focus on eliminating losses, damages and delivering exact quantities. Examples include:
- The introduction of spreader bars for cargo offloading to minimize handling of single units of commodities resulted in a reduction in amount of wastage as reported above under Outcome 1.
 - Influencing the government to collect samples from warehouses rather than the port and in smaller quantities has also minimized wastage.
30. During the evaluation period WFP's Port of Mombasa operations have also seen a focus on decreasing and better managing environmental impact. The following examples stood out from the evaluation:

- **Converting oil into soap** – WFP worked with the Kenya Revenue Authority (KRA) and KPA to obtain permission for disposal of damaged oil, and engaged with community groups to use the oil for soap making. This was reported by WFP Mombasa to have generated employment opportunities for community groups, and in particular for women. The scale of these activities is still small but nonetheless judged promising.
- **Disposal of damaged food** - WFP collaborated with Bamburi Cement Company, with the permission of Kenya Revenue Authority, on the disposal of damaged food commodities in an environmentally safe manner.
- **Recycling** - WFP has sought to re-use Jumbo bags in other operations. For example, WFP Mombasa supported South Sudan with 500 bags that were used in loading cargo on the Barge. And at the time of writing WFP Mombasa was in the process of identifying a company for the recycling of bags and other materials from the warehouse.

Box 3 Direct stakeholders that have benefitted from WFPs investment in recycling and waste management

- Government department related to sampling of commodities - KEPHIS
- Kenya Ports authority on port mechanisation
- Other importers benefit from KPA's improved sampling approach to reduce waste and loss.
- C&F agents that want to use fork lifts and spreader bars.

31. **Sustainability:** The evaluation team was unable to establish to what extent to which the soap making activities with the community groups are sustainable in the long term. This would require more detailed follow-up. Indirectly these changes have effects on the food system by contributing to more environmentally acceptable practices. There was, however, no evidence that these practices are generating changes among other operators in the Port of Mombasa in the way in which other innovations e.g., digitalization and improved fumigation approach is clearly doing.

Thematic area 2: Income opportunities in Mombasa and surrounding rural areas

Outcome 4: Generating and sustaining employment, including for women

32. WFP's activity in Mombasa constitutes an important/major revenue stream for the government and for communities. The evaluation identified various ways in which WFPs operations have influenced business in and around the Port of Mombasa.
33. **Outsourcing of warehouse services** - over the evaluation period WFP has gradually outsourced much of the work that formerly was run by WFP itself. This includes outsourcing warehouses. Currently WFP runs just one warehouse and has outsourced eight, which has created business for companies.
34. **Outsourcing of transport service** - WFP also stopped managing its own transport or owning trucks and outsourced these services. Transport companies stepped up to provide services. Overall, outsourcing services was reported in interviews to have increased employment opportunities for local companies and individuals. The outsourcing of services that were previously managed by WFP opened avenues for income generation for local entities such as truck owners, and also for new companies to open up. Existing companies were reported to have increased investment in order to cope with the increased demand for service and they in turn employed more people. Some former WFP employees started Transport companies. Point to note, though the transport industry was severely affected by the Standard Gauge Railway (SGR)⁷ operations, the WFP preferred transporters continued operating out of Mombasa to WFP warehouses and other extended delivery points.
35. **Encouraging competition** - WFP recommended the contracting of more than one C&F agent. This created competition for the existing agent and was reported to have resulted in improved services from all the agents in a more competitive environment and guided by WFPs quality standards and requirements.
36. **WFPs business for the Port of Mombasa** – The investment by the Government of Kenya in the SGR that connects the port city of Mombasa to the capital city of Nairobi resulted in a decision by Government to require all cargo

⁷ Railway that connects Mombasa and Nairobi.

to be moved to Inland container depots in a measure meant to decongest Mombasa. This meant that transporters who had the responsibility of taking goods from the port overland to destinations lost their business. However, WFP through its unique relationship with KPA was granted permission to off-load at the quay-side into warehouses in Mombasa and is the only user of Mombasa Port that has this privilege. As a result, transporters serving WFP continued to operate in Mombasa and this has secured continued business for these transportation companies, their employees and warehouse owners and their employees and avoided loss of livelihoods. When WFP volumes went up (2020 – tonnage increased from 220,000 to 250,000 tonnes) this increased business for transporters. In addition, during COVID-19, WFP continued operations, guaranteeing continued employment and income generation at time when the economy had mostly shut down.

37. **WFPs Urban Response Programme to COVID-19** - The introduction of Cash Based Transfer (CBT) during COVID-19 (a time when all businesses had shut down) through the 'Urban Response Programme' generated economic activity for traders. This programme was put in place to complement the Government's COVID-19 impact mitigation and response efforts, and implemented in collaboration with the County Governments of Nairobi and Mombasa, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection and the Ministry of Devolution and Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASALs). The response targeted 282,000 people and 96,000 people respectively in informal settlements in Nairobi and Mombasa with CBT.⁸
38. Beneficiaries procured from traders and this kept shops open. Anecdotal evidence also suggested that the CBT allowed some of the female beneficiaries to run small businesses.
39. **Unintended effects/changes:** Due to congestion in Mombasa town, the County authorities relocated the transporters to rural Mombasa area, including transporters who serve WFP. The farmers in these areas were able to rent out their properties to the transporters, creating a new revenue source for the farmers and diversification. This is an unintended change – government decision as truckers were causing too much congestion and relocated them out of town.
40. On the other hand, the switch to CBT by WFP, and the fact that this is likely to increase into the future has negative effects for employment of transporters who are concerned that their income stream will diminish.
41. The terms of transport that WFP has with some of the transporters at the Port, are not favourable for the local transporters in Kakuma which is one of the destinations of the cargo. Some transporters based in Mombasa are required to do direct deliveries from the port to the end delivery point. This bypasses the local transporter, who then loses business. The loss of business is compounded by the fact that commodity volumes have gone down. A transporter interviewed in Kakuma reported initially transporting 1200 MT but now doing only 100 MT.
42. **Sustainability:** The job creation and employment opportunities related to transport may not be sustainable as volumes decrease with the uptake of CBT across WFP programs
43. **Gender:** WFP CO has been working on ensuring that gender, protection and inclusion are key components for contracting and recruitment processes. Thus, WFP Kenya CO developed a gender and supply chain training module which is part of all trainings with transporters etc. There have also been efforts to ensure that field level agreement Memoranda of Understanding (MoU) include clear terminology on the need to adhere to gender and protection issues of WFP.
44. The evaluation found little evidence of a deliberate focus on gender in the Mombasa Port operations. The interview with transporters highlighted that only a few women are involved in this area of work, and that most are employed in general office jobs. Similarly, port operations were found not to be very women focussed.
45. While there are some clauses related to gender in WFP's contracts these are not met with measures to enforce them and therefore are perceived as not being effective in terms of driving change.

