



WFP EVALUATION



**World Food
Programme**

**SAVING
LIVES
CHANGING
LIVES**

Evaluation of Ghana WFP Country Strategic Plan 2019–2023

Centralized evaluation report – Volume II Annexes

OEV/2022/012
Office of Evaluation

October 2023

Acknowledgements

The external evaluation team is very grateful for all the assistance provided by Dawit Habtebariam and Soo Mee Baumann, Evaluation Officers, Sanela Muharemovic Research Analyst, and Alexandra Chambel, Senior Evaluation Officer, of the World Food Programme Office of Evaluation; Barbara Clemens, Country Director of WFP Ghana; the many colleagues at headquarters, regional bureau, country office and sub-offices. The assistance from the evaluation focal points in Ghana, Prince Kwesi Otabil and Olatunji Sonoiki was invaluable.

We would also like to acknowledge the valuable contributions of the Ghanaian Government and numerous donors from United Nations agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGO), the private sector and other informants who generously made time to talk with us and provide us with their insights and advice during the evaluation process.

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.

Photo cover: WFP/Derrick Botchway

Key personnel for the evaluation

OFFICE OF EVALUATION

Anne-Claire Luzot	Director of Evaluation
Alexandra Chambel	Senior Evaluation Officer, Quality Assurer
Dawit Habtemariam	Evaluation Officer, Evaluation Manager (March 2022–September 2022)
Soo Mee Baumann	Evaluation Officer, Evaluation Manager (October 2022 onwards)
Sanela Muharemovic	Research Analyst

EXTERNAL EVALUATION TEAM

Tom Mogeni Mabururu	Team Leader, Capacity Strengthening and Policy Coherence Lead
Richmond Nii Okai Aryeetey	Nutrition Expert
Maxwell Agbenorhevi	Agriculture, Food Security and Livelihood Expert
Erik Toft	Emergency Preparedness and Response Expert
Léonie Borel	Research Analyst
Barnaby Peacocke	Quality Assurance Expert
Julian Brett	Project Manager

Table of contents

Annex I: Summary Terms of Reference	1
Annex II: Evaluation timeline.....	3
Annex III: Evaluation methodology	5
3.1 Data collection methods.....	6
3.2 Evaluation process	7
3.3 Ethical considerations.....	8
3.4 Limitations.....	8
Annex IV: Evaluation matrix	10
Annex V: Data collection tools	27
Annex VI: Fieldwork agenda	39
Annex VII: Findings–conclusions–recommendations mapping	43
Annex VIII: Additional analysis	48
Annex IX: Outcome/Outputs and Cross-cutting Indicators	51
Annex X: Key informants’overview	71
Annex XI: Acronyms	73
Annex XII: Bibliography	77

List of figures

Figure 1: Reconstructed theory of change	50
--	----

List of tables

Table 1: Updated evaluation timelines.....	3
Table 2: Levels of data collection	7
Table 3: Evaluability of CSP indicators	9
Table 4: Semi-structured interview guide for WFP country office staff	27
Table 5: Semi-structured interview guide for key government informants	30
Table 6: Semi-structured interview guide for key private sector informants	32
Table 7: Semi-structured interview guide for key civil society/NGO informants	33
Table 8: Semi-structured interview guide for key United Nations informants	34
Table 9: Interview guide for beneficiaries	35
Table 10: Reconstructed CSP theory of change assumptions.....	48
Table 11: Overview of complete, partially complete and incomplete indicators for the T-ICSP (2018)	51
Table 12: Overview of complete, partially complete and incomplete indicators for the CSP (2019–2023)	52
Table 13: T-ICSP outcome indicators	52
Table 14: CSP outcome indicators	54
Table 15: T-ICSP output indicators	58
Table 16: CSP output indicators	60
Table 17: T-ICSP cross-cutting indicators	68
Table 18: CSP cross-cutting indicators.....	69

Annex I: Summary Terms of Reference

Evaluation of Ghana WFP Country Strategic Plan 2018 - 2023

Summary Terms of Reference



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 and focus of the evaluation

The evaluation will cover all WFP activities (including cross-cutting results) in Ghana from 2018 under the T-ICSP and CSP up to mid-2022. It will also consider WFP interventions immediately preceding the T-ICSP to assess key changes in the approach. The evaluation will also cover WFP contributions to CSP strategic outcomes, establishing plausible causal relations between outputs of WFP activities, the implementation process, the operational environment, and changes observed at the outcome level, including unintended consequences.

It will also analyse WFP partnership strategy and WFP strategic positioning in a complex and dynamic national and international context. The evaluation will also focus on adherence to humanitarian principles, gender, protection, accountability to affected populations and the environment.

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

The evaluation will assess WFP contributions to the 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, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability as well as connectedness, and coverage.

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 November 2023.

Key evaluation questions

The evaluation will address the following four key questions:

Question 1: To what extent is the CSP evidence-based and strategically focused to address the needs of the most vulnerable? The evaluation team will assess: (i) the extent to which the CSP was informed by evidence on hunger challenges, food security and nutrition issues prevailing in the county at design stage; (ii) the extent to which the CSP is aligned to national policies and plans and to the SDGs; (iii) the coherence and alignment of the CSP to the wider UN and including partnerships based on WFP's comparative advantage in Ghana; (iv) the extent to which the CSP design is internally coherent, based on a clear theory of change articulating WFP's role and contributions in a realistic manner, and based on WFP's comparative advantage.

The evaluation will also reflect on the extent to which WFP's strategic positioning remained relevant throughout the implementation period of the CSP considering the changing context, national capacities and needs, particularly in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Question 2: What is the extent and quality of WFP's specific contribution to Country Strategic Plan strategic outcomes in Ghana? The evaluation team will reflect on the extent to which: (i) WFP activities and outputs contribute to the expected outcomes of the CSP and to the UNSDP and whether there were any unintended outcomes, positive or negative; (ii) WFP contributes to achievement of cross-cutting aims (humanitarian principles, protection including Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA), accountability to affected

populations, gender, equity and inclusion, environment); (iii) achievements of the CSP are likely to be sustained; and (iv) the CSP facilitates strategic linkages between humanitarian action, development cooperation and, where appropriate, contribution to peace.

Question 3: To what extent has WFP used its resources efficiently in contributing to Country Strategic Plan outputs and strategic outcomes? The focus of the evaluation will be on the extent to which: (i) outputs were delivered within the intended timeframe; and (ii) the extent to which the depth and breadth of coverage of the CSP ensures that the most vulnerable to food insecurity benefit from the programme.

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? The evaluation will reflect on the extent to which: (i) WFP has been able to mobilise adequate, timely, predictable and flexible resources to finance the CSP; (ii) the monitoring and reporting systems have been useful in tracking and demonstrating progress towards expected outcomes and to inform management decisions; (iii) the partnerships and collaboration with other actors influenced performance and results; (iv) the CO has appropriate human resources capacity to deliver the CSP; and (v) WFP CO has made strategic shifts expected by the CSP.

Scope, methodology and ethical considerations

The unit of analysis is the Country Strategic Plan, understood as the set of strategic outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were included in the Country Strategic Plan document approved by WFP Executive Board (EB), as well as any subsequent approved budget revisions.

The evaluation will adopt a mixed methods approach implying a methodological design in which data collection and analysis is informed by a feedback loop combining a deductive approach, which starts from predefined analytical categories, with an inductive approach that leaves space for unforeseen issues or lines of inquiry that had not been identified at the inception stage. This, in turn, would eventually lead to capturing unintended outcomes of WFP operations, negative or positive.

In line with this approach, data will be collected through a mix of primary and secondary sources using various techniques including desk review, semi-structured or open-ended interviews, surveys, focus groups and direct observation. Systematic data triangulation across different sources and methods should be carried out to validate findings and avoid bias in the evaluative judgement.

Roles and responsibilities

EVALUATION TEAM: Evaluation team: The evaluation will be conducted by a team of independent consultants with a mix of expertise relevant to the strategic areas covered by Ghana CSP.

OEV EVALUATION MANAGER: The evaluation will be managed by Dawit Habtemariam, 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 Alexandra Chambel, Senior Evaluation Officer in the WFP Office 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 Deputy Director of Evaluation, Anne-Claire Luzot, 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

All evaluation products will be in English. As part of the international standards for evaluation, WFP requires that all evaluations are made publicly available. The summary of the evaluation report along with the management response to the evaluation recommendations will be presented to the WFP Executive Board in November 2023. The final evaluation report will be posted on the WFP website and the Office of Evaluation will ensure dissemination of lessons through the annual evaluation report.

Timing and key milestones

Inception Phase: May- September 2022

Data collection: September - October 2022

Debriefing: October 2022

Reports: November 2022 – April 2023

Stakeholder Workshop: February 2023

Executive Board: November 2023

Annex II: Evaluation timeline

1. The table below presents the timeline followed in conducting the evaluation

Table 1: Updated evaluation timelines

Phase 2: Inception		
Team preparation, literature review prior to headquarters (HQ) briefing.	Team	21–25 April 2022
HQ & regional bureau (RB) inception briefing.	Evaluation manager (EM) & team	3–6 May 2022
Inception briefings.	EM & team leader (TL)	16–26 May 2022
Submit draft inception report (IR).	TL	22 June 2022
Office of Evaluation (OEV) quality assurance and feedback.	EM	30 June 2022
Submit revised IR.	TL	7 July 2022
IR QA2 review.	QA2	14 July 2022
IR clearance to share with country office (CO).	Deputy Director of Evaluation (DDoE)	28 July 2022
EM circulates draft IR to country office for comments.	EM	28 July–10 August 2022
Submit revised IR.	TL	19 August 2022
IR review.	EM	26 August 2022
Seek final approval by QA2.	EM	26 August 2022
EM circulates final IR to WFP key stakeholders for their information + posts a copy on intranet.	EM	31 August 2022
Phase 3: Data collection including fieldwork		
In-country / remote data collection.	Team	12–30 September 2022
Exit debrief (ppt).	TL	30 September 2022
Preliminary findings debrief.	Team	8 November 2022
Phase 4: Reporting		

Submit high quality draft ER to OEV (after the company's quality check).	TL	18 November 2022
OEV quality feedback sent to TL.	EM	25 November 2022
Submit revised draft ER to OEV.	TL	5 December 2022
OEV quality check.	EM	16 December 2022
Seek clearance prior to circulating the ER to the internal reference group (IRG).	DDoE	1 February 2023
OEV shares draft evaluation report with IRG for feedback.	EM	10 February 2023
Stakeholder workshop.		14–16 February 2023
Consolidate WFP comments and share with team.	EM	24 February 2023
Submit revised draft ER to OEV based on WFP comments, with team's responses on the matrix of comments.	ET	22 March 2023
Review D2.	EM	23 to 31 March 2023
Submit final draft ER to OEV.	TL	24 April 2023

Annex III: Evaluation methodology

2. This annex presents the methodology followed for this evaluation. The aspects of methodology presented include the overall methodological approach, evaluation process and ethical considerations.

Overall methodological approach

3. The general methodological approach for this evaluation follows the WFP Office of Evaluation's Guidance for Process and Content for Country Strategic Plan Evaluations (CSPEs), which is in line with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee's (OECD-DAC) framework and quality standards for evaluation.¹

4. The evaluation applied a theory-based approach to assess the causal logic underpinning the country strategic plan (CSP) and its adaptation to changes. It considered the synergies across various outcomes and outputs and the assumptions and other contextual factors that influenced the achievement of CSP results. The CSP did not include a theory of change (ToC) at the time of design. The evaluation team (ET) has therefore used the CSP line of sight, CSP logical framework and consultations with the WFP country office to construct a theory of change to inform the evaluation.² The theory of change was applied in EQ2 to assess how activities resulted in the planned outputs and whether the outputs contributed to the CSP outcomes.

5. The evaluation used a mixed methods approach, which involved a combination of qualitative and quantitative data collection methods comprising desk review of documents, semi-structured interviews with key informants, in-depth interviews with beneficiaries, review of available documents and observation during site visits. Data was triangulated across the data sources to validate the findings. Data analysis methods included descriptive quantitative analysis, qualitative iterative analysis, contribution analysis and data triangulation.

6. The evaluation team prepared an evaluation matrix that set out the lines of inquiry and data collection methods for each evaluation question and sub-question. More than one data source was identified for each sub-question to address data gaps and strengthen data validity and reliability. The matrix guided all stages of data collection and analysis.

7. The evaluation assessed cross-cutting aims, which included gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE), protection including protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA), accountability to affected populations (AAP), social inclusion, humanitarian principles and access, and the triple nexus in the context of the CSP. The evaluation team used corporate and country office guidance and tools in assessing these cross-cutting aims.

8. The CSP has a strategic outcome focused on country capacity strengthening and policy coherence. Capacity strengthening was also integrated into strategic outcomes 1 and 2. The evaluation assessed the activities and outputs and their contribution to strategic outcomes 3 and 4. It also assessed capacity strengthening as it was integrated across the CSP outcomes using the WFP corporate capacity strengthening outcome. The contribution of the capacity strengthening outputs to the outcomes was limited by the types of indicators selected to measure the CSP outcomes.

9. The evaluation team adopted a gender-sensitive methodology as follows: (i) gender was considered in the stakeholder analysis to ensure involvement of women, men, boys and girls in the evaluation and in the selection of key informants with expert knowledge on GEWE; (ii) sub-questions on GEWE were included in the evaluation matrix; (iii) data collection tools included questions eliciting information on GEWE; and (iv) data was disaggregated by gender and age to the extent possible. The evaluation team also assessed the country office and partners' mainstreaming of gender in CSP activities.

¹ The evaluation followed OEV's CEQAS.

² During the inception mission in Accra, the theory of change (TOC) was constructed in consultation with the WFP CO staff and the final version of the TOC was shared with the CO for validation.

3.1 DATA COLLECTION METHODS

10. The methods for data collection were as follows:

11. Document review: A desk review of qualitative and quantitative secondary documentation was conducted. A substantial number of documents were compiled with the assistance of the Office of Evaluation and the WFP country office. Through the evaluation matrix, the evaluation team identified the relevant documents to be reviewed for each evaluation sub-question. Over 250 documents were reviewed to provide secondary data for the evaluation. Insights from the documents review also helped to shape the primary data collection tools.

12. Semi-structured key informant interviews: Interviews with in-country key informants were conducted in face-to-face and virtual meetings. The evaluation team identified individual informants and beneficiaries purposively to ensure the selected persons had been involved in the activities under each strategic outcome. The interviews were conducted using a semi-structured interview guide adapted to the role of the key informant in the CSP (see Annex V: Data collection tools). The interview guides were prepared in accordance with the lines of inquiry and evaluation indicators set out in the evaluation matrix.

13. In-depth interviews: In-depth interviews were held with various categories of beneficiaries, including women, adolescent girls, caregivers of children who received nutrition support and smallholder farmers. The country office supported the evaluation team in identifying and organizing meetings with the beneficiaries.

14. Site visits and observations: The evaluation team visited the industrial food processors and selected community processors, and selected retailers to observe the production and distribution of specialized foods. The evaluation team also visited the farmer-based organizations to observe the warehouses and post-harvest technologies provided by WFP.

Sampling strategy

15. The evaluation team selected the two regions where most WFP activities are concentrated – Ashanti and Northern Region. Within each region, the evaluation team selected one district in which data were collected. District selection was based on three criteria, which were linked with efficiency. The first two criteria were: 1) districts with a high concentration of interventions and 2) districts where both transitional interim country strategic plans (T-ICSP) and CSP activities were undertaken. In regard to these criteria, the evaluation team reviewed the district-level activity map provided by WFP country office to determine activities implemented in each district in the Northern Region and Ashanti. In each region, two districts stood out as having the highest number of interventions. In the Northern Region, Sagnerigu district had most intervention activities followed by Zabzugu. In Ashanti, both Bosomtwi and Asokore Mampong districts had six activities each. In all other districts there were fewer activities. The final criterion was 3) accessibility – focusing on the possibility of reaching stakeholders and completing the field data collection within the given time frame. Based on this consideration, the evaluation team selected Asokore Mampong district in Ashanti and Sagnerigu district in Northern Region for field data collection.

16. Within the selected districts, the evaluation team interviewed key informants in the WFP sub-office, government departments at the regional and district levels, the private sector and civil society implementations. Data were collected from health facilities, food retailers, food aggregators, community and industrial agro-processors, smallholder farmers and beneficiaries of social and behavioural change communication (SBCC) and nutrition support.

Table 2: Levels of data collection

Level of participation	Type of stakeholder	Institution(s) ³	Data collection method
National	Internal stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WFP country office staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-structured key informant interviews (face-to-face)
	External stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UN agencies including the Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-structured key informant interviews (face-to-face)
	External stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government ministries, departments and agencies Private sector Civil society Academia Development partners International non-government organizations (NGOs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-structured key informant interviews (face-to-face)
Regional (Ashanti and Northern Region)	Internal stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WFP sub-office staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-structured key informant interviews (face-to-face)
	External stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government ministries, departments and agencies, regional offices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-structured key informant interviews (face-to-face)
District (Asokore Mampong district in Ashanti and Sagnerigu district in Northern Region)	External stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government ministries, departments and agencies, regional offices Civil society 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-structured key informant interviews (face-to-face)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health facilities Food retailers Food aggregators Food processors Community volunteers Smallholder farmers Food security and nutrition, and SBCC beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-structured key informant interviews (face-to-face) In-depth interviews Observation

3.2 EVALUATION PROCESS

17. The evaluation followed the Office of Evaluation three-phase process for CSPEs. This consists of: (i) inception phase, which focuses on defining and refining the overall evaluation methodological framework; (ii) data collection phase; and (iii) a reporting phase during which the evaluation team analyses and triangulates information and develops the evaluation report, presenting findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Evaluation phase	Tasks	Deliverables
Inception phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team preparation and preliminary review of documents Remote briefing by WFP headquarters and regional bureau Inception mission to WFP country office in Ghana Evaluability assessment Reconstruction of the theory of change Preparation of data collection tools Draft inception report for OEV and country office review Development of final inception report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft inception report Final inception report

³ Refer to Annex X: Annex VI: Fieldwork agenda for the selected institutions and names of key informants from each institution listed below.