Key Areas of Change: Kakuma

46. The findings from the Kakuma field work and documentary analysis are presented in this section. The discussion is structured under the thematic area "Capacity strengthening" and by outcomes. Three outcomes were identified, as follows:
 - Outcome 1: Diversification of income generating activities
 - Outcome 2: More sustainable food supply through market strengthening

⁸ WFP (2021). WFP Annual Country Report Kenya.

- Outcome 3: Economic development and improved livelihoods.

47. Each outcome is discussed below highlighting the nature and the process behind the change, the stakeholders that were affected, any unintended changes that were identified, and reflections on the likely sustainability of the change.

Thematic area 3: Capacity Strengthening

Outcome 1: Diversification of income generating activities

48. Kakuma refugee camp has been supported by WFP since 1991. In this area of Kenya, a key change has been the diversification of income generating-activities which has come about through a range of interventions that WFP has supported and that have targeted refugees, host communities, traders, as well as County Government.
49. WFP's interventions have promoted a shift from pastoralism to trading and farming by the host community, influenced by a range of WFP interventions in the refugee camps. The change in income generation has been brought about by development of infrastructure for horticulture, training, establishing markets, linking producers to traders, and interventions in the support of food safety and quality control. This dynamic has improved relationship between the refugee and host community, and has also led to diversification of diet – both for refugee and for host communities. The change has been driven by the introduction of CBT in 2015. Access to cash has meant that refugees are able to purchase food on the market. Until 2015, refugees were almost entirely reliant on food provided by WFP. The cash is sent through mobile phones and the transfers, are known as Bamba Chakula (Swahili-based slang for 'get your food').⁹
50. Thus, in Kalobeyei, WFP has put in place infrastructure (greenhouses) and dug a canal from seasonal river to a pan that is used to store water to irrigate vegetables. Women and men farmers have used these resources to diversify production, and to make a shift from pastoralism to horticulture. WFP has worked to establish markets where vegetables are sold (mainly by women).
51. WFP supported the establishment of markets, and provided training as well as umbrellas for market sheds run by women. WFP also introduced Market Coordinators who are appointed by WFP from the Refugee camps to oversee market activities in the camps, with some market coordinators being women and youth. In total approximately 30 market coordinators are in place of which 6 are women (formerly 10 women but a number were reported to have dropped out).
52. There is evidence that these activities have generated additional income promoting initiatives. The evaluation was told by informants that in response to the market, women have set up a Village Savings & Loans Association (VSLA) which they run themselves. The members (all women) contribute money monthly and use this to provide loans to members who are in need, which reduces the dependency on wholesalers. However, one of the business women interviewed said the Chamas' were corrupt and she would rather put her money in a savings cooperative society.
53. The support by WFP has resulted in changed dietary habits by communities. Since the introduction of CBT, refugees represent a major market for the produce, and both host and refugee communities have changed and diversified their dietary habits and are eating products they were not eating before.
54. This intervention by WFP has involved capacity building at four distinct levels: Refugees, Host Community, County Government and Traders/Wholesalers. The evaluation came across various examples of how training had resulted in enhanced skills, among others:
- Refugee communities have gained trading skills as a result of WFP training. Traders have been contracted to run Bamba Chakula shops (WFP Project). WFP has also introduced tabs to support traders with technology.
 - Traders have also been trained to do distributions rather than WFP partners, this resulted in new skills being gained.
 - Traders have also been trained on how to preserve the shelf-life of products and have been provided with pallets that are essential to improved food safety and quality.
55. The work in Kakuma has also created a dynamic for youth involvement. Thus, the evaluation was told that youth have been taking the initiative to generate income around the market in the camps by using carts for transport.

⁹ WFP (undated). Refugees in Kenya. WFP Factsheet – Kakuma.

One such initiative is a group called Lokato Youth Group that uses carts to provide transport for cargo within the camp. Youth are also involved in cleaning in the Food Distribution Centers (FDC).

56. The evaluation was told that these WFP initiatives have improved the relationship between the host community and the refugees, with a much closer co-existence. This was evident in the Kalobeyie camp where the host community was reported to have donated land for the resettlement of refugees and for the setting -up of the green houses and water pan for irrigation at the Kalobeyie camp.
57. An important challenge remains that the production of vegetables is seasonal which means that income generation is not consistent throughout the year. WFP plans to introduce fish farming because of the ponds in a future effort to improve diet and increase income.

Box 4 Direct stakeholders that have been affected by interventions in Kakuma

- **Women** have definitely been affected. WFP has been intentional about building the capacity of women to do business and to farm. In the markets visited, the majority of sellers were women. The evaluation team also interviewed a woman transporter and two women traders (both of whom were refugees). They are trading more now and also included in the running of the trade community in the camps. WFP has also appointed a Food Advisory Committee from the refugee community. It has 90 members, of which 40 percent are women. They advocate for food.
- **Youth.** The youth are now actively involved in trade and run some of the Bamba Chakula shops. Some of the market coordinators are youth. They are managing Bamba Chakula shops and have been trained in business, and are also involved in transportation within the camps.
- **Refugees'** lives have been transformed. They have been trained to do business and be compliant with the statutory requirements of obtaining a business license. This has produced an increase in Government revenue from collections.
- **Host Community** have embraced trading, running shops, paying Government taxes and fulfilling statutory obligations

58. **Unintended effects/changes:** The evaluation found anecdotal evidence that the activities have produced a vicious credit cycle and the risk of fraud. It appears that when CBT to refugees is delayed by WFP, some refugees have been taking credit from the retailers, whom in turn take credit from the wholesalers, and further up the chain from manufacturers. As a result, when a beneficiary defaults, this debt affects the entire supply chain. The evaluation came across the example of a refugee wholesaler who is owed millions of shillings by the Refugees. Out of desperation, it appears that some of the refugees use their card with one trader on credit and leave it as collateral, then report it missing. They are then issued another card which they use to purchase from another trader. The first trader loses as he/she is not paid for the produce they gave to the refugee.
59. Participating in the Bamba Chakula initiative is sometimes a loss to some of the Traders who handle the transactions on the Safaricom mobile money platform. One youth Refugee Trader, who is also an appointed Market Coordinator, reported that Safaricom charges Ksh 6 for the transfer and Ksh 28 for withdrawal. Totalling to Ksh 34 multiplied across the number of beneficiaries taking stock and the trader bears the cost. If he trades with 1,000 refugees a month, he loses Ksh 34,000.
60. **Sustainability:** WFP interventions in the refugee camps have clearly transformed Kakuma and the host community. The CBT has enabled WFP to build resilience and strengthen the refugees and communities to become more resilient and self-reliant.
61. Refugees are trading among themselves and the host community and earning an income. They have also learnt new methods of farming and have been linked to markets where they can sell their produce, either themselves to consumers or to other traders.
62. Overall, the assessment of the evaluation based on the information collected during the field work is that these interventions are likely to be sustainable into the future.
63. **Unintended effects/changes:** One of the women refugee traders reported that traders who are not part of the Bamba Chakula initiative have lost business to Bamba Chakula shops because they cannot afford to give refugees credit, so almost all beneficiaries purchase from Bamba Chakula shops only.

Outcome 2: More sustainable food supply through market strengthening

64. Complementary to outcome 1 above, WFP interventions in Kakuma have brought about an important change in food supply through market strengthening.
65. As described above, to promote self-reliance, WFP introduced kitchen gardens, innovative technology (hydroponics & rain harvesting), green houses set-up with water-pans for irrigation, and has developed infrastructure for markets, including improved road access in the camps. WFP's investment in inter-camp and camp road infrastructure was reported by traders and farmers to have helped the trade, as previously it was challenging to get from one place to another, especially during the rainy season.
66. A key focus of the market strengthening activities has been on linking small holder farmers with traders. Capacity building has focussed on how to do business for traders from camps and this has been conducted in partnership with a company from Germany. WFP trains traders to train others in business, generating a multiplier effect.
67. WFP has been actively involved in encouraging traders to procure from the farmers. An important aspect of this has been a focus on Food Safety and Quality (FSQ), which has involved county government public health officers and the introduction of facilities for testing (through a blue box mini lab). This has seen County Government doing joint market inspections with WFP. It has also involved training of traders on aflatoxin and on the management of food in their business premises. As noted under Outcome 1, WFP provides pallets so traders can manage shelf life and maintain food quality. This has resulted in raised standards and has made the produce by farmers more attractive to traders.
68. Increased trading in the camps and host community has generated income both for beneficiaries and the government. On the side of Government this is reflected in increased revenue for the County Government collection through the collection of payments made to meet statutory requirements.

Box 5 Direct stakeholders affected by market strengthening activities

- Refugees
- Host Community
- Women in the host community and refugee camps
- Youth
- County Government
- Business community
- People with disability in the camps

69. **Gender:** The evaluation also found anecdotal evidence that the market strengthening activities have resulted in increase in sales and buying from women, and purchasing from women, and thus stronger market linkages for women. The interviews also suggest enhanced capacity for women, with some women venturing into becoming entrepreneurs in transport and retail traders e.g., Mama Mboga, and women manning warehouses in Kakuma (and reportedly also in Dadaab). A specific example was encountered of a female transporter who as a result of the contract with WFP, contracted a loan using the title for her land and purchased a truck to meet WFP needs and opened a hardware shop. The income from the trucking business stocked her hardware shop, paid school fees for her children and opened opportunities with other clients. She confirmed that there are many women who own trucks but that a challenge is that many do not know how to go about bidding for WFP business (with the result that most WFP transporters are men).
70. Some challenges were noted with the market strengthening activities:
 - Some wholesalers bring food commodities in bulk in anticipation that communities & refugees will buy, but then find they are not able to sell the food commodities when WFP distributes that same commodity, as refugees will not buy until the WFP rations run out.
 - In some places the markets that were installed had not taken off because they were built in locations with little buyer traffic, leading traders to pack-up and move back to town for lack of business (insert pictures).
 - In some locations traders in the host community dropped out of the Bamba Chakula initiative because the refugees could not come out of the camp to buy from them. And if the traders do not give credit, then the refugees do not buy from them. The host community traders got frustrated and their businesses dropped.

- The host community woman transporter expressed frustration that all assistance is given to refugees when there are families in host community starving for lack of food.

71. **Unintended effects/changes:** WFP has at times provided varieties of crops that have produced changes in preferences and eating habits by the refugee community and which affect sales of other varieties held by traders. E.g., the beans variety. This has repercussions for wholesalers who are unable to sell the other varieties.

72. **Sustainability:** To the extent that the market strengthening activities have generated reliable income this is creating a dynamic that has the potential to be sustainable. Some challenges were noted in terms of the dependency and implications of WFP's cash injection into the market and how this can disturb market dynamics.

Outcome 3: Economic development and improved livelihoods

73. The activities and changes described under Outcome 1 and Outcome 2 above have brought about improved livelihoods through economic development which was identified by the evaluation team as the third key outcome for Kakuma.