Data collection phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-depth desk review of documents, programmatic and financial data • Preparation for primary data collection including making appointments with the assistance of the WFP country office • Data collection through face-to-face interviews and virtual interviews • Debriefing of the WFP country office on data collection and overview of findings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary and primary data • Debriefing of country office
Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data analysis and triangulation • Consolidation of findings, conclusions and recommendations • Preparation of OEV, internal reference group and WFP country office on preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations • Development of draft evaluation report and submission to OEV for review • Submission of revised draft evaluation report to OEV for circulation to stakeholders • Holding of stakeholder learning workshop • Revision and submission of draft evaluation report based on comments from the learning workshop • Quality check of the evaluation report by OEV • Submission of final evaluation report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft zero evaluation report • Draft 1 evaluation report • Draft 2 evaluation report • Final draft evaluation report

3.3 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

18. The evaluation conformed to WFP and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) ethical standards and norms at all stages and in all of its activities. All members of the evaluation team were bound by the 2020 UNEG Ethical Guidelines and the 2014 Guidelines on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations.

19. The evaluation team signed statements confirming no conflict of interest and adhered to the WFP code of conduct. Members of the evaluation team were not involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of the WFP CSP in Ghana, nor were there any other potential or perceived conflicts of interest.

20. The evaluation team safeguarded and ensured ethics at all stages of the evaluation cycle. This included, but was 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 did no harm to participants or their communities.

21. The evaluation team followed ethical principles such as independence, impartiality, confidentiality and transparency. In addition to signing a pledge of ethical conduct in evaluation, the evaluation team signed agreements related to, and then adhered to, confidentiality, and internet and data security requirements.

3.4 LIMITATIONS

22. A limitation experienced by the evaluation team was data collection on projects that had been closed. However, the evaluation team, with the assistance of the WFP country office, was able to reach smallholder farmers, aggregators and retailers supported under the Enhanced Nutrition and Value Chain (ENVAC) project.

23. Another limitation of the evaluation was the lack of data for some of the indicators as identified during the evaluability assessment. The evaluation team used qualitative data from the annual country reports, end-of-year review reports and other project-specific reports and key informant interviews to assess performance of the CSP in areas where indicators lacked data. Some of the indicators also lacked data because no related activities were undertaken.

Table 3: Evaluability of CSP indicators

Indicators	Evaluable	Partially Evaluable	Non-Evaluable	TOTAL	% Evaluable
T-ICSP outcome indicators	23	0	5	28	24. 82%
T-ICSP output indicators	14	0	18	32	25. 44%
T-ICSP cross-cutting indicators	25	0	2	27	26. 93%
CSP outcome indicators	30	18	19	57	27. 53%
CSP output indicators	69	0	19	88	28. 78%
CSP cross-cutting indicators	9	0	1	10	29. 90%

Annex IV: Evaluation matrix

Dimensions of analysis	Lines of inquiry	Indicators	Data sources	Data collection methods	Data analysis
Evaluation Question 1: To what extent is the CSP evidence-based and strategically focused to address the needs of the most vulnerable?					
1.1: To what extent was the CSP informed by existing evidence on the hunger challenges, and the food security and nutrition issues prevailing in the country to ensure its relevance at design stage?					
1.1.1 Comprehensiveness and quality of data and analysis informing CSP design.	<p>1.1.1.1 What analysis was done on food security, nutrition and hunger challenges to inform the CSP design?</p> <p>1.1.1.2 How is the analysis/evidence reflected in the prioritization of CSP strategic outcomes (SOs) and activities?</p> <p>1.1.1.3 Was the evidence informing CSP design adequate?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of reviews, surveys, WFP monitoring data, institutional knowledge and lessons informing CSP design. Adequacy of the evidence used (e.g. no data gaps; evidence was up-to-date data, data covered all key food security and nutrition indicators etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents on strategic review and surveys of hunger challenges, food security and nutrition issues; data analysis undertaken; documentation on CSP design process; and references in the CSP. Key informant interviews with: WFP staff; government institutions (the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA), the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection (MoGCSP), Ghana Health Service (GHS), the Food and Drugs Authority (FDA), the National Disaster Management Organization (NADMO), School Feeding Secretariat); and donor partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive document review. Semi-structured key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative iterative analysis of key informant interviews (KIIs) with key stakeholders. Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
1.2: To what extent is the CSP aligned to national policies and plans and to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)?					
1.2.1 Alignment of CSP to national	1.2.1.1 How were the CSP strategic outcomes and activities aligned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree of matching between CSP strategic outcomes and objectives set out in national policies, strategies and plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key documents: WFP Ghana T-ICSP and CSP, budget revisions, national policies and plans including the Coordinated Programme of Economic and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive document review. Semi-structured 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative iterative data analysis of KIIs with stakeholders. Triangulation between data sources, data

policies and plans.	with objectives set out in national policies? 1.2.1.2 How were the CSP strategic outcomes and activities aligned with priorities in national plans?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree of matching between CSP activities and interventions set out in government policies, strategies and plans. • Perceptions of government officials on degree of alignment of the CSP strategic outcomes with national policies, strategies and plans. 	Social Development Policies (CPESDP), the National Medium Term Development Policy Framework (NMTDPF), nutrition policy, Agenda for Transformation of Ghana's Agriculture, Education Strategic Plan and national disaster management plans. • Key informants including: WFP staff; senior government officials (MoFA, MoGCSP, GHS, FDA, NADMO, School Feeding Secretariat); and donor partners.	key informant interviews.	collection techniques and data types.
1.2.2 Alignment of CSP to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).	1.2.2.1 How was the CSP design aligned to SDGs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree of matching between CSP strategic outcomes and activities with relevant SDGs. • Degree of matching between CSP activities and government (country) efforts to achieve relevant SDGs. • Perceptions of government officials of degree of alignment of CSP strategic outcomes and activities with government efforts to achieve relevant SDGs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key documents including CSP, SDGs and Ghana Voluntary National Review report. • Key informants: WFP staff, senior government representatives from key ministries (MoFA, GHS, MoGCSP and the National Development Planning Commission (NDPC)), other United Nations agencies and donor partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive document review. • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative iterative data analysis of KIIs with stakeholders. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
1.3: To what extent is the CSP coherent and aligned with the wider United Nations and include appropriate strategic partnerships based on the comparative advantage of WFP in the country?					
1.3.1 Coherence and strategic alignment of the CSP with UNSDP.	1.3.1.1 What specific result areas of the United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership (UNSDP) 2018–2022 was the CSP aligned to? 1.3.1.2 How was CSP alignment to UNSDP consistent with WFP comparative advantage in Ghana?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSP outcomes and activities are linked to relevant UNSDP 2018–2022 outcomes. • Evidence of CSP priorities and principles of United Nations in Ghana 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents linking CSP to UNSDP: UNSDCF document, joint work plans, joint programming, joint reports, minutes of UNSDP coordination structures. • Key informants: WFP staff and other United Nations agencies (RCO, the International Fund for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive document review. • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative iterative data analysis of KIIs with stakeholders. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency of WFP contribution to UNSDP with its comparative advantage in Ghana. • Stakeholder perceptions of WFP CSP synergy and linkages with other United Nations agencies. 	Agricultural Development (IFAD), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the World Health Organization (WHO)).		
1.3.2 Strategic partnerships.	<p>1.3.2.1 How appropriate was the WFP partnership strategy as articulated in the CSP?</p> <p>1.3.2.3 How were strategic partnerships informed by the comparative advantage of WFP in Ghana?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of WFP strategic partnerships established during CSP. • Degree of appropriateness of the strategic partnerships in relation to evidence of actual WFP comparative advantage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key documents: CSP and documentation of CSP design process; mapping of existing partnerships. • Key informants: WFP staff, other United Nations agencies, government institutions (MoFA, MoGCSP, GHS, NADMO, FDA, NDPC), private sector, agriculture donor partner and donor partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive document review. • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative iterative data analysis of KIIs with stakeholders. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
1.4: To what extent is the CSP design internally coherent and based on a clear theory of change articulating the WFP role and contributions in a realistic manner and based on its comparative advantages as defined in the WFP strategic plan?					
1.4.1 Internal coherence of CSP design.	<p>1.4.1.1 How were CSP activities under different SOs interlinked and harmonized?</p> <p>1.4.1.2 To what extent does the CSP design allow for activities in one SO to contribute to other SOs?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree of synergy and harmonization between CSP activities under different SOs. • Evidence of activities under one SO contributing to other SOs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key documents: CSP document and implementation plans. • Key informant interviews with WFP country office staff, CSP implementing organizations and service providers. • Beneficiaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents. • Key informant interviews. • In-depth interviews with beneficiaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative iterative data analysis of KIIs with stakeholders. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
1.4.2 Clarity and appropriateness of CSP theory of change.	<p>1.4.2.1 Does the CSP ToC have appropriate results logic with defined assumptions?</p> <p>1.4.2.2 How did the ToC inform overall CSP design?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of appropriateness of the results logic and assumptions of CSP ToC. • Degree of appropriateness of the role of WFP and other stakeholders in ToC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key documents: CSP document, line of sight, logical framework, documentation on CSP preparation and reconstructed ToC. • Key informants: WFP staff, government institutions (MoFA, MoGCSP, GHS, FDA, NADMO); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive review of documents. • Key informant interviews. • In-depth interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review identifying iterative themes on CSP ToC. • Qualitative iterative data analysis of KIIs with stakeholders. • Triangulation between data sources, data

	1.4.2.3 How is the WFP role defined in the ToC and is this role realistic given the comparative advantage of WFP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders' perceptions of the appropriateness of CSP ToC and roles of key stakeholders. 	Implementing CSOs and private sector organizations, donors, partners and beneficiaries.	with beneficiaries.	collection techniques and data types.
1.4.3 WFP comparative advantage.	1.4.3.1 How is the WFP comparative advantage reflected in CSP SOs, activities and implementation modalities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of CSP considering the WFP comparative advantage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key documents: CSP and documentation on CSP design process. Key informants: WFP staff, other United Nations agencies (RCO, IFAD, FAO, UNICEF, WHO) government institutions (MoFA, MoGCSP, GHS, FDA, NADMO), donor partners, private sector and NGOs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive review of documents. Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative iterative data analysis of KIIs with stakeholders. Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
1.5: To what extent has WFP strategic positioning remained relevant throughout the implementation of the CSP considering changing context, national capacities and needs? – in particular in response to the COVID-19 pandemic?					
1.5.1: Adaption to changes in national governance, policies and priorities.	<p>1.5.1.1 How did WFP adapt to changes in policies and/or government requests during CSP implementation?</p> <p>1.5.1.2 How timely and adequate was the WFP response to changes in national context?</p> <p>1.5.1.3 What was the effect of the WFP response to national context changes on CSP design and implementation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree to which WFP implementation plans and budget were responsive to evolving national policies, priorities and specific government requests. Evidence of adjustments to CSP in response to emerging needs of government. Timeliness and adequacy of WFP response to changes in national context. Effect of WFP response on CSP design and implementation. Stakeholders' perceptions of WFP positioning as being appropriate and aligned to national priorities and partner landscape 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key documents: national development policy, strategy and plans, CSP budget revisions and budget adjustments, implementation plans and annual reports. Key informants: WFP country office staff; government officials (MoFA, MoGCSP, GHS, NADMO, FDA); and donor partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive review of documents. Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative iterative data analysis of KIIs with stakeholders. Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.

		throughout implementation period.			
1.5.2 WFP relevance to changing national capacities.	<p>1.5.2.1 How did WFP adapt to changes in national capacities during CSP implementation?</p> <p>1.5.2.2 How timely and adequate was the WFP response to national capacities?</p> <p>1.5.2.3 What was the effect of the WFP response to changes in national capacities on CSP design and implementation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree to which WFP implementation plans and budgets were adjusted in response to changing capacity needs of government institutions. • Timeliness and adequacy of WFP response to changes in national capacities. • Effect of the WFP response on CSP design and implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key documents: CSP budget revisions and budget adjustments, implementation plans and annual reports. • Key informants: WFP country office staff; government institutions (MoFA, MoGCSP, GHS, NADMO, FDA, other United Nations agencies (RCO, IFAD, FAO, WHO) and donor partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive review of documents. • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative iterative data analysis of KIIs with stakeholders. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
1.5.3 WFP relevance to needs of vulnerable populations.	<p>1.5.2.1 How did WFP adapt to changes in needs of targeted populations and institutions during CSP implementation?</p> <p>1.5.2.2 How timely and adequate was the WFP response?</p> <p>1.5.2.3 What was the effect of the WFP response on CSP design and implementation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of continuous adjustments to WFP plans and budgets in response to changing needs of vulnerable populations. • Timeliness and adequacy of WFP response to changes in needs. • Effect of the WFP response on CSP design and implementation. • Stakeholders' and beneficiaries' perceptions of flexibility of WFP to address emerging needs of beneficiaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key documents: CSP budget revisions and budget adjustments, implementation plans and annual reports. • Key informants: WFP country office staff; government institutions (MoFA, MoGCSP, GHS, NADMO, FDA); private sector, NGOs; and donor partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive review of documents. • Key informant interviews. • In-depth interviews with beneficiaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative iterative data analysis of KIIs with stakeholders. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
1.5.4 WFP relevance in light of the COVID-19 pandemic.	<p>1.5.4.1 How did WFP adapt to the COVID-19 pandemic during CSP implementation?</p> <p>1.5.2.2 How timely and adequate was the WFP response to the COVID-19 pandemic?</p> <p>1.5.2.3 What was the effect of the WFP response to the COVID-19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of adjustments made to CSP implementation plans and budgets in response to assessments of evolving COVID-19 pandemic context and effects on vulnerable populations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key documents: CSP budget revisions and budget adjustments, implementation plans, annual reports, COVID-19 assessments and monitoring reports. • Key informants: WFP country office staff; government institutions (MoFA, MoGCSP, GHS, NADMO, FDA); Private sector, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive review of documents. • Key informant interviews. • In-depth interviews with beneficiaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.

	pandemic on CSP design and implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions of the appropriateness of implementation adjustments made by WFP in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. 	NGOs, other United Nations agencies (RCO, IFAD, FAO, WHO), donor partners and beneficiaries.		
Evaluation Question 2: What is the extent and quality of the specific contribution of WFP to the country strategic plan strategic outcomes in Ghana?					
2.1 To what extent did WFP activities and outputs contribute to the expected outcomes of the CSP and to the UNSDP? Were there any unintended outcomes, positive or negative?					
2.1.1 Achievement of planned outputs.	<p>2.1.1.1 To what extent have planned CSP output targets been achieved?</p> <p>2.1.1.2 What were the reasons for over or underachievement of output targets?</p> <p>2.1.1.3 What activities were implemented and how did they lead to the achieved CSP output targets?</p> <p>2.1.1.4 Which institution played what role in implementation of the activities?</p> <p>2.1.1.5 To what extent did the CSP assumptions hold true and how did this affect the achievement of CSP outputs?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proportion of output targets achieved. Number and proportion of beneficiaries reached compared to planned (disaggregated by gender, age, district etc). Evidence of activities leading to achieved output targets. Roles of various institutions in activity implementation. Evidence of country capacity strengthening (CCS) activities and outputs achieved. Evidence on whether CSP assumptions remained as expected and how they contributed to realization of outputs. Perceptions of stakeholders regarding CSP output as having been achieved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents: logical framework, implementation plans, mid-year and annual review reports, annual country reports, decentralized evaluation reports, and quantitative data on output indicator baselines, targets and results achieved. Key informant interviews with WFP country office and sub-office staff; government institutions at national level (MoFA, GHS, MoGCSP, NADMO, FDA, School Feeding (SF) Secretariat); government representatives at regional and district levels; private sector, NGOs, staff service delivery points (health facilities, schools), food retailers and processors, beneficiaries, and donor partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and analysis of WFP data. Key informant interviews. In-depth interviews. Site visits and observation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantitative analysis of CSP monitoring data. ToC analysis and contribution analysis tracing activities to results. Qualitative iterative data analysis. Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
2.1.2 Progress towards CSP	2.1.2.1 To what extent were CSP outcome targets achieved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree to which outcome targets have been achieved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review and WFP strategic outcome data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive review of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantitative analysis of CSP monitoring data.

strategic outcomes.	<p>2.1.2.2 How were outputs utilized to contribute to CSP outcomes?</p> <p>2.1.2.3 What accounts for any unintended (positive or negative) outcomes?</p> <p>2.1.2.4 To what extent did the CSP assumptions hold true and how did they affect the contribution to CSP outcomes?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of utilizing outputs to contribute to CSP outcomes. • Evidence of any unintended outcomes. • Evidence of improved access to, and quality and availability of, nutritious food. • Evidence of improved post-harvest food handling, processing and linkages to markets. • Evidence that capacity-strengthening interventions created observable change in government institutions to deliver their mandates. • Evidence of strengthened food and nutrition policy environment. • Evidence of how assumptions affected the contribution to CSP outcomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with WFP staff, government institutions at national level (MoFA, GHS, MoGCSP, NADMO, FDA, SF Secretariat), government representatives at regional and district level, private sector, NGOs, staff service delivery points, food retailers and processors, beneficiaries, and donor partners. 	<p>documents, quantitative analysis of WFP data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informant interviews. • In-depth interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ToC analysis and contribution analysis linking outputs to outcomes. • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
	2.1.2.5 To what extent have the WFP nutrition-sensitive activities contributed to strengthening resilience of systems and communities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of nutrition-sensitive activities contributing to building community and institutional resilience. • Stakeholders' perceptions of the extent to which nutrition activities have contributed to resilience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informant interviews: WFP country office staff, government partners, NGO implementers, private sector and beneficiaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ToC linking WFP activities and outputs to UNSDP outcomes. • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
2.1.3 WFP contribution to UNSDP 2018–2022.	<p>2.1.3.1 What type of contribution did CSP make to UNSDP and in what results area?</p> <p>2.1.3.2 In what ways did WFP collaborate with other United</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree to which WFP contributed to UNSDP outcomes. • Evidence of WFP collaboration with other 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key documents including UNSDP document, joint work plans and reports, UNSDP evaluation report. • Interviews with WFP country office staff, RCO, UNICEF, FAO, IFAD, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive review of documents. • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ToC linking WFP activities and outputs to UNSDP outcomes. • Qualitative iterative data analysis.