74. Informants were consistent in underscoring how Kakuma town has been transformed in the last decade from a small and quiet town to a vibrant business town. The introduction of CBT has been key to this growth as it has driven the creation and growth of markets. Supply Chain activities have linked traders to these markets, encouraging traders to buy from the local population and resulting in the empowerment of local farmers, many of whom are women.

75. Changes have also been brought about WFP's progressive move to outsource many of the activities that it was formerly running itself. Thus, WFP previously owned trucks, but has moved to contracting trucking services in the local community. This contributed to creating employment, generating income, enhancing economic development of the area, and has also created opportunities for women entrepreneurs, for example through the "Mama Mboga initiative".

76. The dynamic around economic development is linked to a number of interlinked areas of change, including:

- **Enhanced trading:** As reported above WFP Supply Chain interventions have had a positive impact on traders, among others through consistent efforts in capacity building at the refugee market level. Refugee traders have been connected to the Supply Chain and are now able to buy outside Kakuma. This has contributed to strengthening the local food system.
- **Access to financing:** The traders have been connected to banks (Equity bank & Kenya Commercial Bank) and Safaricom for mobile money and are able to access small loans for their businesses. This has left refugees more empowered and is contributing to sustainability and building resilience.
- **Enhanced revenue stream:** WFP works closely with Government offices, local authorities and refugees on compliance with statutory requirements for retail market activities. Training and capacity strengthening has been provided for the business community and Government. Refugee compliance with statutory requirements has created a source of revenue for the government. Some refugees transact millions of shillings.
- **Introduction of innovative technology:** WFP has built market stalls and vendors are encouraged to occupy the stalls and bring vegetables to markets. In collaboration with Nairobi University, WFP has developed a cooling system that keeps vegetables fresh for 4 to 5 days, as compared to previous 1 to 2 days which has helped to promote trading.
- **Market strengthening:** The school feeding program has created a new outlet for farmers' produce. Initially the millers were too small to cater for the needs. WFP supported them to grow and provided them with assistance that enabled them to cater for 90,000 learners. To further grow the market, WFP introduced bread in the meals and supported bakeries to supply the bread to the schools.

Assessment of Processes within WFP

Knowledge sharing and collaboration

77. This section of the report considers evidence on the collaboration between Supply Chain and Programme sections of WFP. The following are the key findings from the Kenya country study in this respect:

78. **Mombasa:** The evaluation found that Mombasa port is run as a supply chain operation with very limited connections to Programme. Mombasa port is seen as transiting point for WFP food and non-food items within the country and the region. There is little linkage with programme activities for Mombasa Port because there were no direct linkages to beneficiaries. The introduction of CBT during the Urban Response Programme in Mombasa has slightly changed this, but in practice Mombasa Port operation continue to function within WFP as a strictly supply chain driven activity.
79. **Kakuma:** For Kakuma the evaluation established a very different picture. The interviews and documentary evidence (CSP and planning documents) highlight strong integration of programme and supply chain activities, with programme leading and supply chain supporting the implementation of many of the interventions. This reflects the way in which the Kenya CSP is designed. For example, market assessment activities that are done by Supply Chain (SC) are part of support programme interventions.
80. At CO level interviews and the recent CSP Mid Term Review¹⁰ both suggest that while there have been improvements there are still siloed ways of working which affect knowledge sharing and collaboration. Some informants suggest this is related to the fact that supply chain is both a function with a specific dedicated section with the CO and has also been mainstreamed across the different Strategic Objectives of the CSP leading to fragmentation.

Data collection and analysis

81. Data was not immediately available. In view of the short timeline for the case study, accurate, reliable and timely data was critical for validation of findings. Based on the findings and evolving changes, continuous data collection and analysis is required for informed conclusions and recommendations. E.g., Evidence of progressive decrease in quantity of commodities being rejected for aflatoxin at the Port of Mombasa after training on warehouse management, or the impact of WFP distribution on market prices for similar commodities in Kakuma over a period of time or impact of the reduced commodity volumes on transporters. Basically, data to measure impact, identify patterns.
82. The evidence reviewed highlights that much of the more innovative and capacity strengthening elements of WFPs supply chain work are not monitored and captured in reporting by WFP. For example, the investments that supply chain team have made in targeting the port authority and other players to make the port operation more efficient are not mentioned in WFPs own annual reports. WFPs lesson learning exercises also could more strongly bring out the role of supply chain in the case studies of food systems work, although this has been improving¹¹. This reduces the learning and linkage to planning as well as the need for strategic thinking around the integration of the two areas of work (supply chain and programme).
83. The evaluation team highly recommends, based in the evaluation findings, WFP to be more intentional collecting data related to interventions that will capture impact or change or trends against which achievements would be measured (all the recommendations are available on the main report).

¹⁰ Mokoro (2021). WFP Kenya Country Strategic Plan 2018-2023: Mid-Term Review.

¹¹ For example. WFP (2018). Food System Country Case Study Kenya; and WFP (2021).

5. Discussion and Conclusions

84. The table below provides an overview of the 12 EQs and the evaluation team's assessment against each.

Table 2 Assessment against evaluation questions

EQ	Summary and conclusion
<p>1. To what extent are supply chain interventions informed by programmatic nutrition priorities, market assessments, climate change risks and gender analyses?</p>	<p>The overall conclusion of the evaluation team is that interventions in Kakuma have been driven and informed by programmatic nutrition priorities and market assessments, but to a lesser extent by climate change risks and gender analyses. Use of these different types of analysis has been more pronounced in Kakuma than in Mombasa.</p> <p>Market intelligence in Kakuma is part of WFPs role with a continuous process to protect refugees from traders through the use of mystery checkers who operate undercover to understand and report back on market dynamics. In Kakuma the evaluation found a very intentional effort to involve women in the markets. Kitchen gardens have been very focussed on women and there has been a focus on developing the capacity of women. Overall the use of data to inform interventions in Kakuma also reflects the strong integration between the programme and supply chain function which characterizes the interventions in Kakuma and is part of the Country Strategic Plan design.</p> <p>For Mombasa, as noted under findings, the interventions are very much a supply chain activity that involves moving goods (for WFP and others), and there has been very limited resort to assessments of this kind. There has been no significant focus on gender except through the urban response where CBT was given mainly to women, and where women managed that and they contributed to shops remaining open when businesses were closing due to the pandemic. Market assessments are not done as WFP does not directly intervene in markets.</p>
<p>2. To what extent are supply chain interventions relevant and appropriate to local food systems across the different country contexts?</p>	<p>Both in Kakuma and in Mombasa the activities are broadly relevant and appropriate to local food systems. In Kakuma there has been a very clear strategy of seeking to improve the availability of food, to diversify food production, to improve food safety and quality and to work with different stakeholders in the food chain (traders, wholesalers, local government, food producers), and there have been efforts to ensure relevance for particular target groups such as women and youth, and to a lesser extent persons with disability. In Kakuma the supply chain interventions are well integrated with the programmatic priorities. As was highlighted above, the supply chain interventions – gathering market data, capacity building of government and other activities have supported programmatic priorities, and in identifying and seeking to address weaknesses in the food system. This approach ultimately is contributing to building resilience and working towards self-reliance. It is clear from the evidence reviewed that capacity strengthening initiatives are building business skills for refugee retailers, and that support to market linkages and capacity of retailers is creating a strong dynamic and addressing the weaknesses of the food system.</p> <p>In Mombasa the relevance of interventions is also in evidence but these interventions are in themselves mostly the result of a spin off from WFPs supply chain function rather than a deliberate attempt to strategically intervene in relevant areas of the food systems.</p>
<p>3. What are the most significant outcomes of supply chain activities?</p>	<p>The most significant outcomes have been reported on under the findings section and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of a revenue stream for government (Kakuma and Mombasa) • Economic development of Mombasa as WFP spends 30 million annually on transporters alone, and 2.5 million USD to the port.

EQ	Summary and conclusion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WFPs engagement especially in the latter years since 2015 since CBT have created harmony between host community and refugees – where host communities were upset about being neglected but with this engagement host community now much more on board so host community contributed land for Kalobe (include in unintended). • Host community business sector has grown as they have markets in refugee community. <p>Internal factors that contributed to the outcomes include: a) when WFP discontinued its own transport and started contracting private sector operators for transportation and warehousing; b) the move to CBT which has created a strong market dynamic (first in Kakuma and then also felt in Mombasa during 2020 with the Urban Support Programme); and c) the integration of supply chain and programme under the current CSP with supply chain playing a strong enabling and supportive function to achieving the food system outcomes. School feeding is an example of this (not mentioned above) where WFPs work has resulted in schools procuring from local markets.</p> <p>External influences on the decisions include the Mombasa municipal government decision to move truck traffic out of Mombasa; the launch of SGR train operations (01 January 2018); and the COVID-19 pandemic which spurred certain innovations such as the spreader bars to encourage social distancing;</p>
<p>4. To what extent do outcomes demonstrate inclusion and representation of women, youth, and vulnerable actors across the supply chain?</p>	<p>The activities in Kakuma highlight WFPs commitment to gender, and youth under the CSP. There has been deliberate targeting of women in Kakuma including through their involvement in vegetable production and sale and by encouraging their involvement in market activities. There is also evidence of youth involvement in various activities, such as the activities that have seen youth being involved in transportation using carts in refugee camps and holding jobs such as keeping distribution centers clean. In refugee camps 40 percent of market facilitators are women. There have been some attempts (small scale) to include Persons with Disability in Kakuma with some refugees who are disabled running shops but this has been a challenge.</p> <p>Mombasa Port operations showed little evidence of being intentional in terms of what the effects are on women, youth and persons with disability.</p>
<p>5. What routine data or other evidence may help strengthen and inform supply chain activities moving forward towards greater effectiveness, impact, inclusion, and sustainability?</p>	<p>WFP does not have data that tracks trends in the markets and how WFP engagement on the markets influences availability and quality of commodities as well as the behaviour of market actors. Tracer studies around different topics would be of significant value.</p> <p>In terms of sustainability WFP would benefit from data showing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trends in refugee buying from traders. For example, in Kakuma, anecdotal evidence highlights that refugees are buying more from traders, data would highlight the scale of this. • Trends in Smallholder farmers (SHF) sales to Traders to understand to what extent and in what ways farmers are benefitting and whether the benefits are equally accessible to women and men. <p>This kind of data would be very useful for WFP to be able to understand how it influences markets and to be able to take any necessary corrective actions.</p> <p>More detailed gender analysis would also be beneficial to allow WFP to understand what the underlying dynamics and social norms are that create differences between women and men and to be able to develop strategies (and partnerships) that address these issues.</p>