	Nations agencies to contribute to UNSDP collective results?	United Nations agencies to deliver UNSDP.	WHO and other United Nations agencies.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
2.2 To what extent did WFP contribute to the achievement of cross-cutting aims (humanitarian principles, protection including attention to PSEA, accountability to affected populations, gender, equity and inclusion, environment, climate change and other issues as relevant)?					
2.2.1 WFP country office accountability to affected populations (AAP).	<p>2.2.1.1 To what extent have targets for accountability to affected populations been achieved?</p> <p>2.2.1.2 How has the accountability system in place contributed to the achieved results?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree of achievement of accountability to affected population targets. • Evidence of integration of mechanisms to ensure AAP mechanisms in programme planning and implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents: WFP corporate guidance on AAP, AAP monitoring data, reports on client feedback and complaints handling, and annual country reports (ACRs). • Key informant interviews with WFP staff, cooperating partners (government and non-government), staff at service delivery points and beneficiaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive review of documents. • Key informant interviews. • In-depth interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative analysis of WFP AAP monitoring data. • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
2.2.2 WFP country office protection of affected populations including attention to PSEA.	<p>2.2.2.1 To what extent have targets for protection of affected populations been achieved?</p> <p>2.2.2.2 How has the protection mechanism in place contributed to the achieved results?</p> <p>2.2.2.3 To what extent has the country office Ghana ensured the integration of protection of affected populations including attention to PSEA in its programmes?</p> <p>2.2.2.4 To what extent has WFP engaged with broader dialogue on PSEA with other United Nations country team (UNCT) members?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of achievement of planned targets about protection of affected population targets. • Evidence of use of the protection mechanism in line with WFP guidance. • Evidence of integration of PSEA into programme planning, implementation and monitoring. • Evidence that country office staff and partners are aware of PSEA guidance and can follow it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents: WFP corporate policy and guidance on protection and PSEA, WFP country office protection monitoring data, annual country reports and reports on adherence to the protection mechanisms. • Key informant interviews with WFP staff, cooperating partners (government and non-government), staff at service delivery points and beneficiaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive review of documents. • Key informant interviews. • In-depth interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative analysis of WFP monitoring data. • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
2.2.3 WFP country office contribution to environmental protection.	<p>2.2.3.1 To what extent have targets for environmental protection been achieved?</p> <p>2.2.3.2 How have the strategies for environmental protection contributed to the achieved results?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree of achievement of environmental protection targets. • Evidence of integration of environmental protection strategies into programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents: WFP corporate environmental protection guidance, environmental sustainability monitoring data, annual country reports and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive review of documents, quantitative analysis of WFP data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative analysis of WFP monitoring data. • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data

		planning, implementation and monitoring.	documentation on environmental sustainability strategies. • Key informant interviews with WFP staff, cooperating partners (government and non-government), staff at service delivery points and beneficiaries.	• Key informant interviews. • In-depth interviews.	collection techniques and data types.
2.2.4 WFP country office contribution to gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE).	2.2.3.1 To what extent have targets for GEWE been achieved? 2.2.2.2 What GEWE strategies, approaches and activities contributed to the achieved targets? 2.2.2.3 To what extent did WFP country office and cooperating partners develop capacity in implementing GEWE strategies?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of GEWE targets achieved. • Evidence of gender analysis and mainstreaming into programme planning, implementation and monitoring. • Evidence of capacity developed for WFP country office staff and partners in GEWE. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents: WFP corporate gender policy, national gender policy and action plan, GEWE monitoring data, annual country reports and documentation on GEWE strategies. • Key informant interviews with WFP staff, cooperating partners (government and non-government), staff at service delivery points and beneficiaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive review of documents, quantitative analysis of WFP data. • Key informant interviews. • In-depth interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative analysis of WFP monitoring data. • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
2.2.5 WFP country office adherence to humanitarian principles and access.	2.2.5.1 How did WFP country office ensure adherence to corporate humanitarian principles and access in its support to the national response to COVID-19 pandemic? 2.2.5.2 Were relevant WFP partners aware of, and did they adhere to, the humanitarian principles?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of integration of humanitarian principles and access into programme planning, implementation and monitoring. • Evidence of WFP country office awareness and adherence to humanitarian principles in its support for national COVID-19 response. • Evidence of awareness and application of humanitarian principles by WFP partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant documents including training reports, partner contracts. • Key informant interviews with WFP staff and WFP cooperating partners of the support for the response to COVID-19 pandemic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informant interviews. • Document review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
2.2.6 Climate change mainstreaming in the CSP.	2.2.6.1 How did WFP mainstream climate change adaptation strategies in its activities? 2.2.6.2 What were the results of the climate change adaptation activities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of integration of climate change adaptation in programme planning and implementation. • Results achieved due to this integration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of the climate change adaptation activities implemented and data on results achieved, annual country reports. • Key informant interviews with WFP staff, government cooperating partners, non-government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive review of documents. • Key informant interviews. • In-depth interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.

			cooperating partners and targeted beneficiaries of climate change adaptation activities.		
2.2.7 Country capacity strengthening contribution to CSP results and enhanced country office enabler role.	2.2.7.1 Were the CCS activities based on an understanding of existing capacity gaps? 2.2.7.2 Have the CCS activities filled the capacity gaps? 2.2.7.3 How have CSS activities contributed to achievement of CSP outputs? 2.2.7.3 How has CCS contributed to WFP positioning as an enabler?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of capacity gap analysis informing CCS activities. Degree to which CCS activities contributed to achievement of CSP outputs. Evidence of CCS playing a role in WFP country office positioning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key documents: implementation plans, annual country reports, corporate CCS strategy or framework, documentation on CCS needs identification and activity implementation. Key informants: WFP country office staff, government institutions (GHS, MoGCSP, FDA, NADMO, MoFA, SF Secretariat); donor partners and private sector. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive review of documents. Key informant interviews. In-depth interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative iterative data analysis. Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
2.2.8 Role of CCS in enhancing food security.	2.2.8.1 What CCS activities were carried out in relation to improving food security? 2.2.8.1 What specific contributions did these activities make towards enhancing food security?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Types of CCS activities carried out and targeted populations and institutions. Evidence of how CCS activities have strengthened food systems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key documents: implementation plans, annual country reports, corporate CCS strategy or framework, documentation on CCS needs identification and activity implementation. Key informants: WFP country office staff, government institutions (GHS, MoGCSP, FDA, NADMO, MoFA, SF Secretariat), donor partners and private sector. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive review of documents. Key informant interviews. In-depth interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative iterative data analysis. Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
2.2.9 CSP mainstreaming social inclusion and disability.	2.2.9.1 How was social inclusion and disability integrated into CSP delivery modalities and monitoring system?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of analysis and reflection of social inclusion in identification and targeting of vulnerable populations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key documents: CSP and documentation of CSP design process, CSP results framework, monitoring data, ACRs, implementers' reports, beneficiary data. Key informants including WFP country office staff, government institutions, NGO implementers, other United Nations agencies and donor partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive review of documents. Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative iterative data analysis. Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.

2.3 To what extent are the achievements of the CSP likely to be sustainable, in particular from a financial, social, institutional and environmental perspective?

<p>2.3.1 The Government of Ghana (GoG) funding for the CSP.</p>	<p>2.3.1.1 Are programmes to which WFP contributes likely to be incorporated into government policies, strategic frameworks and budgets?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of changes in government policies and priorities on school feeding, food security, nutrition and social protection that can sustain CSP results. • Evidence of progress towards integration of country office food assistance interventions into government social protection programme. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review: government policies, strategies and budget plans on school feeding, social protection, agriculture and food security and nutrition. • Key informants: WFP staff and senior government officials in MoFA, MoGCSP, GHS, FDA, NADMO and the National Development Planning Commission (NDPC). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents. • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
<p>2.3.2 Community capacity building and ownership sustaining CSP results.</p>	<p>2.3.2.1 Is the capacity built among targeted populations likely to contribute to sustainability of CSP gains? 2.3.2.2 Is there adequate ownership of WFP programmes among targeted populations?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of capacities built among targeted populations (smallholder farmers, adolescents, pregnant and lactating women (PLW)). • Evidence of community engagement in planning and implementation of WFP programmes. • Perceptions of community/ farmer representatives on sustainability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with WFP staff, government cooperating partners, NGOs, service providers and beneficiaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
<p>2.3.3 Targeted institutions sustaining CSP results.</p>	<p>2.3.3.1 What is the likelihood of institutional capacity building contributing to sustainability of CSP results?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of institutional capacity in place to sustain CSP achievements. • Examples of institutional ownership of CSP achievements through institutional plans). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with WFP staff, institutions supported by WFP for capacity building: FDA, GHS, NADMO, MoFA, MoGCSP, SF secretariat, food processors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
<p>2.3.4 Sustainability of gains made in environment.</p>	<p>2.3.4.1 What is the likelihood of target populations sustaining environment technologies and practices adopted by the CSP? 2.3.4.2 What is the likelihood of WFP-supported environment sustainability technologies and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beneficiary perceptions of environmental technologies and practices. • Evidence of integration of environmental protection technologies and practices into government plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with WFP staff, key government institutions: MoFA, MoGCSP and NADMO and beneficiaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informant interviews. • In-depth interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.

	practices being integrated into government programmes?				
2.4: To what extent did the CSP facilitate more strategic linkages between humanitarian action, development cooperation and, where appropriate, contribute to peace?					
2.4.1 Linkages between humanitarian, development and peace nexus were strengthened.	2.4.1 What actions were taken to strengthen linkages between humanitarian, development and peace nexus? 2.4.1.2 What are the results of these actions?	Extent to which the CSP makes clear linkages between humanitarian–development and peace nexus in programming and implementation of activities. Evidence of WFP country office collaborating with other partners to enhance connectedness between humanitarian–development and peace nexus. Extent to which WFP country office addresses root causes of food insecurity and malnutrition.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents: CSP implementation plans and progress reports. Interviews with WFP staff, other United Nations agencies (RCO, IFAD, FAO, WHO, UNICEF), donor partners and government institutions (MoFA, GHS, MoGCSP, NADMO, FDA, SF Secretariat). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents. Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative iterative data analysis. Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
Evaluation Question 3: To what extent has WFP used its resources efficiently in contributing to CSP outputs and strategic outputs and strategic outcomes?					
3.1: To what extent were outputs delivered within the intended time frame?					
3.1.1 Timeliness in CSP implementation.	3.1.1.1 Which outputs were delivered within expected timeframe and which ones were not? 3.1.1.2 What factors determined timely delivery of outputs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proportion of WFP interventions and outputs delivered on schedule. Degree to which activities were delivered as planned. Stakeholder perceptions that activity implementation is timely and appropriate to context requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents: CSP results framework, annual performance plans, performance review reports, ACRs, annual budget reports. Key informants: WFP country office staff, cooperating partners and donor partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents. Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative iterative data analysis. Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Factors hindering or facilitating timely delivery of outputs. 			
3.2: To what extent does the depth and breadth of coverage ensure that the most vulnerable to food insecurity benefit from the programme?					
3.2.1 Appropriateness of CSP coverage and targeting.	<p>3.2.1.1 How appropriate were the criteria used by the CSP for geographical and population targeting?</p> <p>3.2.1.2 What trade-offs were made in the CSP between coverage and targeting against available capacity and resources?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate criteria are in place and are used to ensure targeting and coverage of activities is justified, realistic and aligned to operating environment. • Targeting and coverage of activities reflects the recommended standard procedures and criteria. • Degree of trade-offs made between CSP coverage and targeting relative to need. • Evidence of involvement of communities in the targeting process. • Degree to which targeting is aligned with interventions of other actors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents: CSP activity map, documentation on CSP geographical coverage and beneficiaries, financial data. • Key informants: WFP staff, senior government officials, and donor partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents. • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
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 CSP?					
4.1: To what extent has WFP been able to mobilize adequate, timely, predictable and flexible resources to finance the CSP?					
4.1.1 Adequacy of CSP funding.	<p>4.1.1.1 How effective was the WFP country office resource mobilization strategy?</p> <p>4.1.1.2 What was the implication of the funding gap on CSP results?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of application of a resource mobilization strategy. • Evidence of actions taken by the country office to raise funds from donors and other sources. • Percentage of funds mobilized relative to needs-based plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents: needs-based plan including all budget revisions, CSP implementation plan, data on funds mobilized. • Key informants: WFP country office staff and government institutions and non-government implementers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents. • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative data analysis of funds mobilized. • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.

4.1.2 Timeliness and predictability of financial resources.	4.1.2.1 Were donor funds received as per schedule and in expected amounts? 4.1.2.2 What were the reasons for any delays in timely and predictable disbursement of donor funds? 4.1.2.3 What was the effect of any issues in timeliness and predictability in funds disbursement on achievement of CSP results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of funds received as per schedule. • Proportion of funds received in expected amount. • Factors facilitating or hindering timely and predictable funding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents: fund disbursement schedules, financial data on funds received. • Key informants: WFP country office staff, donor partners, WFP cooperating partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents. • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative data analysis of receipt of funds from donors. • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
4.1.3 Effect of funding flexibility on achievement of CSP results.	4.1.3.1 What proportion of funding was earmarked and unrestricted? 4.1.3.1 How did earmarking and unrestricted funding affect achievement of CSP results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of earmarked and unrestricted funds. • Evidence of effects of earmarked and unrestricted funding on CSP implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents: financial data on unrestricted earmarked funding, CSP implementation plans and ACRs. • Key informants: WFP country office staff and donor partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents. • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative data analysis of earmarked and unrestricted funds. • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.

4.2: To what extent were the monitoring and reporting systems useful to track and demonstrate progress towards expected outcomes and to inform management decisions?

4.2.1 Robustness and usefulness of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems	4.2.1.1: What percentage of CSP outputs, outcomes and cross-cutting indicators have relevant baseline data, targets and results? 4.2.1.2: What evidence is there of a robust monitoring system that can provide reliable data? 4.2.1.3: What evidence is there that monitoring data has been used to inform management decisions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of CSP output, outcome and cross-cutting indicators with complete data. • Evidence of monitoring and reporting systems in place. • Evidence of use of monitoring data and reports to inform management decisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents: CSP logical framework, monitoring and reporting plan and tools, monitoring data, ACRs, minutes of management meetings. • Key informants: WFP country office staff and implementing organizations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents. • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative analysis of monitoring data. • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
---	---	--	---	---	---

4.3: How did the partnerships and collaborations with other actors influence performance and results?

<p>4.3.1 Influence of partnerships and collaborations on CSP performance and results.</p>	<p>4.3.1.1 How did the selection of partners influence CSP performance and results?</p> <p>4.3.1.2 What is the evidence of specific CSP results influenced by WFP partnerships and collaborations?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existence and use of WFP partnership strategy. • Evidence of results and added value of WFP country office partnership and collaboration with other actors. • Stakeholder perceptions of partnerships established for implementation of CSO and extent to which they consider them as critical for achievement of results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents: CSP implementation plans and reports, Memorandums of understanding (MoUs) with partners, documentation on collaborations (e.g. MoUs with partners, joint work plans). • Key informant interviews: WFP staff, cooperating partners, government ministries and other institutions, private sector and CSOs, agriculture development partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents. • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
<p>4.3.2 Extent to which WFP partnerships with private sector contributed to strengthening food systems.</p>	<p>4.3.2.1 What specific aspects of food systems did WFP partnership with private sector focus on?</p> <p>4.3.2.2 How did this partnership strengthen the specific aspects of food systems?</p> <p>4.3.2.3 What are the opportunities for WFP-private sector partnership to enhance food systems.</p> <p>4.3.2.4 What challenges did such partnerships face in strengthening food systems?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific aspects of food systems that are the focus of WFP-private sector partnership. • Evidence of how this partnership strengthened food systems. • Types of opportunities for WFP-private sector partnerships that can enhance food systems. • Types of challenges facing WFP-private sector partnerships. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents: CSP implementation plans and reports, MoUs with partners, documentation on collaborations. • Key informant interviews: WFP staff, cooperating partners, government ministries and other institutions, private sector and CSOs, agriculture development partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents. • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
<p>4.4: To what extent did the country office have appropriate human resources (HR) capacity to deliver on the CSP?</p>					
<p>4.4.1 Adequate human resources for CSP.</p>	<p>4.4.1.1 What measures did the WFP country office take to align human resources to the CSP?</p> <p>4.4.1.2 What changes took place in the WFP country office staffing during T-ICSP and CSP period?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which the WFP country office staffing is adequate (in terms of numbers and skills). • Evidence of measures taken to align staffing to the CSP requirements. • Evidence of other measures taken to complement staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents: HR data, external technical assistance data (consultants), staff development data. • Key informant interviews: WFP staff and cooperating partners (government, private sector and NGOs). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents. • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative staffing data. • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.