EQ	Summary and conclusion
<p>6. To what extent is there collaboration between supply chain, engineering, and programme units?</p>	<p>As reported under the findings above, there has been strong and growing collaboration between supply chain and programme for the work that WFP does in Kakuma. This is seen in areas such as market monitoring.</p> <p>Overall, the evidence shows that supply chain has played a strong enabling and supportive function to achieving the food system outcomes and this is reflected in supply chain being involved in planning and delivery of the activities. There are ways in which this collaboration could be further enhanced, and interviews suggest that there is at times a lack of understanding from the Nairobi CO of the realities of the work in the field, but overall, it is clear that integration exists and that there is a dynamic interaction between programme needs and supply chain supportive actions to programme delivery.</p> <p>In Mombasa there has been very limited engagement with programme as the Port operations are seen as exclusively pertaining to the traditional supply chain domain. The exception to this is the Urban Response Programme which provided CBT during the COVID-19 pandemic and which was led by Programme. However, the findings above underscore that WFPs supply chain function in Mombasa Port has significant effects on practices of market operators (C&F agents, government, food quality stakeholders, transporters) and there is room to enhance these effects, for example by a more deliberate attention to gender.</p>
<p>7. Are supply chain capacities and capabilities effectively leveraged to achieve desired outcomes and contribute to wider systems level change? What, if any, efficiency gains have been realized through WFP supply chain interventions? How or why?</p>	<p>Overall, there has been strong leveraging of supply chain capabilities and capacities. The focus on capacity strengthening of supply chain functions has had a strong effect on quality and efficiency of Port Operations in Mombasa. For example, WFP Mombasa trained warehouse staff to train service providers so they maintain high performance levels to meet standards. The effect of these capacities and capabilities is evident in efficiency gains that are reported under findings which reflect the focus on capacity strengthening and on the use of technology in Mombasa Port (e.g., cranes and jumbo bags, digitalization). The capacity strengthening role is likely to be enhanced in the future as from Headquarters level, WFP has selected Mombasa as the location for the Supply Chain Academy which will seek to expand the focus on capacity strengthening.</p> <p>In Kakuma the role of supply chain capacities and capabilities was very evident with the supply chain team very engaged in warehouses and in the markets and engaged in food safety and quality strengthening for example through the introduction of the Blue Box for aflatoxin testing. In the past this would have been programmes, but this is now a supply chain function.</p>
<p>8. To what extent have supply chain activities and identified outcomes contributed to wider food system impacts (including intended and unintended effects on local economies, upon resilience and inclusiveness of food systems, and upon access and availability of affordable nutritious foods)?</p>	<p>There is evidence from this review that WFPs supply chain activities in Kakuma have had considerable effects. In the past, the WFP intervention in Kakuma focussed exclusively on feeding of refugees. However, in recent years the changes and more strategic nature of WFPs work with refugees and host communities has been empowering refugees to take charge of food security and has resulted in the establishment of a community of business people. This reflects the focus of the CSP which has important ambitions in terms of building resilience and self-reliance. To achieve that WFP have put in place small projects that are linked for communities and which have contributed to reducing reliance on humanitarian aid. Examples include pans for water, green houses, etc., which have had the effect of seeing wholesalers engage with refugee communities who are now producing food. Anecdotal evidence also suggests that refugees are buying from sources where retailers buy from, again highlighting that there is a change in the kind of engagement by refugee communities in markets. There is also clear evidence of inclusiveness, because majority of markets are run by women now. WFP also collaborates with Refugee affairs department to be able to shop in other towns and has been building the capacity of government to facilitate refugees to become self-reliant.</p>

EQ	Summary and conclusion
	<p>Mombasa operations as mentioned above are about moving food. However the engagement of WFP with increasing the level of efficiency at the port has had clear effects down the food system (food is moved more quickly, with less loss, and less cost). In this process WFP has established a very strong relationship with the Kenya Port Authority and with the local Government which has allowed it to leverage certain privileges and negotiate waivers which have reduced costs of clearing not just for WFP but also for the wider humanitarian community.</p> <p>Various intended and unintended effects are in evidence on local economies. Mostly these effects are positive in bringing new actors into markets, improving food quality, diversifying produce and creating streams of revenue and securing employment for actors such as transporters. The evaluation did also, however, find some evidence of unintended negative effects.</p>
<p>9. How do the outcomes of supply chain interventions vary with the scope and scale of the interventions?</p>	<p>The data collected do not allow the evaluation to have a conclusive opinion.</p>
<p>10. How have the dynamics between different stakeholders within food systems been affected by WFP supply chain activities? Any differential effects for women and youth supply chain actors?</p>	<p>The evaluation finds that there is convincing evidence that different food system stakeholders who would never have engaged with one another are now engaged through WFPs interventions. This includes: the engagement between retailers and refugees which did not exist before; the engagement between wholesalers and refugees in the camps (with refugees buying from wholesalers; and the direct contact between vegetable retailers and SHF (who have found a market) which has been enabled through WFPs work including the building of markets; and on wider perspective government is now working directly with refugees at different levels building capacity to do business. In Mombasa engagement was already in existence but has been enhanced – WFPs interventions have affected warehouse owners, labourers, KPA, and other government bodies. These stakeholders were already working together but WFPs focus on quality and efficiency in the port and its influence as a business partner (together with the fact that it is the only entity that still has the right to off load at the port) have changed the nature of the business operations of many of these stakeholders.</p>
<p>11. To what extent are results from supply chain interventions sustainable?</p>	<p>Broadly speaking the changes in Mombasa are sustainable as they are being carried by private sector operators and government and can be funded moving forward. However, WFP has a strong influence on market dynamics by virtue of being an important actor and any changes in volumes or ways in which it does business has an effect on other actors. This is illustrated by the unintended negative effect for Kakuma with food volumes moving through Mombasa going down and the knock-on effects of transporters are losing business. One transporter reported seeing her business go down from 1200 tons, to 100 tons which is not sustainable unless there is alternative business.</p> <p>WFPs work in Kakuma has created a strong dynamic. The evaluation is not equipped to do a full assessment of sustainability. However, WFP has made significant investments in infrastructure such as green houses, water pans, solar panels etc. and there is a need to assess how sustainable these are if WFP is not there to fill in the gap. As was concluded by the recent SO2 Mid-Term Evaluation some activities may not be sustainable without government funding, e.g. the mini-labs for testing which require sustained government funding (at local level).</p>
<p>12. In what ways are WFP interventions strengthening capacity of key</p>	<p>WFP interventions have had a strong effect on government institutions in Mombasa Port and also in Kakuma. For example, knowledge gained by clearing and forwarding agents is not just serving WFP but the efficiency gains (as reported under findings) have trickled down to other clients. There have also been significant knowledge gains</p>

EQ	Summary and conclusion
government institutions and supply chain actors as reported by stakeholders?	for government on how to do better sampling (both Mombasa and Kakuma). In Mombasa this has resulted in reduced losses not just for WFP but with a huge multiplier effect of reduced losses in the Port as sampling practices have been adopted by Government for its role as a whole.

Annex 1. Fieldwork overview

Table 3 List of people interviewed

Name (sex)	Position
1. Hussein Abdullahi (M)	Supply Chain, Kakuma Field Office, WFP Kenya
2. Claudia Ahpoe (F)	SO2 Manager, WFP Kenya
3. Thomas Chika (M)	Head of Supply Chain, Kakuma Field Office, WFP Kenya
4. Marjam Chimosa Lugazo (M)	Market Coordinator, WFP Refugee Traders Representative (Kakuma)
5. Antoninah Ekal (F)	Transporter, WFP Kenya
6. Byamunga Elie Manasse (M)	Trader, WFP Refugee Traders Representative (Kakuma)
7. David Ereng (M)	Camp Field Officer, Refugee Affairs Secretariat
8. Georgia Farley (F)	Logistics Officer, WFP Kenya
9. Mesfin Getahun (M)	Wholesaler, Kakuma Camp
10. Astrid Harbo (F)	Food Systems Coordinator, WFP Kenya
11. Abubakar Harun (M)	Trader, WFP Refugee Traders Representative (Kakuma)
12. Muhamad Jamal Musa (M)	Trader, WFP Refugee Traders Representative (Kakuma)
13. Judith Joseph (F)	Quality Assurance and Hygiene Manager, UNGA
14. Samuel Kebe (M)	Supply Chain, Kakuma Field Office, WFP Kenya
15. Dan Kirwa (M)	Supply Chain Officer, WFP Kenya
16. Eddie Kisach (M)	Supply Chain Associate , WFP Kenya
17. Julius Kisingu (M)	VAM Officer, WFP Kenya
18. Allan Kute (M)	Head of VAM, WFP Kenya
19. Gabriel Lbate (M)	Committee Secretary, Food Distribution Committee (Kakuma)
20. Julius Loboto (M)	Supply Chain, Kakuma Field Office, WFP Kenya
21. Erasto Magak (M)	KPA Marketing Department, KPA
22. Alexandra Malikoa (F)	Food Systems and Supply Chain Intern, WFP Kenya
23. Melisa Maumina (F)	Head of Office, Kenya National Chamber of Commerce and Industry (KNCCI)
24. Odawa Michael (M)	Warehouse Operations Associate, Bollore Logistics
25. Caroline Muchai (F)	Programme Policy Officer, WFP Kenya
26. Jacob Munyeke (M)	Supervisor, SGS Kenya
27. Jason Murithi Marangu (M)	Inspector, KEPHIS
28. Samuel Muriuki (M)	Operations Manager, SGS Kenya
29. Christine Murugami (F)	Donor Relations, WFP Kenya
30. Elizabeth Muthoka (F)	Supply Chain, Kakuma Field Office, WFP Kenya
31. Jairus Mutisya (M)	Logistics Officer, Mombasa Field Office, WFP Kenya
32. Anii Mwambire (M)	Head of Operations, KPA
33. Caroline Mwendwa (F)	Head of Food Safety and Quality, WFP Kenya
34. Beatrice Mwongela (F)	Head of M&E, WFP Kenya
35. Selina Nangeyo (F)	Marketing, Kakuma Field Office, WFP Kenya
36. Peter Ndugu (M)	Warehouses, Kakuma Field Office, WFP Kenya
37. Balabala Ndume (M)	Trader, WFP Refugee Traders Representative (Kakuma)
38. Alphonse Ndune Mlala (M)	Inspector, KEPHIS
39. George Njoroge (M)	FtMA Lead, WFP Kenya
40. Olivier Nkakuduku (M)	Head of Office, Kakuma Field Office, WFP Kenya
41. Eric Nyakundi (M)	Senior Warehouse Associate, Mombasa Field Office, WFP Kenya
42. Josephine Oguna (F)	Supply Chain, Kakuma Field Office, WFP Kenya
43. Alfayo Ombuya (M)	Senior Plant Health Inspector, KEPHIS
44. Allan Onyara (M)	Store Manager, Al Mubarak Wholesaler
45. Anton Oosthuizen (M)	Group Technical Manager, UNGA

Name (sex)	Position
46. Judith Otieno (F)	Gender and Protection Officer, WFP Kenya
47. David Owade (M)	Warehouse Associate, Mombasa Field Office, WFP Kenya
48. Kenneth Sangut (M)	Inspector, SGS Kenya
49. Clara Silva (F)	Head of Mombasa Field Office, WFP Kenya
50. Nashon Sitei (M)	Supply Chain, Kakuma Field Office, WFP Kenya
51. Kwizera Telsphore (M)	Trader, WFP Refugee Traders Representative (Kakuma)
52. Alexandre Vincent (M)	Head of Proects and Corridor Solutions, Bollore Logistics
53. Olive Wahome (F)	Activity 4 Lead, WFP Kenya
54. Betty Wakio Mkonyi (F)	KPA Marketing Department, KPA
55. Boniface Wanganju (F)	Programmes, Kakuma Field Office, WFP Kenya
56. Philomena Wanyama (F)	Supply Chain, Kakuma Field Office, WFP Kenya
57. Emily Yeko (F)	Operations Manager, Kenya Babu Freighters

Table 4 Kenya fieldwork agenda

Date	Activities	Stakeholders Interviewed	Evaluation Team Members Responsible ¹²
Kenya			
Sunday 6 February	Team travel to Mombasa		TM; JJ
Monday 7 February	Mombasa fieldwork	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opening meeting with Mombasa Field Office WFP Kilindini Warehouse Meeting with Kenya Ports Authority BOLLORE 	TM; JJ; MV remote (for team briefings)
Tuesday 8 February	Mombasa field work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KEBS KEPHIS WFP Mombasa SC Staff Closing meeting with Head of Mombasa Field Office 	TM; JJ; MV remote (for team briefings)
Wednesday 9 February	Travel to Kakuma/ Team meeting and fieldwork evidence consolidation		TM; JJ; MV remote (for team briefings)
Thursday 10 February	Kakuma fieldwork	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group Discussion with WFP Kakuma SC Staff Transporter Refugee Affairs Secretariat (RAS) 	TM; JJ; MV remote (for team briefings)
Friday 11 February	Kakuma Field Work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wholesaler Al Mubarak Kenya National Chamber of Commerce (KNCCI) Market Coordinators Food Distribution Committee Secretary Mama Farhiya – Trader Al-Barako Trader Mesfin (Wholesaler and Transporter) Meeting with Head of WFP Kakuma Field Office 	TM; JJ; MV remote (for team briefings)
Saturday 12th	Visit to Kalobeyei Refugee settlement; Travel Back to Nairobi		TM; JJ; MV remote (for