	<p>4.4.1.3 What measures did the WFP country office take to adapt its human resources to its strategic shifts?</p> <p>4.4.1.4 How did the WFP country office make use of external technical support to enhance its human resources capacity?</p>	<p>capacity (technical advisor (TA) and regional or headquarters support) and the contribution of these measures.</p>			
<p>4.4.2 Adaptation of human resources capacity to enabler role of WFP in Ghana.</p>	<p>4.4.2.1 What specific actions were taken to adapt the human resources skills, knowledge, overall orientation towards the country office enabler role?</p> <p>4.4.2.2 What have been the successes of these actions?</p> <p>4.4.2.3 What are the challenges/bottlenecks hindering staff from adapting to the country office enabler role?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Types of actions taken to orient and adapt human resources to the enabler role. • Evidence of what has been achieved. • Evidence of challenges in adapting staff to the enabler role. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents: reports of staff capacity assessment, training undertaken. • Key informant interviews: WFP country office staff, government partners, NGOs and private sector partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents. • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.
<p>4.5: What are the other factors that can explain WFP performance and the extent to which it has made the strategic shift expected by the country strategic plan?</p>					
<p>4.5.1 Realization of expected strategic shifts.</p>	<p>4.5.1.1 How did the country office implement expected strategic shifts including shifts from food assistance to an enabling role, direct service delivery to capacity strengthening?</p> <p>4.5.1.2 How have the strategic shifts influenced achievement of CSP results?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which the country office has made strategic shifts expected under CSP and contribution of these shifts to WFP performance. • Evidence of internal factors contributing to or hindering WFP performance e.g. country office decision making processes, staffing, organizational structure, financial and technical resources etc. • Evidence of external factors contributing to or hindering WFP performance e.g. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents: CSP implementation plans and reports. • Key informant interviews: WFP staff, senior government officials, other United Nations agencies and donor partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents. • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.

		political, policy, socio-economic etc.			
	4.5.1.3 How successful has WFP country office been in transitioning from food aid to food assistance?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of realization of the strategic shift from food aid to food assistance. • Evidence that targeted vulnerable populations have continued to benefit from food security and nutrition (FSN) intervention with the shift to food assistance. • Challenges in shifting from food assistance to food aid. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents: CSP implementation plans and reports. • Key informant interviews: WFP staff, senior government officials, other United Nations agencies and donor partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents. • Key informant interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative iterative data analysis. • Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques and data types.

Annex V: Data collection tools

Semi-structured interview guides

30. Semi-structured guides were used to collect qualitative information related to relevant evaluation sub-questions from various key informants. The questions were intended to guide the key informant on the issues to be discussed. This ensured that the data collected by each team member responded to the indicators, lines of inquiry and dimensions of analysis of the evaluation matrix. Being semi-structured, the tools provided flexibility for the evaluator to ask probing questions depending on how the key informant responded. The evaluation team contextualized the questions to the direction of the discussion, but the guide ensured that all critical issues were covered. In-depth interview guides were also used to collect data from beneficiaries. These were also tailored to the category of beneficiary. The data collection tools are presented below.

Table 4: Semi-structured interview guide for WFP country office staff

Evaluation question	Key informant interview guiding questions
1.1: To what extent was the CSP informed by existing evidence on the hunger challenges, the food security and nutrition issues prevailing in the country to ensure its relevance at design stage?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What evidence on hunger challenges, food security and nutrition did you use in designing the CSP? (determining issues to be addressed, outcomes, activities, geographical locations, target populations and their needs, setting targets etc) •How was the evidence reflected in the CSP design (outcomes and activities)? •Was the evidence adequate – were there data gaps or important issues that did not have solid evidence? Was data up to date? •Do you have evidence of the data analysis that was done to inform CSP design?
1.2.1 Alignment of CSP to national policies and plans	<p>Questions tailored to the respective strategic outcome</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Which national policies is the CSP aligned to and how? Are there any challenges in aligning the CSP to these policies? •Which national plans is the CSP aligned to and how? Are there any challenges in aligning to these plans?
1.2.2 Alignment of CSP to sustainable development goals (SDGs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Which SDGs is the CSP aligned to? •How is the CSP assisting government effort to achieve these two SDGs? •Any challenges in assisting government efforts in attaining the SDGs?
1.3.1 Coherence and strategic alignment of the CSP with UNSDP	<p>NOTE THIS QUESTION CAN EASILY LEAD TO A DISCUSSION OF WFP CONTRIBUTION TO UNSDP RESULTS UNDER EFFECTIVENESS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How was the CSP aligned to the UNSDP? Which specific UNSDP outcome did was the CSP designed to contribute to? •How is the CSP aligned to the UNSDP cross-cutting areas and overall UN programming principles (in a LMIC country) •Was the CSP developed before or after the UNSDP? If before, how did you ensure alignment to UNSDP?
1.3.2 How is WFP partnering with other UN agencies to deliver CSP?	<p>In the context of delivering as one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How is WFP partnering with other UN agencies to deliver what is in CSP? (Assuming what is in CSP is aligned to UNSDP) •What roles is WFP playing in the UNSDP coordination structures? •Going forwards how can CSP enable WFP to strengthen partnership with other UN agencies
1.4.1 Internal coherence of CSP design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How does the CSP design enhance coherence across outcomes and activities? •Are there any gaps or issues with the coherence of the CSP?
1.4.2 Clarity and appropriateness of CSP theory of change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •In your view, was the CSP based on a well-defined theory of change? Are WFP roles clear? •What are the weaknesses of the TOC?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What could be improved in the way the CSP defines the ToC in the future?
1.4.3 Extent to which CSP design takes into account on WFP comparative advantage?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What is the comparative advantage of WFP in Ghana? •How is the CSP aligned to or taking into account this comparative advantage? •Any areas of WFP comparative advantage that could be better exploited?
1.5.1: Adaption to changes in national governance, policies and priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What changes in government policy or priorities took place during CSP implementation? •What new (unplanned) government requests were made during implementation? •How did WFP response to these?
1.5.2 Extent to which WFP relevance was maintained in light of changing national capacities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What changes took place in government or institutions capacity to address FSN? •How did WFP adjust CSP to response to such changes?
1.5.3 Extent to which WFP relevance was maintained in light of needs of vulnerable populations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How did WFP respond to any changes in needs of beneficiaries? Which were these changes and what adjustments were made to CSP? •How timely was WFP response? •How adequate was WFP response?
1.5.4 Extent to which WFP relevance was maintained in light of COVID-19 pandemic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What adjustments were made to the CSP to response to COVID-19? •How timely and adequate funded was the response to COVID-19?
2.1.1 Level of achievement of planned outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Why were some output targets achieved, over-achieved or under-achieved? •What activities were implemented to achieve specific outputs?
2.1.2 Extent of achievement or progress towards CSP strategic outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How were outputs utilized to contribute to respective outcomes? (Reference to each SO outcomes) •Any assumptions and risks affected achievement of CSP outcomes? •Were there any unintended results achieved? •Given the FSN context in Ghana, are there FSN issues related to each CSP SO that were not adequately addressed or could be better addressed?
2.1.3 Extent of WFP contribution to UNSDP 2018–2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How did WFP contribute to UNSDP outcome results? What specific contributions did WFP make? •How were these contributions made? – joint programmes, joint implementation, collaboration etc.
2.2 To what extent did WFP contribute to achievement of cross-cutting aims? 2.2.1 AAP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What mechanisms were put in place to ensure WFP was AAP during design, implementation and monitoring/reporting of programmes/ activities? •How well did this system work? What are the key achievements? •What were the challengers in ensuring AAP?
2.2.2 Protection including PSEA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What mechanism was put in place to protect affected populations? How well did this mechanism work? (especially in CBTs) •What measures were taken to ensure PSEA in programme activities and at the CO? •What were the key achievements? •What challenges did you face in protection of affected populations and PSEA?
2.2.3 Environment protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How did WFP CO deploy to integrate environment protection into its activities? •What environment protection measures were taken within WFP operations/ internally? •What were the key achievements? •What challenges did you face?
2.2.4 GEWE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How did the WFP CO integrate gender into the CSP at design stage? Why was the CSP given a GAM of 3? What aspects were missing? •How did CO integrate gender into CSP (under each SO) during implementation? How did this contribute to GEWE? •How did the WFP CO integrate gender into CSP M&E system? •How did WFP CO ensure partners integrate gender into their activities?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What was done to improve WFP CO and partners' capacity to integrate gender into CSP activities? •What challenges did you face in ensuring GEWE?
2.2.5 Humanitarian principles and access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How did you ensure adherence to WFP humanitarian principles and access? (humanity, impartiality, neutrality) •Did you face any challenges in implementing these principles? Which ones?
2.2.6 Climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How were climate change adaptation strategies integrated into the CSP? •To what effect? •Any challenges in integrating climate change adaption strategies?
2.2.7 Social inclusion and disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How does the CSP integrate marginalized populations including disability? •Was there specific analysis of FSN vulnerabilities among these populations? •What are the key achievements? •What are the challenges in ensuring social inclusion and disability?
2.2.8 Country capacity strengthening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country capacity strengthening – to what extent has CCS helped position WFP as an enabler? How well as this worked? • What did not work well? • How is the approach for CCS going forward?
2.2.8 (a) role of CCS in enhancing food security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What CCS activities were carried in relation to improving food security? • What specific contributions did these activities make towards enhancing food security?
3.1.1 Timeliness in CSP implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What outputs were delivered on time/ as planned? What accounts for timely delivery in terms of implementation strategies, approaches, processes, funding, capacity, partnerships etc.? •What outputs were not delivered as planned? What accounts for delayed delivery? How did this affect overall achievement of CSP outcomes? •Did COVID-19 affect implementation? What measures were taken to ensure timely implementation/ delivery of outputs?
3.2.1 Appropriateness of CSP coverage and targeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How the total NBP was arrived? What is the process of selecting targeted populations? •How did you select beneficiary when you had less funds – e.g. reaching more with less •How did you choose the level assessed need covered by the CSP in light of not having all required financial resources? In terms of geographical and target population coverage. •Did you make any trade-offs to optimize targeting and coverage? If so, which ones? •How did you ensure the target population covered was the one most in need?
4.1.1 Adequacy of CSP funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How did you mobilize resources for the CSP? How successful were you? And why? •What bottlenecks did you face in mobilising financial resources?
4.1.2 Timeliness and predictability of financial resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What was the influence of multiyear and non-multiyear funding on the planning for and implementing the CSP? What could you do or not do due to multi-year or non-multi-year funding •What factors contributed to CO receipt of donor funds on time? And what contributed to delayed donor disbursements? •How did this affect CSP implementation? •What factors contributed to receipt of expected amounts? And what hindered disbursement of expected amounts? •How did this affect CSP implementation?
4.1.3 Effect of funding flexibility on achievement of CSP results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How did earmarking of funds influence/affect CSP implementation and achievement of CSP results (outputs and outcomes) •How did earmarking influence your choice of priorities? E.g. target populations, geographical coverage, etc. •How did unrestricted funds influence/ affect CSP implementation and achievement of CSP results (outputs and outcomes)? •Do you have any challenges with any of the two modes of funding?
4.2.1 Robustness and usefulness of M&E systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •To what extent was M&E data available in a timely manner? •To what extent was M&E data complete and reliable? •What are the key issues related to M&E systems (for CSP, projects, cross-cutting issues etc)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What is the evidence that M&E data was used to make management decisions? •What are the issues with use of M&E data, if any?
4.3.1.1 Influence of partnerships and collaborations on CSP performance and results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How did WFP leverage/ utilize partnerships and collaborations in CSP implementations? •How were partners selected? Taking into account WFP corporate partnerships strategy. •What do the partners bring to the partnership and what does WFP bring? •How did partnerships and collaborations contribute to achievement of CSP results? Ask to provide examples of results arising from partnerships with specific organizations
4.3.2 Extent to which WFP partnerships with private sector contributed to strengthening food systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What specific aspects of food systems did WFP partnership with private sector focus on? •How did this partnership strengthen the specific aspects of food systems? •What are the opportunities for WFP-private sector partnership to enhance food systems? •What challenges did such partnership face in strengthening food systems?
4.4.1 Extent to which WFP CO has adequate human resources adapted to CSP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What measures were taken to align staffing to CSP? •What measures were taken to build capacity of staff to delivery CSP? •How did these measures contribute to achievement of CSP results? •What other measures complement staff capacity? Which ones and how did they influence CSP results? •Any staffing gaps or challenges affecting delivery of CSP results?
4.4.2 Adaptation of human resources capacity to enabler role of WFP in Ghana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What specific actions were taken to adapt the human resources skills, knowledge, overall orientation towards the CO enabler role? •What have been the successes of these actions? •What are the challenges/bottlenecks hindering staff from adapting to the CO enabler role?
4.5.1 Realization of expected strategic shifts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Were the strategic shifts envisioned in the CSP realized? Making reference to shifts under each SO. (see docs review) •Did the strategic shifts achieve the intended purpose? How? Any examples?
4.5.1.3 How successful has WFP CO been in transitioning from food aid to food assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What was specifically done to shift from food aid to food assistance •How did this ensure continued support for targeted vulnerable populations? •What were the challenges in shifting from food assistance to food aid? •What is way forward in this shift?

Table 5: Semi-structured interview guide for key government informants

Evaluation question	Key informant interview guiding questions
1.1: To what extent was the CSP informed by existing evidence on the hunger challenges, the food security and nutrition issues prevailing in the country to ensure its relevance at design stage?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What evidence was used to identify the food security and nutrition challenges and needs being addressed with WFP support? • Was there evidence adequate to ensure the most vulnerable populations and their most critical needs are identified? • How do your activities, geographical and population targeting reflect the evidence? OR To what extent are these based on evidence? • Were there any gaps in evidence (data)? Which ones? • Are there areas where, in your view, the evidence/data on food security and nutrition could be improved for better planning?
1.2.1 Alignment of CSP to national policies and plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which national policies is WFP support aligned to (or responsive to)? • Which national plans is WFP support assisting you to implement? • How is WFP contributing to the achievement of priorities set out in these policies and plans? • Any challenges in WFP support for implementation of these policies and plans?
1.2.2 Alignment of CSP to sustainable development goals (SDGs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Which SDGs is the WFP support helping the government efforts to achieve? And how?

1.4.3 Extent to which CSP design takes into account on WFP comparative advantage?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What is WFP comparative advantage on Ghana? •How well is WFP exploiting this comparative advantage in assisting Ghana to enhance food and nutrition security? •Any areas of WFP comparative advantage that could be better exploited?
1.5.1: Adaption to changes in national governance, policies and priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What changes in government policy or priorities took place during CSP implementation? •What new (unplanned) government requests were made during implementation? •How did WFP response to these?
1.5.2 Extent to which WFP relevance was maintained in light of changing national capacities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What changes took place in government or institutions capacity to address FSN? •How did WFP adjust CSP to response to such changes?
1.5.3 Extent to which WFP relevance was maintained in light of needs of vulnerable populations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How did WFP respond to any changes in needs of beneficiaries? Which were these changes and what adjustments were made to CSP? •How timely was WFP response? •How adequate was WFP response?
1.5.4 Extent to which WFP relevance was maintained in light of COVID-19 pandemic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What adjustments did you make to WFP supported activities in the light of COVID-19? •What support did WFP provide in the light of the adjustments made? How timely and adequate was this support?
2.1.1 Level of achievement of planned outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Why were some output targets achieved, over-achieved or under-achieved? •What activities were implemented to achieve specific outputs? And how?
2.1.2 Extent of achievement or progress towards CSP strategic outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How were outputs utilized to contribute to respective outcomes? (Reference to each SO outcomes) •Did any assumptions and risks affect achievement of CSP outcomes? •Were there any unintended results achieved? •Given the FSN context in Ghana, are there FSN issues related to each CSP SO that were not adequately addressed or could be better addressed?
2.1.3 Extent of WFP contribution to UNSDP 2018–2022	
2.2 To what extent did WFP contribute to achievement of cross-cutting aims? 2.2.1 AAP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What mechanisms were put in place to ensure WFP AAP at design, implementation and monitoring/reporting of WFP supported activities? •How well did this system work? What are the key achievements? •What were the challengers in ensuring AAP?
2.2.2 Protection including PSEA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What mechanism was put in place to protect affected populations? How well did this mechanism work? (especially in CBTs) •What measures were taken to ensure PSEA in programme activities? •What were the key achievements? •What challenges did you face in protection of affected populations and PSEA?
2.2.3 Environment protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What strategies did you deploy to integrate environment protection in activities supported by WFP? •What were the key achievements? •What challenges did you face?
2.2.4 GEWE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How did you integrate gender into activities supported by WFP? •How did WFP assist in mainstreaming of GEWE areas into your activities? •How did this contribute to GEWE? •How did the you integrate gender into the monitoring and reporting system? •What was done to improve your capacity to integrate gender into CSP activities? •What challenges did you face in ensuring GEWE in your activities (supported by WFP)?
2.2.5 Humanitarian principles and access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How did you adhere to the principles of humanity, impartiality and neutrality in the provision of food assistance?
2.2.6 Climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How were climate change adaptation strategies integrated into the CSP? •To what effect? •Any challenges in integrating climate change adaption strategies?
2.2.7 Social inclusion and disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How you integrate socially excluded communities including PWDs disability in WFP supported activities? •What are the key achievements? •What are the challenges in ensuring social inclusion and disability?