¹² Kenya team members: MV - Muriel Visser (case study lead); TM - Tikhwi Munyondo (fieldwork lead); JJ - Jacob Juma (Kenya consultant)

Date	Activities	Stakeholders Interviewed	Evaluation Team Members Responsible ¹²
			team briefings)
14 th February – 4 th March	National Level Interviews in Nairobi (Remote)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National-level interviews with key WFP Kenya CO Staff • FGDs with WFP CO • Interviews with external stakeholders 	TM; MV

Bibliography

Short reference	Full reference
Dunn and Otsula, 2020	Dunn and Otsula (2020). Final evaluation of the USDA-supported Local and Regional Procurement (LRP) project in Kenya FY 2017-2020. May 2020.
FEWSNET, 2022a	FEWSNET (2022) Kenya Food Security Outlook Update, February to September 2022
Global Hunger Index, 2021d	Global Hunger Index (2021) Kenya. Available at: https://www.globalhungerindex.org/kenya.html
Government of Kenya, 2018	Government of Kenya (2018) Towards Zero Hunger Strategic Review: Kenya. 1 May 2018.
IPC, 2021b	IPC (2021) Kenya: Acute Food Insecurity Situation July - October 2021 and November 2021 - January 2022
Mokoro Ltd., 2021	Mokoro Ltd. (2021) WFP Kenya Country Strategic Plan 2018-2023: Mid-Term Review.
Taylor et al, 2019	Taylor et al . (2019). Potential Local Economy Impacts of Kenya's Home-Grown School Meals Program. June 2019.
Visser et al., 2019b	Visser, M., Turner, S.D., Driscoll, Z., Goza, A., Hassan, F., Jelensperger, J., Joughin, J., Midega, M., Mwangi, M., 2019. Visser, Turner, Driscoll, Goza, Guevarra, Hassan, Jelensperger, Midega, Mwangi (2019). Evaluation (including a baseline and outcome monitoring) of Outcome 2 (Sustainable Food Systems Programme), of WFP Kenya Country Strategic Plan, in arid and semiarid areas in Kenya from 2018 to 2023. Baseline Report. 19 November 2019
Visser et al., 2020	Visser, M., Turner, S.D., Driscoll, Z., Hassan, F., Midega, M., Mwangi, M., 2020. Evaluation (including a baseline and outcome monitoring) of Outcome 2 (Sustainable Food Systems Programme), of WFP Kenya Country Strategic Plan, in arid and semiarid areas in Kenya from 2018 to 2023. Outcome Monitoring Report 2020. 8 January 2021
WFP, 2018	WFP (2018). Food System Country Case Study Kenya
WFP Kenya, 2018a	WFP Kenya (2018). Kenya country strategic plan (2018–2023). Executive Board Annual session Rome, 18–22 June 2018.
WFP Kenya, 2018b	WFP Kenya (2018). The Kenya Retail Engagement Initiative Getting More Value from Bamba Chakula Cash Transfers. WFP Kenya June 2018
WFP Kenya, 2018c	WFP (2018). WFP Kenya Country Strategic Plan: Implementation Strategy for Outcome 2 (Sustainable Food Systems) (2018 – 2023). August 2018. (Draft)
WFP Kenya, 2019a	WFP Kenya (2019). Kenya Annual Country Report 2018, Country Strategic Plan 2018 – 2023.
WFP Kenya, 2020a	WFP Kenya (2020). Kenya Annual Country Report 2019, Country Strategic Plan 2018 – 2023.
WFP Kenya, 2020b	WFP Kenya (2020). Kenya National School Meals Supply Chain Compliance Assessment – A report of an independent supply chain assessment undertaken by the WFP on request from the Cabinet Secretary, Ministry of Education.
WFP Kenya, 2021	WFP Kenya (2021). Kenya Annual Country Report 2020, Country Strategic Plan 2018 – 2023.
WFP Kenya, 2021b	WFP Kenya (2021) WFP Kenya Disability Inclusion Plan
WFP Kenya, n.d.	WFP (n.d.) Refugees in Kenya. WFP Factsheet – Kakuma.
World Bank, 2021b	World Bank (2021) Poverty headcount ratio at \$1.90 a day (2011 PPP) (% of population) – Kenya. Available at: https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.DDAY?locations=KE
World Bank, n.d.c	World Bank (n.d.) World Development Indicators

Acronyms

ASALs	Arid and Semi-Arid Lands
C&F	Clearing and Forwarding
CBT	Cash Based Transfers
CO	Country Office
CSP	Country Strategic Plan
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
EQ	Evaluation Question
FDC	Food Distribution Center
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FSQ	Food Safety and Quality
FtMA	Farm to Market Alliance
GoK	Government of Kenya
KEPHIS	Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service
KSH	Kenya Shilling
KII	Key Informant Interviews
KNCCI	Kenya National Chamber of Commerce
KPA	Kenya Ports Authority
KRA	Kenya Revenue Authority
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
RBN	Regional Bureau for the East Africa region, Nairobi
SC	Supply Chain
SGR	Standard Gauge Railway
SHF	Smallholder Farmer
SO2	Strategic Outcome 2
USD	United States Dollar
VSLA	Village Savings and Loans Associations
WFP	World Food Programme