3.1.1 Timeliness in CSP implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What outputs were delivered on time/ as planned? What accounts for timely delivery in terms of implementation strategies, approaches, processes, funding, capacity, partnerships etc.? •What outputs were not delivered as planned? •What accounts for delayed delivery? How did this affect overall achievement of intended outcomes? •Did COVID-19 affect implementation? What measures were taken to ensure timely implementation/ delivery of outputs?
3.2.1 Appropriateness of CSP coverage and targeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How did you choose the prioritized vulnerable population in light of not having all required financial resources? In terms of geographical and target population coverage •How did you ensure the target population covered was the one most in need?
4.1.2 Timeliness and predictability of financial resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Did you receive funds from WFP on time? And the expected amount? •What facilitated timely receipt of funds? And receipt of expected amount? •What contributed to delays in funds disbursement? And receipt of expected amount? •How did this affect activity implementation?
4.2.1 Robustness and usefulness of M&E systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •To what extent was M&E data available in a timely manner? •To what extent was M&E data complete and reliable? •What are the key issues related to M&E systems (strengths, weaknesses, robustness etc) •What is the evidence that M&E data was used to make management decisions? •What are the issues with use of M&E data, if any?
4.3.1.1 Influence of partnerships and collaborations on CSP performance and results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What have you been able to accomplish due to partnership with WFP? •Do you find partnership with WFP beneficial? How? •What does WFP bring to the partnership and what do you bring? •What aspects of the partnership with WFP could be improved?
4.3.2 Extent to which WFP partnerships with private sector contributed to strengthening food systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What specific aspects of food systems did WFP partnership with private sector focus on? •How did this partnership strengthen the specific aspects of food systems? •What are the opportunities for WFP-private sector partnership to enhance food systems? •What challenges did such partnership face in strengthening food systems?
4.4.1 Extent to which WFP CO has adequate human resources adapted to CSP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •In your view, how adequate is the WFP staff capacity (skills/numbers) in providing the support you need? •Any areas of improvement?

Table 6: Semi-structured interview guide for key private sector informants

Evaluation questions	Key informant interview guiding questions
1.4.3 Extent to which CSP design takes into account WFP comparative advantage?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What is WFP comparative advantage on Ghana? •How well is WFP exploiting this comparative advantage in assisting Ghana to enhance food and nutrition security? •Any areas of WFP comparative advantage that could be better exploited?
1.5.1: Adaption to changes in national governance, policies and priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Were there any changes in government policy or plans that affected the activities supported by WFP? •How did WFP and yourself response to such changes?
1.5.2 Extent to which WFP relevance was maintained in light of changing national capacities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What changes took place in your institution's capacity to carry out your activities? •How did WFP adjust CSP to response to such changes?
1.5.4 Extent to which WFP relevance was maintained in light of COVID-19 pandemic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What adjustments did you make to WFP supported activities in the light of COVID-19? •What support did WFP provide in the light of the adjustments made? How timely and adequate was this support?
2.1.1 Level of achievement of planned outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Why were some output targets achieved, over-achieved or under-achieved? •What activities were implemented to achieve specific outputs? And how?

2.2.3 Environment protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •In the activities supported by WFP, what measures did you take to protect the environment? (warehouse construction, food processing/preservative chemicals etc)
2.2.4 GEWE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How did you integrate gender into the activities supported by WFP?
2.2.6 Climate change	Did you integrate climate change adaptation strategies in activities supported by WFP? If so, which ones? To what effect?
3.1.1 Timeliness in CSP implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Was the support from WFP received on time/ as planned? •If delayed, what were the reasons for the delay and how did it affect your activities? •Did COVID-19 affect implementation? What measures were taken to ensure timely implementation/ delivery of services?
4.1.2 Timeliness and predictability of financial resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Did you receive funds from WFP on time? And the expected amount? •What facilitated timely receipt of funds? And receipt of expected amount? •What contributed to delays in funds disbursement? And receipt of expected amount? •How did this affect activity implementation?
4.2.1 Robustness and usefulness of M&E systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What guidance do you have on the data you should collect and how you should report on WFP supported activities? •Do you use the data you collect? If so, how? •What challenges do you have with data collection and reporting?
4.3.1.1 Influence of partnerships and collaborations on CSP performance and results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What have you been able to accomplish due to partnership with WFP? •Do you find partnership with WFP beneficial? How? •What does WFP bring to the partnership and what do you bring? •What aspects of the partnership with WFP could be improved?
4.4.1 Extent to which WFP CO has adequate human resources adapted to CSP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •In your view, how adequate is the WFP staff capacity (skills/numbers) in providing the support you need? •Any areas of improvement?

Table 7: Semi-structured interview guide for key civil society/NGO informants

Evaluation questions	Key informant interview guiding questions
1.4.3 Extent to which CSP design takes into account WFP comparative advantage?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What is WFP comparative advantage on Ghana? •How well is WFP exploiting this comparative advantage in assisting Ghana to enhance food and nutrition security? •Any areas of WFP comparative advantage that could be better exploited?
1.5.1: Adaption to changes in national governance, policies and priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What changes in government policy or priorities took place during CSP implementation? •What new (unplanned) government requests were made during implementation? •How did WFP response to these?
1.5.3 Extent to which WFP relevance was maintained in light of needs of vulnerable populations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How did WFP respond to any changes in needs of beneficiaries? Which were these changes and what adjustments were made to CSP? •How timely was WFP response? •How adequate was WFP response?
1.5.4 Extent to which WFP relevance was maintained in light of COVID-19 pandemic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What adjustments did you make to WFP supported activities in the light of COVID-19? •What support did WFP provide in the light of the adjustments made? How timely and adequate was this support?
2.1.1 Level of achievement of planned outputs	<p>(We make reference to analysis of CSP outputs targets vs results achieved under each SO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Why were some output targets achieved, over-achieved or under-achieved? •What activities were implemented to achieve specific outputs? And how?
2.1.2 Extent of achievement or progress towards CSP strategic outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How were outputs utilized to contribute to respective outcomes? (Reference to each SO outcomes) •Any assumptions and risks affected achievement of CSP outcomes? •Were there any unintended results achieved? •Given the FSN context in Ghana, are there FSN issues related to each CSP SO that were not adequately addressed or could be better addressed?
2.2.4 GEWE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How did you integrate gender into activities supported by WFP? •How did WFP assist in mainstreaming of GEWE areas into your activities? •How did this contribute to GEWE?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How did the you integrate gender into the monitoring and reporting system? •What was done to improve your capacity to integrate gender into CSP activities? •What challenges did you face in ensuring GEWE in your activities (supported by WFP)?
2.2.6 Climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Did you integrate climate change adaptation strategies in activities supported by WFP? If so, which ones? To what effect?
2.2.7 Social inclusion and disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How you integrate socially excluded communities including PWDs disability in WFP supported activities? •What are the key achievements? •What are the challenges in ensuring social inclusion and disability?
3.1.1 Timeliness in CSP implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What outputs were delivered on time/ as planned? What accounts for timely delivery? •What outputs were not delivered as planned? •What accounts for delayed delivery? How did this affect overall achievement of intended outcomes? •Did COVID-19 affect implementation? What measures were taken to ensure timely implementation/ delivery of outputs?
4.1.2 Timeliness and predictability of financial resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Did you receive funds from WFP on time? And the expected amount? •What facilitated timely receipt of funds? And receipt of expected amount? •What contributed to delays in funds disbursement? And receipt of expected amount? •How did this affect activity implementation?
4.2.1 Robustness and usefulness of M&E systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •To what extent was M&E data available in a timely manner? •To what extent was M&E data complete and reliable? •What are the key issues related to M&E systems (strengths, weaknesses, robustness etc) •What is the evidence that M&E data was used to make management decisions? •What are the issues with use of M&E data, if any?
4.3.1.1 Influence of partnerships and collaborations on CSP performance and results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What have you been able to accomplish due to partnership with WFP? •Do you find partnership with WFP beneficial? How? •What does WFP bring to the partnership and what do you bring? •What aspects of the partnership with WFP could be improved?
4.4.1 Extent to which WFP CO has adequate human resources adapted to CSP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •In your view, how adequate is the WFP staff capacity (skills/numbers) in providing the support you need? •Any areas of improvement?

Table 8: Semi-structured interview guide for key United Nations informants

Evaluation question	Resident Coordinator's Office	United Nations agencies
1.3.1 Coherence and strategic alignment of the CSP with UNSDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How was the CSP (WFP) aligned to the UNSDP? Which specific UNSDP outcome did was the CSP designed to contribute to? •In which ways is WFP CSP/work integrating the cross-cutting areas of the UNSDP? •In your view how is WFP work advancing the collective positioning of UN in a LMIC country? •Are there areas of CSP/WFP alignment to UNSDP that need improvement? •Going forward, how is UN in Ghana likely to be positioned in the next UNSDCF? And what is the expectation for the next WFP CSP? 	
1.3.2 How is WFP partnering with other	<p>In the context of delivering as one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How is WFP partnering with other UN agencies to deliver what is in CSP? 	<p>In the context of delivering as one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How are your collaborating with WFP to achieve the UNSDP results?

UN agencies to deliver CSP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What roles is WFP playing in the UNSDP coordination structures? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •In which specific activities/ programmes are you collaborating with WFP? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Please give details of WFP role and your role? •In which UNSDP coordination structures is WFP playing a role?
1.4.3 Extent to which CSP design takes into account WFP comparative advantage?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What is WFP comparative advantage on Ghana? •How well is WFP exploiting this comparative advantage in assisting Ghana to enhance food and nutrition security? •Any areas of WFP comparative advantage that could be better exploited? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What is WFP comparative advantage on Ghana? •How well is WFP exploiting this comparative advantage in assisting Ghana to enhance food and nutrition security? •Any areas of WFP comparative advantage that could be better exploited?
1.5.4 Extent to which WFP relevance was maintained in light of COVID-19 pandemic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What role did WFP play in UN collective support to government COVID-19 response? •How adequate was WFP contribution? •What is UN collectively (as UNCT) aiming to do to be better prepared for emergencies or to build resilience? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What role did WFP play in UN collective support to government COVID-19 response? •How did you collaborate with WFP in this response? •How adequate was WFP contribution? •What is UN collectively (as UNCT) aiming to do to be better prepared for emergencies or to build resilience?
2.1.3 Extent of WFP contribution to UNSDP 2018–2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How did WFP contribute to UNSDP outcome results? What specific contributions did WFP make? •How were these contributions made? – joint programmes, joint implementation, collaboration etc. 	<p>What UNSDP results did you achieve or contribute to through collaboration with WFP? How were these contributions made? – joint programmes, joint implementation, collaboration etc.</p> <p>Going forward, what are the opportunities for collaboration with WFP?</p>
2.2.3 Environment protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •In the Context of UNSDP and in activities where you collaborated with WFP, how did WFP integrate environment protection? •What is the UN in Ghana guidance for environment protection and how are agencies integrating these? 	
2.2.4 GEWE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What is the UN guidance in GEWE and how well are agencies (including WFP) integrating these? 	
2.2.6 Climate change	In the Context of UNSDP and collaboration with WFP, how did agencies (including WFP) integrate climate change adaptation strategies?	
2.2.7 Social inclusion and disability	<p>How is UN in Ghana advancing LNOB? How have agencies integrated LNOB agenda?</p> <p>What are the gaps/ challenges?</p>	

Table 9: Interview guide for beneficiaries

Food security questions for adolescents/caregivers of young children
<p>What support have you received from WFP or <name> institutions?</p> <p>For how long have you received this support?</p> <p>How was/is the support delivered to you?</p> <p>Did anyone ask you what assistance you specifically needed? If so, when and who?</p>

How long does it take you to reach the point where the support is provided (health facility, retailer? What are the costs you incur while accessing the support?

Do you find the support provided adequate? If not, why?

How did you use the support provided to you?

How important is this support to you or your family? In what way?

What needs were met by the support you received?

What/who has influenced your decision on how to use the support you receive?

How did other persons close to you benefit from this support?

Who do you contact if you face a problem with the support from WFP? By what means? How often have you reached out to this contact?

Has anyone you know successfully reached out to this contact? How was their issue resolved?

What is the biggest gap between your needs (especially food security needs) and the support you received?

How has the WFP support met your needs?

What can be done in the future to improve the way the support is provided?

Food and nutrition social and behaviour change (SBC) questions

What information/advice have you received about eating well for good health from WFP or <name> institution working for WFP?

What were the main messages?

Who provided this information?

Where was this information given?

How was it given? How frequently?

Is the message/advice on nutrition that was given to you clear to understand? Explain

Did you find the messages relevant to you? How?

How did you use the information provided?

What challenges did you face in using the information?

What other issues about food and nutrition of interest to you could you like to be covered?

Questions for those who received vouchers

How often did you receive vouchers from WFP?

What did you use your vouchers for?

What did WFP or its agencies tell you regarding the use of the vouchers?

Do you have to travel to redeem the voucher?

What is (has been) the value of the vouchers to you?

What challenges have you encountered using the vouchers?

Questions for those who received nutritious food supplements

How often did you receive the nutritious food supplements?

How did you use them regarding the feeding of your child?

What information did you receive about how to use the foods?

What challenges have you encountered using the food supplements?

What is (has been) the value of the nutritious food to your child? To you?

Do you often get the quantity of the nutritious food that you want for your child? Explain

Smallholder farmers – training

What training did WFP provide? When and how many days was the training for?

Which issues were covered during the training?

Was the manner in which the training was conducted useful?

Did you find the issues discussed in the training useful? Why or why not?

How have you applied what you learnt in the training?

What difference has the training made to your work, give specific examples? Prompt: how has the training helped you cope with and withstand shocks?

What impact has the support had on your farming, enterprise, livelihood, income?

Is there anything that could have been done differently that, in your opinion, could have produced better results?

Questions for smallholder farmers – post-harvest support

What specific challenges have you had after harvesting your produce? Prompt: At drying, shelling, transport, storage, processing

In which of these areas was the challenge largest? Why? Are you able to tell how much produce you lost between harvest and selling, and reduction in quality due to the poor practices?

What support did WFP provide to help address these challenges? What has worked well and been most beneficial? What has not worked so well? Give specific examples Prompt: post-harvest loss management technologies – moisture meters, hermetic silos, zero fly bags; training in post-harvest management practices

What difference has the support made to your work? Give specific examples.

Have you seen any reduction in loss of your produce, improvement in quality? How can you tell? Can you estimate the extent of improvements?

What impact has the support had on your farming, livelihood, incomes?

Is there anything that could have been done differently that, in your opinion, could have produced better results?

Questions for smallholder farmers – access to markets

How were you selling your produce, who was buying, were you able to sell at the right time and in the right quantities and price?

What challenges did you face selling your produce? Which were the biggest ones? How did they affect your enterprise, livelihood, income?

What supports did WFP provide to help address these challenges? Were they the right ones? What has worked well and what hasn't worked well? Prompt: facilitating group sale to institutional buyers, link to aggregators, use of e-commerce platforms

What difference has the WFP support made in helping you access markets? Prompt: Selling at the right time, in the right quantities, at the right price, on the right payment terms

How much produce are you selling now as compared to before the WFP support? How are you able to estimate?

How helpful are aggregators in helping you access the market? Do you think they will remain going into the future? What do you think can be done to make them stronger and to keep them going?

Is there anything that could have been done differently that, in your opinion, could have produced better results?

Additional questions for women beneficiaries

What challenges have you faced in your work as a smallholder farmer? Which are the biggest challenges?

How have these affected your work?

Did the WFP support help you overcome any of these challenges? In what way? Can you give examples?

Prompt: across all the areas of WFP support

Are you able to make decisions on the use of money earned from farming? Why or why not?

Annex VI: Fieldwork agenda

Team member: Erik Toft		
Time	Activity	Stakeholder involved
Day 1: Sunday, 18.09.2022		
	Travel from Accra to Tamale: Erik Toft	
Day 2: Monday, 19.09.2022		
08.00 – 09.30	Briefing with the head of WFP Tamale sub-office	WFP country office
09.30 – 10.30	Travel to Gunja	
10.30 – 11.30	Meeting with Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection	Local government
11.30 – 13.30	Meeting with group of farmers	Beneficiaries
13.30 – 14.30	Travel to Tamale	
14.30 – 15.30	Lunch	
15.30 – 16.30	Final planning of Tuesday meetings	Tamale sub-office
Day 2: Tuesday, 20.09.2022		
08.00 – 08.45	Meeting with UNICEF	United Nations
08.45 – 09.00	Travel to meeting	
09.00 – 09.45	Meeting with Ghana Red Cross	NGO
09.45 – 10.00	Travel to meeting	
10.00 – 11.00	Meeting with Care	NGO
11.00 – 11.30	Travel to meeting	
11.30 – 12.30	Meeting with NADMO	Local government
12.30 – 13.30	Travel to meeting and lunch	
13.30 – 14.30	Meeting with head of Tamale sub-office cancelled	Tamale sub-office
14.30 -	Travel to Accra	

Team member: Maxwell Agbenohervi		
Time	Activity	Stakeholder involved
Day 1: Wednesday, 21.09.2022		
12.00 – 17.00	Travel from Accra to Tamale	
Day 2: Thursday, 22.09.2022		
08.00 – 08.30	Briefing with the head of WFP Tamale sub-office and staff	WFP sub-office
8.30 – 11.30	Interview with Decentralized Government Agency	Regional MoFA extension staff
13.00 – 14.00	Interview with Decentralized Government Agency	Regional Food and Drugs Board (FDA)
14.30 – 16.00	Interview with community processor	Private sector
Day 3: Friday, 23.09.2022		
08.00 – 10.30	Interview with smallholder farmers	Smallholder farmers
10.50 – 11.30	Meeting with retailer	Retailer
15.00 – 17.00	Interview with farmer-based organization (FBO)	Smallholder farmers
Day 4: Saturday, 24.09.2022		

9.00 –12.00	Writing of interview notes	
Day 5: Sunday, 25.09.2022		
10.00 – 13.00	Writing of interview notes	
Day 6: Monday, 26.09.2022		
08.00 – 12.00	Interview with community processor and 4 retailers	Processor and 4 retailers
15 – 19.50	Travel to Accra – Kumasi	
Day 7: Tuesday 27.09.2022		
09.00 – 10.30	Premium Foods (virtual)	Private sector
11.00 – 12.30	MoFA	Government agency (MoFA) and beneficiaries
13.00 – 15.00	Interview with industrial processor – Yedent	Industrial processor- Yedent
Day 8: Wednesday 28.09.2022		
07.00 – 10.20	Travel to Ejura	
11.30 – 10.45	Interview with district MoFA staff and aggregators	Government agency (MoFA) and beneficiaries
13.00 – 15.00	Interview with industrial processor – Premium Foods	Industrial processor –Yedent
17.00 –19.30	Travel from Kumasi to Accra	

Team leader: Tom Mabururu		
Time	Activity	Stakeholder involved
Day 1: Wednesday, 21.09.2022		
12.00 –17.00	Travel from Accra to Tamale	
Day 2: Thursday, 22.09.2022		
08.00 -08.30	Briefing with the head of WFP Tamale sub-office and staff	WFP sub-office
09.30 – 11.30	Interview head of sub-office	WFP
13.00 –14.00	Savannah Signatures	NGO
12:20 – 13.15	Savannah Signatures	NGO
13.30 – 14.30	Lunch	
15.00 – 17.00	Care Ghana and the Savanna Women Integrated Development Agency (SWIDA)	NGO
Day 3: Friday, 23.09.2022		
08.00 – 10.30	Interview with smallholder farmers	Smallholder farmers
10.50 – 11.30	Meeting with retailer	Retailer
12.00 – 14.00	Travel to Tamale office	
14.00 – 15.00	Travel to St Lucy health centre	Government
15.00 – 16.30	St Lucy health centre	Government
Day 4: Saturday, 24.09.2022		
06.00 – 09.30	Travel from Tamale to Gunja	
10.00 – 11.30	Meeting with smallholder farmers	Beneficiaries
11.30 – 13.30	Travel from Gunja to Tamale	
Day 5: Sunday, 25.09.2022		
10.00 –13.00	Writing of interview notes	
Day 6: Monday, 26.09.2022		
08.00 – 12.00	Interview with community processor and 4 retailers	Processor and 4 retailers

15 -19.50	Travel to Accra -Kumasi	
Day 7: Tuesday 27.09.2022		
09.00 - 10.30	Sesi Technologies	Private sector
12.00 - 14.00	Bosomtwi District Health Administration	Government
14.00 - 15.00	Lunch	
15.00 - 16.00	Ghana Health Services	Government
Day 8: Tuesday 28.09.2022		
07.00 - 10.20	Travel to Ejura	
11.30 - 10.45	Interview with district MoFA staff and aggregators	Government agency (MoFA) and beneficiaries
13.00 - 15.00	Interview with industrial processor -Yedent	Industrial processor -Yedent
17.00 -19.30	Travel from Kumasi to Accra	

Team member: Richmond Aryteey		
Time	Activity	Stakeholder involved
Day 1: Wednesday, 21.09.2022		
12.00 -17.00	Travel from Accra to Tamale	
Day 2: Thursday, 22.09.2022		
08.00 -08.30	Briefing with the head of WFP Tamale sub-office and staff	WFP sub-office
09.00 -11.00	Choggu health centre	Government
10.00 - 12.00	Interview with WFP sub-office staff	Head of sub-office and others
12:20 - 13.15	Savannah Signatures	NGO
13.30 - 14.30	Lunch	
15.00 - 17.00	Care Ghana and SWIDA	NGO
Day 3: Friday, 23.09.2022		
14.00 - 15.00	Travel to St Lucy health centre	Government
15.00 - 16.30	St Lucy health centre	Government
Day 4: Saturday, 24.09.2022		
09.00 - 12.00	Writing interviews	
Day 5: Sunday, 25.09.2022		
09.00 - 12.00	Writing interviews	
Day 6: Thursday, 22.09.2022		
08.00 - 09.00	Travel to Kanvil health centre	
09.00 - 11.00	Kanvili health centre	Government
12.00 - 13.00	Lunch	
14.00 - 19.50	Travel to Accra and to Kumasi	
Day 7: Tuesday 27.09.2022		
08.00 - 10.00	Travel to regional health administration offices	
10.00 - 12.00	Regional Health Administration	Government
12.00 - 14.00	Bosomtwi District Health Administration	Government
14.00 - 15.00	Lunch	
15.00 - 16.00	Ghana Health Services	Government
Day 8: Wednesday 28.09.2022		
08.00 - 09.00	Travel to health facility	
09.00 - 10.30	Healthcare workers	Government
11.00 - 13.00	Beneficiaries (adolescent girls)	Beneficiaries

13.00 - 14.00	Lunch	
17.00 - 19.30	Travel from Kumasi to Accra	

Annex VII: Findings–conclusions–recommendations mapping

Findings	Conclusions	Recommendations
<p>Finding 1.1a: Activities and outcomes of the country strategic plan responded to food and nutrition security challenges in Ghana. Major sources of evidence shaping the CSP included the National Zero Hunger Strategic Review, the Fill the Nutrient Gap Analysis, and the demographic and health survey.</p> <p>Finding 1.2a: The country strategic plan demonstrated alignment with national policies and initiatives as outlined in the CPESDP (2017–2024) as well as sectoral policies and plans, particularly for nutrition, school feeding, agriculture, social protection and gender.</p> <p>Finding 1.2b: The country strategic plan is consistent with the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) priorities, particularly SDG 2 (zero hunger) and SDG 17 (partnerships).</p> <p>Finding 1.3a: The country strategic plan is consistent with and well aligned to the design of the United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership 2018–2022.</p> <p>Finding 1.4.a: The CSP did not have an explicit theory of change (ToC) but the interlinkages between activities demonstrates a coherent set of interventions generating value, strengthening capacity, providing support and generating demand for enhanced food security and nutrition among the most vulnerable in communities. The CSP activities were also in line with WFP comparative advantage.</p> <p>Finding 1.5a: The CSP remained relevant throughout the implementation and adapted to the COVID-19 pandemic.</p>	<p>Conclusion 1: The CSP supported the Government to respond to food security and nutrition needs of vulnerable populations through coherent programmatic interventions, and remained relevant throughout the implementation period. The CSP also established AAP mechanisms but these mechanisms did not function optimally.</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: WFP should clearly define its strategic focus as an enabler and facilitator within the Ghana context in the next CSP.</p> <p>Recommendation 6: Review the AAP mechanism and address bottlenecks to ensure all beneficiaries are informed about the WFP programme.</p>

<p>Finding 2.2a: Mechanisms and tools for accountability to affected populations are in place and are being used, but the percentage of beneficiaries informed about the programme was insufficient, especially in 2020 and 2021.</p> <p>Finding 2.2h: Country capacity strengthening enhanced the WFP country office enabler role but was not guided by a clear intervention logic.</p> <p>Findings 3.2a: CSP activities targeted populations most vulnerable to food insecurity and nutrition support.</p>		
<p>Finding 2.1.1f: The CSP anticipated and implemented a transition from food assistance to a market-based food systems strategy. However, implementation has been affected by supply chain challenges.</p> <p>Finding 2.1.3.a: Most of the WFP capacity strengthening interventions contributed to improvement of government food security and nutrition programmes, but some of these CSP interventions were recently launched and, therefore, have not contributed to the outcomes while others did not take place.</p> <p>Finding 2.1.3b: Capacity strengthening of the school feeding programme (SFP) contributed to the provision of nutritious school meals. However, the provision of quality school meals was affected by delayed payment of caterers and inadequate funding of the programme.</p> <p>Finding 2.1.3d: With WFP support, the MOFA/GHS and NADMO established the food security and nutrition monitoring system (FSNMS) and flood information system (FIS). Information from the FIS has been utilized to develop district contingency (or preparedness) plans while there is limited evidence on how information from the FSNMS has been utilized.</p> <p>Finding 2.1.4a: Most of the CSP interventions for advocacy and policy coherence had not been completed while others had not taken place by the time of the evaluation. Interventions such as enactment of legislation for school feeding and targeting of HIV-impacted households in LEAP have not realized their outputs.</p> <p>Finding 4.4b: There was no evidence of an explicit plan for adapting human resources capacity to the WFP enabler role; the process has largely been ad hoc and has not been completed.</p>	<p>Conclusion 2: The CSP had a clear intent and has made progress in shifting from direct implementation to an enabler role. However, the absence of a plan to operationalize or manage the change resulted in a lack of clarity about the expected change and uncertainty among staff on their roles.</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: WFP should clearly define its strategic focus as an enabler and facilitator within the Ghana context in the next CSP.</p>

<p>Finding 4.5b: The WFP strategic shift to an enabler role is ongoing; models on how this role can be delivered are emerging; and its partners are beginning to recognize this role.</p> <p>Finding 4.5c: The CSP has been a learning process but was not guided by a change management plan.</p>		
<p>Finding 3.1a: Overall, most T-ICSP and CSP outputs and activities were not delivered on time, although there are variations across strategic outcomes.</p> <p>Finding 3.1.b: Utilization of country strategic plan financial resources has been low due to staff turnover, low staff numbers at the country office, and long processes in finalizing partner agreements as well as the impact of COVID-19 on CSP implementation.</p> <p>Finding 2.1.4a: Most of the CSP interventions for advocacy and policy coherence had not been completed by the time of the evaluation while others did not take place.</p> <p>Finding 4.4.a: WFP human resources, in terms of numbers and skills, have been able to deliver the CSP results but instances of staff movement affected timely delivery of some activities.</p>	<p>Conclusion 3: Implementation of CSP activities and outputs has often not been timely and this impacted negatively on the contribution of the CSP to outcomes.</p>	<p>Recommendation 4: WFP should enhance collaboration processes with cooperating partners and make use of innovative financing mechanisms to ensure timely implementation of the CSP.</p>
<p>Finding 4.1a: The country strategic plan was not adequately funded, although the expenditure rate for the available funds was low and funding across strategic objectives has been unbalanced.</p> <p>Finding 4.1b: The funding landscape for WFP Ghana has been unstable with dependency on two main donors and variations in total funding amounts year on year.</p> <p>Finding 4.3a: WFP partnership with government ministries and agencies was central to achievement of the CSP results.</p> <p>Finding 4.3b: There is limited collaboration between WFP and other United Nations agencies.</p> <p>Finding 4.3c: WFP built partnerships with the private sector to strengthen food systems but faced challenges in sustaining these partnerships due the ending of project funding.</p>	<p>Conclusion 4: Partnerships with government, private sector and non-governmental organizations played a key role in the delivery of the CSP outputs. However, collaboration with other United Nations agencies was limited and the focus on expanding to new partnerships has come in at the later stage of CSP implementation. Further, the inadequate funding of the CSP hindered achievement of CSP outputs especially in outcomes 2, 3 and 4.</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Under the new CSP, WFP should deepen and align partnerships, beyond government, with the private sector, civil society organizations, academia, United Nations agencies and other development partners.</p>

<p>Finding 4.3d: WFP partnerships with development partners⁴ have been based on coordination and information-sharing but there has been recent progression towards leveraging of technical and financial resources and expertise.</p> <p>Finding 4.3d: WFP partnerships with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were based on agreements signed between the two parties and NGOs implemented agreed activities which, in turn, contributed to the achievement of relevant CSP output results.</p>		
<p>Finding 1.5a: The country strategic plan contributed to the food security and nutrition needs of people affected by COVID-19, but the anticipated influx of refugees did not materialize.</p> <p>Finding 2.2e: As WFP Ghana is focused on development, knowledge of and application of humanitarian principles is not prominent.</p> <p>Finding 2.2f: Climate change was not integrated into the CSP design, but WFP has taken steps to mainstream climate change adaptation into the CSP activities.</p> <p>Finding 2.4a: The CSP did not include a holistic focus on the humanitarian-development-peace (triple) nexus, but some initial work has been done on understanding the triple nexus context among WFP country office staff.</p>	<p>Conclusion 5: The CSP was revised to respond to crisis-affected populations, especially those affected by COVID-19. However, the CSP did not adequately address the country capacity gaps in preparedness and response to crisis and development of community resilience to shocks.</p>	<p>Recommendation 3: In the next CSP, WFP should ensure agility in its support to the Government for emergency preparedness and response, in collaboration with other agencies and partners that also have a mandate on crisis response.</p>
<p>Finding 2.1.2a: Under SO2, targeted smallholder farmers in prioritized districts increased the production of high quality and nutrient-dense foods, exceeding the target in 2021, but the WFP support for production of nutrient-rich foods declined due to limited donor funding.</p> <p>Finding 2.1.2b: The CSP contributed to the increase in targeted smallholder farmers selling through the farmer aggregator systems but sales targets were not achieved in 2021 due to the long period it took to establish the systems, WFP staff turnover, weak farmer-based organization (FBO) leadership and poor group dynamics, and the negative impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>Finding 2.1.2c: Targeted volume of sales by smallholder farmers under the WFP-supported farmer aggregator system fell below the baseline and did not meet</p>	<p>Conclusion 6: The use of market-based approaches to strengthen food systems has demonstrated the role the private sector can play to improve food security and nutrition, but major challenges include negative market dynamics and the sustainability of this approach. In addition, the livelihood programme expected to sustain the vulnerable populations' access to nutritious</p>	<p>Recommendation 5: WFP should support the Government to develop sustainable models of market-based approaches to food systems strengthening and to scale up the nutrition-sensitive livelihood programme.</p>

⁴ This refers to multilateral and bilateral partners

<p>targets largely because: farmers could not maintain food quality standards; of high transport costs; of failure to ensure reliability of supplies; and of FBO internal control over members. High transport costs also affected the volume of sales. However, there was a significant increase in the sales target in 2021.</p> <p>Finding 2.1.2d: The country strategic plan activities contributed to the reduction in the rate of smallholder farmers' post-harvest losses but targets could not be achieved due to a low proportion of smallholder farmers supported with post-harvest handling technologies, and an even lower proportion of smallholder farmers purchasing these technologies as well as weak cohesion among FBOs.</p> <p>Finding 2.1.2e: The CSP contributed to the increase in production of specialized nutritious foods (SNFs) through expansion of the capacity of industrial agro-processors. However, the expansion of the capacity of community food processors is not complete and, thus, has not contributed to the production of SNFs.</p> <p>Finding 2.2i: WFP capacity-strengthening activities have led to limited achievements in food system performance.</p> <p>Finding 4.3b: WFP built on partnerships with the private sector established under T-ICSP but faced challenges in sustaining these partnerships due the ending of project funding.</p>	<p>food has only been implemented on a small scale.</p>	
---	---	--

Annex VIII: Additional analysis

31. The overarching assumptions below are related to various levels of results in the ToC.

Table 10: Reconstructed CSP theory of change assumptions

Overarching context assumptions	Level of ToC	Overarching implementation assumptions	Level of ToC
The CSP is supported by the Ghanaian Government because it is well aligned with Ghana's National Development Plan (2016–2057).	Activity to output level	WFP work is strongly supported by donors and funding with grants.	Activity to output level
No major external shocks affect food security and nutrition security.	Output to outcome level	WFP is able to access resources from other donors, including the private sector.	Activity to output level
The triple burden of malnutrition (being underweight, being overweight and having vitamin and mineral deficiencies) persists among the Ghanaian population, especially in children under 5.	Output to outcome level	A focus on root causes is better suited for a country like Ghana, and is supported by donors.	Activity to output level
Nearly half of the workforce is employed in the agricultural sector, dominated by smallholder farmers (52 percent of them being women).	Output to outcome level	Cooperating partners are available and have the capacity to effectively implement and coordinate with WFP Ghana.	Output to outcome level
The high production costs of smallholder agriculture keep the sector uncompetitive and incomes low.	Output to outcome level	WFP Ghana has the internal capacity to deliver capacity development and technical assistance to government bodies.	Activity to output level
Post-harvest losses persist due to underdeveloped food storage and transportation infrastructure.	Output to outcome level	WFP has a unique role and position as an advisor and source of technical assistance to the Government of Ghana in food and nutrition security.	Activity to output level
Agricultural productivity continues to decline as a result of declining land availability due to population pressure, competing land uses, soil degradation, water scarcity, desertification and climate change (especially for smallholder farmers).	Output to outcome level	WFP has an important role in supporting the reduction of malnutrition.	Output to outcome level

<p>Refugee movements and numbers are expected to increase due to the COVID-19 crisis.</p>	<p>Activity to output level</p>	<p>The Government of Ghana is actively engaged in achieving the CSP objectives by providing continuous support to the resource mobilization effort and to the implementation of activities.</p>	<p>Activity to output level</p>
---	---------------------------------	---	---------------------------------

Annex IX: Outcome/Outputs and Cross-cutting Indicators

32. The following section only presents complete and partially complete outcomes, outputs and cross-cutting indicators for the T-ICSP and CSP. Incomplete indicators are not included. For a full overview of complete and partially complete and incomplete indicators please refer to the Ghana CSPE inception report annexes. Table 11 and Table 12 provide a quick overview of the number of complete, partially complete and incomplete indicators by strategic outcome (outcome indicators), activities (output indicators) and (cross-cutting indicators) for the T-ICSP and CSP.

Table 11: Overview of complete, partially complete and incomplete indicators for the T-ICSP (2018)

Indicators ...	Complete	Partially complete	Incomplete	TOTAL
Outcome indicators				
Strategic Outcome 1	19	0	0	19
Strategic Outcome 2	2	0	4	6
Strategic Outcome 3	0	0	1	1
Strategic Outcome 4	2	0	0	2
TOTAL	23	0	5	28
Output indicators				
Activity 1	4	0	2	6
Activity 2	2	0	2	4
Activity 3	2	0	1	3
Activity 4	1	0	3	4
Activity 5	1	0	3	4
Activity 6	0	0	4	4
Activity 7	3	0	0	3
Activity 8	1	0	3	4
TOTAL	14	0	18	32
Cross-cutting indicators				
Accountability	8	0	0	8
Protection	4	0	0	4
Gender	12	0	2	14
Environment	1	0	0	1
TOTAL	25	0	2	27

Source: COMET report CM-L008b. ACR 2018.

Table 12: Overview of complete, partially complete and incomplete indicators for the CSP (2019–2023)

Indicators	Complete	Partially complete	Incomplete	TOTAL
Outcome indicators				
Activity 1	23	2	0	25
Activity 2	0	2	7	9
Activity 3	0	12	9	21
Activity 4	1	1	0	2
Activity 5	0	1	0	1
Activity 6	6	0	3	9
TOTAL	30	18	19	57
Output indicators				
Activity 1	15	0	0	15
Activity 2	2	0	1	3
Activity 3	20	0	4	24
Activity 4	12	0	1	13
Activity 5	3	0	9	12
Activity 6	17	0	4	21
TOTAL	69	0	19	88
Cross-cutting indicators				
Accountability	2	1	0	3
Protection	3	0	0	3
Gender	3	0	0	3
Environment	1	0	0	1
TOTAL	9	1	0	10

Source: COMET report CM-R008 2019, 2020 and 2021. ACR 2019, 2020 and 2021.

Table 13: T-ICSP outcome indicators

Outcome indicator	Details	Baseline set (2017)	2018	T-ICSP-end target
-------------------	---------	---------------------	------	-------------------

			Year-end target	Follow-up	
		Overall	Overall	Overall	Overall
SO1: Vulnerable women, adolescent girls, people living with HIV and children aged 6–23 months in targeted areas have enhanced nutritional status all year round.					
Anti-retroviral treatment (ART) default rate	Eastern Region	9.9	< 15	5.6	< 15
ART nutritional recovery rate	Eastern Region	56.1	> 75	78	> 75
Attendance rate (new)	Northern Region	80	85	91	85
Enrolment rate	Northern Region	202	> 210	154	> 210
Food Consumption Score – Nutrition	Percentage of households that consumed heme iron-rich food daily (in the last 7 days)	45	> 80	29.9	> 80
	Percentage of households that consumed protein-rich food daily (in the last 7 days)	56	> 80	67.7	> 80
	Percentage of households that consumed vit. A-rich food daily (in the last 7 days)	50	> 80	43.3	> 80
	Percentage of households that never consumed heme iron-rich food (in the last 7 days)	24	= 0	33.1	= 0
	Percentage of households that never consumed protein-rich food (in the last 7 days)	8	= 0	3.2	= 0
	Percentage of households that never consumed vit. A-rich food (in the last 7 days)	5	= 0	23.8	= 0
	Percentage of households that sometimes consumed heme iron-rich food (in the last 7 days)	31	< 20	37	< 20
	Percentage of households that sometimes consumed protein-rich food (in the last 7 days)	36	< 20	29.9	< 20

	Percentage of households that sometimes consumed vit. A-rich food (in the last 7 days)	46	< 20	32.9	< 20
Gender ratio	Northern Region	0.8	1	0.85	1
Minimum Dietary Diversity – Women	Northern Region	8.77	> 8.77	8.77	> 8.77
Proportion of children 6–23 months of age who receive a minimum acceptable diet	Northern Region	41.3	= 50	47.2	= 50
Proportion of eligible population that participates in programme (coverage)	Northern Region	75	> 50	44.4	> 50
Proportion of target population that participates in an adequate number of distributions (adherence)	Northern Region	22.11	> 66	90.7	> 66
Retention rate	Northern Region	92.9	85	95	85
SO2: Targeted populations and communities benefit from enhanced food systems that support nutrition value chains by 2030.					
Default rate (as a percentage) of WFP pro-smallholder farmer procurement contracts	Ghana	0	0	0	0
Value and volume of smallholder sales through WFP-supported aggregation systems	Ghana	3457.85	> 5000	3866.3	> 5000
SO3: National institutions have strengthened capacity to manage food security and safety net programmes by 2020.					
SO4: Government efforts towards achieving zero hunger by 2030 are supported by effective and coherent policy frameworks.					
Number of new or improved plans, policies, regulations, pieces of legislation and programmes to enhance food security and nutrition	Ghana	3	> 5	4	> 5
Proportion of targeted sectors and government entities participating in national zero hunger strategic reviews	Ghana	60	> 70	70	> 70

Source: COMET report CM-L008b. ACR 2018.

Table 14: CSP outcome indicators

Outcome Indicator	Details	Baseline set	2019		2020		2021		CSP-end target (2023)
			Year-end target	Follow-up	Year-end target	Follow-up	Year-end target	Follow-up	
		Overall	Overall	Overall	Overall	Overall	Overall	Overall	Overall

SO1: Vulnerable populations, including children and women of reproductive age, in high burden regions have improved nutritional status in line with national targets by 2025.									
01 NPA Provide cash/vouchers for specialized nutritious foods and/or micronutrient-dense fresh foods to vulnerable children 6-23 months, adolescent girls, pregnant and lactating women and girls under government safety net programmes, and support Ghana Health Service on SBCC for healthy diets in high burden areas.									
Consumption-based Coping Strategy Index (Percentage of households with reduced CSI)	Northern	3.29	≤ 3	6.02	≤ 3	5.15	≤ 3	4.52	≤ 3
Food Consumption Score – Nutrition	Percentage of households that consumed heme iron-rich food daily (in the last 7 days)	54.09	≥ 54.09	68.96	≥ 54.09	66.97	≥ 54.09	62.93	≥ 54.09
		29.9	≥ 29.90	64.23	≥ 29.90	49.19	≥ 29.9	47.44	< 30
	Percentage of households that consumed vit. A rich food daily (in the last 7 days)	79.34	≥ 79.34	80.05	≥ 79.34	84.97	≥ 79.34	88.55	≥ 79.94
		43.3	≥ 43.30	73.08	≥ 43.30	61.8	≥ 43.30	65.03	≥ 43.30
	Percentage of households that consumed protein rich food daily (in the last 7 days)	87.1	≥ 87.1	93.69	≥ 87.1	93.85	≥ 87.1	91.28	≥ 87.1
		67.7	≥ 67.70	85.58	≥ 67.70	80.23	≥ 67.70	68.92	≥ 67.70
	Percentage of households that never consumed heme iron-rich food daily (in the last 7 days)	11.66	< 11.66	2.02	< 11.17	1.59	< 11.17	4.36	< 11.17
		33.1	=33.1	14.23	< 33.1	21.68	< 33.1	33.54	= 0
	Percentage of households that never consumed vit. A rich food daily (in the last 7 days)	2.23	< 2.27	2.27	< 2.27	2.28	< 2.23	2.18	< 2.23
		23.8	< 23.8	4.62	< 33.1	5.06	< 23.8	1.84	= 0
	Percentage of households that never consumed protein rich food daily (in the last 7 days)	1.74	<1.74	0.76	<1.74	0.46	<1.74	0.31	<1.74
		3.2	< 3.20	1.73	< 3.20	2.07	< 3.20	5.73	= 0
	Percentage of households that sometimes consumed heme iron-rich food daily (in the last 7 days)	32.24	≥ 32.24	29.04	≥ 32.24	31.44	≥ 32.24	32.71	≥ 32.24
		37	≥ 37	21.54	≥ 37	29.13	≥ 37	19.02	< 37
	Percentage of households that sometimes consumed vit. A rich food daily (in the last 7 days)	18.36	≥ 18.36	17.68	≥ 18.36	12.76	≥ 18.36	15.26	≥ 18.36
		32.9	≥ 32.90	22.31	≥ 32.90	33.14	≥ 32.90	33.13	< 32.9
Percentage of households that sometimes consumed protein rich food daily (in the last 7 days)	11.17	≥ 11.17	5.56	≥ 11.17	5.69	≥ 11.17	8.41	≥ 11.17	
	29.9	≥ 29.90	12.69	≥ 29.90	17.7	≥ 29.90	25.36	< 29	
Minimum Dietary Diversity – Women	Ashanti	58.6			≥ 70	60.94	≥70	63.23	≥ 80
	Northern	56.2		73.36	> 70	72.26	> 75		> 80
	Ashanti	17.38	≥ 22	27.47	≥ 30	20.05	≥ 30	14.54	≥ 70

Proportion of children 6–23 months of age who receive a minimum acceptable diet	Northern	12	> 15	19.49	> 30	14.52	> 22.5	20.48	> 70
Proportion of eligible population that participates in programme (coverage)	Northern	50	> 70	76	> 70.7	77.25	> 70	78	> 70
Proportion of target population that participates in an adequate number of distributions (adherence)	Northern	66	≥ 66	67	≥ 66	69	≥ 66	70	≥ 66
SO2: Targeted populations and communities in Ghana benefit from more efficient, inclusive and resilient food systems that support nutrition value chains by 2030.									
02 CSI1 Provide technical support on production of fortified flours, food safety and quality assurance to selected community level and industrial food processors.									
Consumption-based Coping Strategy Index (Percentage of households with reduced CSI)									
Default rate (as a percentage) of WFP pro-smallholder farmer procurement contracts									
Food Consumption Score									
Percentage increase in production of high-quality and nutrition-dense foods		0		2			> 20	30	> 20
Percentage of targeted smallholder farmers reporting increased production of nutritious crops, disaggregated by gender of smallholder farmer									
Percentage of targeted smallholders selling through WFP-supported farmer aggregation systems									
Rate of smallholder post-harvest losses									
Value and volume of smallholder sales through WFP-supported aggregation systems									
Volume of specialized nutritious foods produced by the supported processors		6,000		6,960		7,000	> 8,000	8,762	> 10,000
03 SMS1 Provide support and link smallholder farmers to the Government One District One Warehouse Flagship through training and equipment support for the reduction of post-harvest losses, quality assurance and market linkages to processors and institutional demand.									
Consumption-based Coping Strategy Index (Percentage of households with reduced CSI)		10	< 6.50	13			< 6.5	6	< 2
Default rate (as a percentage) of WFP pro-smallholder farmer procurement contracts		0	= 0	0			= 0	0	= 0
Food Consumption Score	Percentage of households with Acceptable Food Consumption Score	95.55	> 97.30	94.4			> 96.7	94.55	> 98

	Percentage of households with Borderline Food Consumption Score	3.95	< 2.5	3.9			< 2.8	5.35	< 2
	Percentage of households with Poor Food Consumption Score	0.5	< 0.20	1.7			< 0.5	0.2	= 0
	Percentage of targeted smallholder farmers reporting increased production of nutritious crops, disaggregated by gender of smallholder farmer	10	> 30	29.4	> 30		> 40	31.35	> 50
	Percentage of targeted smallholders selling through WFP-supported farmer aggregation systems	4	> 10	5	> 50		>20	14	> 50
	Rate of smallholder post-harvest losses	2.25	= 1.50	0.66	≤ 1		≤ 1	0.74	= 0
Value and volume of smallholder sales through WFP-supported aggregation systems	Value (USD)	0		0			> 0	0	> 0
	Volume (MT)	3,866.30	> 5,000	3295	> 5,000		> 5,000	13,720.33	> 10,000
SO3: Local and national institutions have strengthened capacity to better target and manage food security, nutrition and social protection programmes by 2030.									
04 CS11 Provide technical support including through South-South cooperation to the national school feeding programme, MoFA-SRID, NADMO, FDA and GHS on nutritional quality of school meals, food security monitoring, early warning system, disaster risk reduction & emergency preparedness, food safety and quality, and food-based dietary guidelines.									
	Number of national food security and nutrition policies, programmes and system components enhanced as a result of WFP capacity strengthening (new)	0	> 4	4	> 8	7	> 8	8	> 8
	Number of national programmes enhanced as a result of WFP-facilitated South-South and triangular cooperation support (new)	0	> 2	2	> 2	0	> 2	0	> 5
SO4: Government efforts towards achieving zero hunger by 2030 are supported by advocacy and effective and coherent policy frameworks.									
05 CS11 Advocate for promulgation and enforcement of policies & legislation related to school feeding, gender, nutrition, food safety, weights, measures and standards, smallholder friendly public procurement and market support at national institutions.									

Proportion of targeted sectors and government entities implementing recommendations from national zero hunger strategic reviews		0	> 50	40	> 60	50	> 60	50	> 80
SO5: Crisis-affected populations are able to meet their basic food and nutrition needs during and in the aftermath of shocks.									
06 URT1 Provide food and nutrition assistance through in-kind or cash-based transfers to crisis-affected populations, including COVID-19 populations in epicentres, refugees and displaced persons, adolescent girls and other vulnerable groups.									
Consumption-based Coping Strategy Index (Percentage of households with reduced CSI)		24.32	n.a	n.a	< 24.32	12.13	< 10	5.4	< 24.32
Dietary Diversity Score		5.79	n.a	n.a	≥ 7	6.2	≥ 7	6.91	≥ 7
Food Consumption Score	Percentage of households with Acceptable Food Consumption Score	81.67	n.a	n.a	> 85	74.83	> 85	94.53	≥ 95
	Percentage of households with Borderline Food Consumption Score	10.56	n.a	n.a	< 10	15.89	< 10	4.48	< 5
	Percentage of households with Poor Food Consumption Score	7.78	n.a	n.a	< 5	9.27	< 5	1	= 0
Food Expenditure Share		67.06	n.a	n.a	< 65	59.49	< 65	55.22	< 65

Source: COMET report CM-L008b. ACR 2019, 2020 and 2021.

Table 15: T-ICSP output indicators

Output indicator	Detail indicator	Unit	2018						% achieved	
			Planned			Actual				
			M	F	Total	M	F	Total		
SO1: Vulnerable women, adolescent girls, people living with HIV and children aged 6–23 months in targeted areas have enhanced nutritional status all year round.										
01 School meals programme provides take-home rations, nutrition education and adolescent sexual & reproductive health education to adolescent girls in junior high school.										
A: Adolescent girls in junior high school receive take-home rations in order to reward attendance (SDG4) and improve gender parity (SDG5).										
A.3	Total amount of cash transferred to targeted beneficiaries		USD	n.a	n.a	1323000	n.a	n.a	130182	9.8%
A.4	Total value of vouchers (expressed in food/cash) distributed to targeted beneficiaries		USD	n.a	n.a	1323000	n.a	n.a	1479595	111.8%
A.7	Number of retailers participating in cash-based transfer programmes		Retailers	n.a	n.a	13	n.a	n.a	13	100%
E: Adolescent girls in junior high school receive education on nutrition and adolescent sexual and reproductive health in order to improve their nutritional status and improve their health and well-being (SDG 3).										

E.2	Number of people exposed to WFP-supported nutrition messaging		Person	n.a	18000	18000	n.a	16028	16028	89%
02 NPA Provide commodity vouchers to access locally-produced specialized nutritious foods to pregnant and lactating women and girls, people living with HIV and children 6–23 months.										
A: Pregnant and lactating women and girls, people living with HIV and children 6–23 months in areas with highest stunting and HIV prevalence receive locally produced nutrient-dense foods, including locally produced specialized nutritious foods, in order to prevent malnutrition.										
A.4	Total value of vouchers (expressed in food/cash) distributed to targeted beneficiaries		USD	n.a	n.a	1548000	n.a	n.a	283286.87	18.3%
A.7	Number of retailers participating in cash-based transfer programmes		Retailers	n.a	n.a	39	n.a	n.a	39	100%
03 CS11 Activity 3 Provide capacity strengthening to Ghana Health Service for nutrition counselling and social behavioural change communication (SBCC).										
E: Pregnant and lactating women and girls and people living with HIV benefit from increased awareness of proper infant and young child feeding (IYCF) practices and healthy eating habits in order to prevent malnutrition.										
E.1	Number of targeted caregivers (male and female) receiving three key messages delivered through WFP-supported messaging and counselling		Individual	n.a	20000	20000	n.a	44181	44181	220.9%
E.3	Number of people receiving WFP-supported nutrition counselling		Individual	n.a	20000	20000	n.a	44181	44181	220.9%
SO2: Targeted populations and communities benefit from enhanced food systems which support nutrition value chains by 2030.										
04 CSB Provide technical support to selected community-level processors of blended flours.										
A,C: Community-level small scale processors benefit from enhanced capacity in order to enhance their livelihoods.										
A.5	Quantity of non-food items distributed		USD	n.a	n.a	700000	n.a	n.a	683047.71	97.6%
05 CS11 Provide financial and technical support to two industrial processors for equipment upgrade.										
C,L: Targeted populations benefit from a better food system which offers increased availability and affordability of locally produced specialized nutritious foods in order to diversify their diet and prevent stunting.										
L.2	Amount of investments in equipment made, by type		USD	n.a	n.a	700000	n.a	n.a	400000	57.1%
06 SMS1 Provide capacity building & equipment support for smallholder farmers on good agricultural practices, post-harvest handling and quality assurance.										
F: Smallholder farmers benefit from increased training in good agricultural practices and on post-harvest management practices to reduce losses and improve sales to industrial and community-level processors.										
F: Targeted smallholder farmers increase sales of quality staples to institutional markets and selected processors of specialized nutritious foods in order to improve livelihoods.										
SO3: National institutions have strengthened capacity to manage food security and safety net programmes by 2020.										
07 CS11 Provide technical support to the national school feeding programme on policy implementation and monitoring, targeting, nutritious quality of school meals and linkages to smallholder farmers.										
C: Schoolchildren targeted by Ghana's home-grown school feeding (HGSF) benefit from increased capacity of the Government to implement and manage a nutrition-sensitive and smallholder friendly home-grown school feeding programme.										
C.1	Number of people trained		Individual	n.a	n.a	500	n.a	n.a	465	93%

C.2	Number of capacity development activities provided		Activity	n.a	n.a	5	n.a	n.a	3	60%
C.3	Number of technical support activities provided		Activity	n.a	n.a	5	n.a	n.a	1	20%
S04: Government efforts towards achieving zero hunger by 2030 are supported by effective and coherent policy frameworks.										
08 CSI1 Provide technical support for policies & legislation related to social protection, nutrition, local fortification, and smallholder farmers to the Government.										
I: Ghanaians benefit from adoption of the “Quality Seal” to enhance quality of locally produced fortified foods.										
I: Ghanaians benefit from adoption of nutrition policy that enables them to improve nutrition status and access nutrition services.										
I.1	Number of policy engagement strategies developed/implemented		Policy	n.a	n.a	10	n.a	n.a	6	60%
I: Smallholders benefit from more friendly public procurement act and from adoption of scales and standardized bags, in order to improve their income and livelihoods.										
I: Ghanaians benefit from adoption of the “Quality Seal” to enhance quality of locally produced fortified foods.										

n.a. = Not applicable (the indicator was not included in the version of the log frame valid at the time of ACR reporting).

Red: target less than 50 percent achieved; **Yellow:** target between 50 percent and 80 percent achieved; **Green:** target achieved over 80 percent.

Source: COMET report CM-R008 2018. ACR 2018.

Table 16: CSP output indicators

Output Indicator	Detail Indicator	Unit	2019			2020			2021			
			Planned	Actual	% achieved	Planned	Actual	% achieved	Planned	Actual	% achieved	
			Total	Total		Total	Total		Total	Total		
S01: Vulnerable populations, including children and women of reproductive age, in high burden regions have improved nutritional status in line with national targets by 2025.												
01 Provide cash/vouchers for specialized nutritious foods and/or micronutrient-dense fresh foods to vulnerable children 6–23 months, adolescent girls, pregnant and lactating women and girls under government safety net programmes, and support Ghana Health Service on SBCC for healthy diets in high burden areas.												
A.1	Number of women, men, boys and girls receiving food/cash-based transfers/commodity vouchers/capacity-strengthening transfers	Number of project participants	Individual	45,000	26,268	58.37%	45,000	34,171	75.94%	45,000	407,227	904.95%
		Children receiving CBT	Individual	20,000	13,900	69.50%	20,000	19,834	99.17%	20,000	18,861	94.31%

		PLW receiving CBT	Individual	20,000	17,891	89.46%	20,000	28,929	144.65%	20,000	20,995	104.98%
		Activity supporters receiving CBT	Individual	5,000	0	0.00%	5,000	4,609	92.18%	5,000	6,432	n.a
A.2	Food transfers		Metric tons (mt)	1,159	0	0.00%	1,159	0	0.00%	1,159	0	0.00%
A.3	Total amount of cash transferred to targeted beneficiaries		USD	2,614,361	1,082,473	41.40%	2,614,361	1,501,547	57%	0	126,005	n.a
A.4	Total value of vouchers (expressed in food/cash) distributed to targeted beneficiaries		USD	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	2,614,362	845,746	32.35%
A,B: Vulnerable pregnant and lactating women and girls, adolescent girls and children aged 6–23 months under government safety net programmes in areas with the highest rates of stunting and anaemia receive e-vouchers for nutrient-dense foods that prevent malnutrition, including locally-produced specialized nutritious foods.												
A.1	Number of women, men, boys and girls receiving food/cash-based transfers/commodity vouchers/capacity-strengthening transfers	Number of participants in beneficiary training sessions (health and nutrition)	Individual	336	326	97.02%	45,000	34,171	75.94%	45,000	56,227	124.95%
		Number of project participants	Individual	45,000	26,268	58.37%	45,000	34,171	75.94%	45,000	407,227	904.95%
A.7	Number of retailers participating in cash-based transfer programmes	Number of retailers participating in cash-based transfer programmes	Retailer	58	58	100.00%	53	79	149.06%	91	79	86.81%
A.8	Number of rations provided	Number of rations provided	Ration	6	6	100.00%	6	10	166.67%	6	6	100.00%
B.2	Quantity of specialized nutritious foods provided	Quantity of specialized nutritious foods provided	MT	910	486	53.45%	500	702	140.39%	500	885	176.90%
E*: Pregnant and lactating women and girls, adolescent girls and caregivers of children aged 6–23 months and their households in areas with high numbers of stunted children benefit from SBCC from the Ghana Health Service.												
E*.4	Number of people reached through interpersonal SBCC approaches	Number of people reached through interpersonal SBCC approaches	Number	65,000	46,917	72.18%	104223	68431	65.66%	55,000	75,190	136.71%
E*.5	Number of people reached through SBCC approaches using media	Community radio	Individual	70,000	52,004	74.29%	150,000	379,655	253.10%	150,000	379,655	253.10%
		Songs, theatre	Individual	55,000	22,535	40.97%	35,000	42,147	120.42%	35,000	42,147	120.42%
SO2: Targeted populations and communities in Ghana benefit from more efficient, inclusive and resilient food systems that support nutrition value chains by 2030.												
O2 CS11 Provide technical support on production of fortified flours, food safety and quality assurance to selected community-level and industrial food processors.												
C,L: Targeted populations benefit from strengthened capacities of industrial and community food processors to improve access to specialized nutritious foods at affordable prices and to safe milled and blended flour.												

C.4*	Number of people engaged in capacity-strengthening initiatives facilitated by WFP to enhance national food security and nutrition stakeholder capacities (new)			10	5	50.00%	12	3	25.00%	200	120	60.00%
C.5*	Number of capacity-strengthening initiatives facilitated by WFP to enhance national food security and nutrition stakeholder capacities (new)	Number of technical assistance activities provided	Unit	100	2	2.00%	5	7	140.00%	3	3	100.00%
		Number of training sessions/workshop organized	Training session	5	1	20.00%	5	0	0.00%	70	67	95.71%
L.2	Amount of investments in equipment made, by type	Number of government/national partner staff receiving technical assistance and training	Individual									
03 SMS1 Provide support and link smallholder farmers to the Government One District One Warehouse flagship through training and equipment support for the reduction of post-harvest losses, quality assurance and market linkages to processors and institutional demand.												
C: Smallholder farmers benefit from enhanced warehouse inventory management under the One District, One Warehouse programme to reduce post-harvest losses.												
C.10	Number of smallholder farmers linked to the WFP-supported warehouse programme	Number of smallholder farmers linked to the WFP-supported warehouse programme	Number	20	16	80.00%	50	50	100.00%	1,200	600	50.00%
C.4*	Number of people engaged in capacity-strengthening initiatives facilitated by WFP to enhance national food security and nutrition stakeholder capacities (new)	Number of government/national partner staff receiving technical assistance and training	Individual	10	20	200.00%	25	5	20.00%	180	120	66.67%
C.5*	Number of capacity-strengthening initiatives facilitated by WFP to enhance national food security and nutrition stakeholder capacities (new)	Number of technical assistance activities provided	Unit	5	100	2000.00%	3	3	100.00%	1	1	100.00%
		Number of training sessions/workshop organized	Training session	5	5	100.00%	39	36	92.31%	5	1	20.00%
C,F: Targeted smallholder farmers improve their incomes and livelihoods through increased purchases by institutional markets and processors of specialized nutritious foods.												
C.5*	Number of capacity-strengthening initiatives facilitated by WFP to enhance national food security and nutrition stakeholder capacities (new)	Number of technical assistance activities provided										
		Number of training sessions/workshop organized										

F.1	Number of smallholder farmers supported/trained	Number of agreements established with market-oriented organizations/ companies for better market linkages	Unit	20	12	60.00%	6	2	33.33%	0	0	n.a
		Number of farmer groups supported through local purchases	Farmer group	60	34	56.67%	30	20	66.67%	0	0	n.a
		Number of farmer leaders trained in farming as a business	Individual	108	58	53.70%	150	50	33.33%	250	240	96.00%
		Number of farmer organizations/farmer group leaders trained on group dynamics	Individual	97	60	61.86%	150	50	33.33%	250	240	96.00%
		Number of individuals trained in business skills	Individual	194	2650	1365.98%	150	50	33.33%	300	260	86.67%
		Number of platform meetings with value chain actors/market-oriented companies	Instance	5	2	40.00%	5	5	100.00%	5	8	160.00%
		Number of smallholder farmers supported by WFP	Individual	8000	7340	91.75%	1000	1000	100.00%	10,000	4,571	45.71%
		Number of training sessions/workshops organized	Training session	5	5	100.00%	6	4	66.67%	5	8	160.00%
		Quantity of food purchased locally from pro-smallholder aggregation systems	MT	5000	3295	65.90%	2000	800	40.00%	5,000	3,511	70.22%

F: Targeted smallholder farmers benefit from the use of hermetic silos and enhanced post-harvest handling to reduce post-harvest losses.

F.1	Number of smallholder farmers supported/trained	Number of farmer organization leaders trained in good agronomic practices	Individual	3,000	2,900	96.67%	150	96	64.00%	0	0	n.a
		Number of farmer organization leaders trained in warehouse management practices	Individual	200	150	75.00%	50	0	0.00%	200	170	85.00%
		Number of farmer organizations supported with basic equipment	Farmer organization	60	0	0.00%	30	0	0.00%	0	0	n.a

		required for marketing (platform weighing scale)										
		Number of farmer organizations supported with equipment (tarpaulins) for post-harvest handling	Farmer organization	80	0	0.00%	30	5	16.67%	60	24	40.00%
		Number of farmer organizations trained in market access and post-harvest handling skills	Farmer organization	80	38	47.50%	30	30	100.00%	74	50	67.57%
		Number of farmers receiving hermetic storage equipment	Individual	20	0	0.00%	150	35	23.33%	2,000	1721	86.05%
		Number of farmers trained in marketing skills and post-harvest handling	Individual	20	20	100.00%	1000	1000	100.00%	5,000	3511	70.22%
		Number of individual farmers trained in post-harvest handling practices	Individual	3,000	2,650	88.33%	1000	1000	100.00%	600	511	85.17%

SO3: Local and national institutions have strengthened capacity to better target and manage food security, nutrition and social protection programmes by 2030.

04 CS11 Provide technical support including through South-South cooperation to the national school feeding programme, MoFA-SRID, NADMO, FDA and GHS on nutritional quality of school meals, food security monitoring, early warning system, disaster risk reduction & emergency preparedness, food safety and quality, and food-based dietary guidelines.

C: Populations benefit from enhanced food security and nutrition monitoring integrated with early-warning systems that facilitate timely government assistance in emergencies.

C.4*	Number of people engaged in capacity-strengthening initiatives facilitated by WFP to enhance national food security and nutrition stakeholder capacities (new)	Number of government/national partner staff receiving technical assistance and training	Individual	10	8	80.00%	120	108	90.00%	120	222	185.00%
C.5*	Number of capacity-strengthening initiatives facilitated by WFP to enhance national food security and nutrition stakeholder capacities (new)	Number of technical assistance activities provided	Unit	2	1	50.00%	3	3	100.00%	3	6	200.00%
		Number of training sessions/workshop organized	Training session	2	2	100.00%	3	3	100.00%	2	4	200.00%

C: Populations benefit from enhanced research into local foods and dietary guidelines to improve nutrition practices.

C.4*	Number of people engaged in capacity-strengthening initiatives facilitated by WFP to enhance national food security	Number of technical assistance activities provided	Unit	2	2	100.00%	39	40	102.56%	35	30	85.71%
------	---	--	------	---	---	---------	----	----	---------	----	----	--------

	and nutrition stakeholder capacities (new)											
C.5*	Number of capacity-strengthening initiatives facilitated by WFP to enhance national food security and nutrition stakeholder capacities (new)	Number of government/national partner staff receiving technical assistance and training	Individual	1	6	600.00%	2	2	100.00%	2	3	150.00%
C: Populations benefit from the enhanced capacity of the Food and Drugs Authority for food safety checks and the labelling of nutritious foods to ensure access to safe food of good quality.												
C.4*	Number of people engaged in capacity-strengthening initiatives facilitated by WFP to enhance national food security and nutrition stakeholder capacities (new)	Number of government/national partner staff receiving technical assistance and training	Individual	3	86	2866.7%	38	38	100.00%	38	30	78.95%
C.5*	Number of capacity-strengthening initiatives facilitated by WFP to enhance national food security and nutrition stakeholder capacities (new)	Number of technical assistance activities provided	Unit	3	3	100.00%	1	0	0.00%	3	2	66.67%
		Number of training sessions/workshop organized	Training session	2	3	150.00%	7	1	14.29%	7	6	85.71%
C: Populations benefit from updated national assessment and mapping of food-insecure and vulnerable groups to improve access to social protection services.												
C.5*	Number of capacity-strengthening initiatives facilitated by WFP to enhance national food security and nutrition stakeholder capacities (new)	Number of technical assistance activities provided	Unit	2	1	50.00%	1	1	100.00%	1	2	200.00%
C: Schoolchildren benefit from strengthened capacities in the national school meals programme to provide nutritious school meals based on local ingredients.												
C.4*	Number of people engaged in capacity-strengthening initiatives facilitated by WFP to enhance national food security and nutrition stakeholder capacities (new)	Number of government/national partner staff receiving technical assistance and training	Individual	50	235	470.00%	40	40	100.00%	50	90	180.00%
C.5*	Number of capacity-strengthening initiatives facilitated by WFP to enhance national food security and nutrition stakeholder capacities (new)	Number of technical assistance activities provided	Unit	4	4	100.00%	2	0	0.00%	2	4	200.00%
		Number of training sessions/workshop organized	Training session	4	7	175.00%	6	0	0.00%	6	14	233.33%
SO4: Government efforts towards achieving zero hunger by 2030 are supported by advocacy and effective and coherent policy frameworks.												

05 CS11 Advocate for promulgation and enforcement of policies & legislation related to school feeding, gender, nutrition, food safety, weights, measures and standards, smallholder friendly public procurement, and market support at national institutions.

C: Smallholder farmers benefit from technical and policy support from the Government and private sector in the development of an effective warehouse receipts system.

C.4*	Number of people engaged in capacity-strengthening initiatives facilitated by WFP to enhance national food security and nutrition stakeholder capacities (new)	Number of government/national partner staff receiving technical assistance and training	Individual	3	3	100.00%	100	0	0.00%	300	200	66.67%
C.5*	Number of capacity-strengthening initiatives facilitated by WFP to enhance national food security and nutrition stakeholder capacities (new)	Number of technical assistance activities provided	Unit	2	2	100.00%	1	1	100.00%	3	2	66.67%
		Number of training sessions/workshop organized	Training session	50	50	100.00%	5	0	0.00%	5	4	80.00%

J: Populations benefit from advocacy on nutrition-sensitive agriculture under the One Village, One Dam programme to improve access to nutritious food.

J: Populations benefit from nutrition-sensitive and gender-responsive social protection programmes that meet their basic food and nutrition needs.

J: Populations benefit from support for national institutions in the development of a gender-transformative nutrition policy and school meals legislation that meet their basic food and nutrition needs.

J: Smallholder farmers benefit from pro-smallholder public procurement policies and procedures that increase their incomes.

SO5: Crisis-affected populations are able to meet their basic food and nutrition needs during and in the aftermath of shocks.

06 URT1 Provide food and nutrition assistance through in-kind or cash-based transfers to crisis-affected populations, including COVID-19 populations in epicentres, refugees and displaced persons, adolescent girls and other vulnerable groups.

A.1	Beneficiaries receiving cash-based transfers	All	Individual	n.a	n.a	n.a	50,000	68,311	136.62%	50,000	23,380	46.76%
		Students (secondary schools)	Individual	n.a	n.a	n.a	25,000	0	0.00%	25,000	0	0.00%
		All	Individual	n.a	n.a	n.a	20,000	0	0.00%	20,000	0	0.00%
A.2	Food transfers		MT	n.a	n.a	n.a	1,356	0	0.00%	1,236	0	0.00%

A: Adolescent girls in junior high school receive cash incentives that contribute to their basic food and nutrition needs and improve attendance and retention in schools after the COVID-19 emergency

A.1	Number of women, men, boys and girls receiving food/cash-based transfers/commodity vouchers/capacity-strengthening transfers	Number of institutions supported for the delivery of shock responsive and nutrition-sensitive social protection programmes	Institution	n.a	n.a	n.a	5,000	0	0.00%	5,000	0	0.00%
A.6	Number of institutional sites assisted	Number of schools assisted by WFP	School	n.a	n.a	n.a	59	0	0.00%	0	0	n.a
A.8	Number of rations provided	Number of rations provided	Ration	n.a	n.a	n.a	6	0	0.00%	6	0	0.00%

N*.1	Feeding days as percentage of total school days			n.a	n.a	n.a	30	0	0.00%	0	0	n.a
A: COVID-19 affected populations in epicentres receive timely and adequate nutritious food and/or cash-based transfers in order to meet their immediate food and nutrition needs.												
A.1	Number of women, men, boys and girls receiving food/cash-based transfers/commodity vouchers/capacity-strengthening transfers	Number of beneficiaries reached as a result of the WFP contribution to the social protection system	Individual	n.a	n.a	n.a	65,000	48,816	75.10%	5000	23380	467.60%
		Number of institutions supported for the delivery of shock responsive and nutrition-sensitive social protection programmes	Institution	n.a	n.a	n.a	4	4	100.00%	4	3	75.00%
A.6	Number of institutional sites assisted	Number of institutional sites assisted	Site	n.a	n.a	n.a	10	7	70.00%	0	0	n.a
A.8	Number of rations provided	Number of rations provided	Ration	n.a	n.a	n.a	3	3	100.00%	0	0	n.a
B.2	Quantity of specialized nutritious foods provided	Quantity of specialized nutritious foods provided	MT	n.a	n.a	n.a	50	65	130.00%	100	0	0.00%
A,B: Refugees and displaced persons receive timely in-kind food assistance in order to meet their immediate food and nutrition needs.												
A.1	Number of women, men, boys and girls receiving food/cash-based transfers/commodity vouchers/capacity-strengthening transfers	Number of project participants	Individual	n.a	n.a	n.a	25,000	0	0.00%	0	0	n.a
A.8	Number of rations provided	Number of rations provided	Ration	n.a	n.a	n.a	0	0	n.a	0	0	n.a
B.1	Quantity of fortified food provided			n.a	n.a	n.a	10000	0	0.00%	0	0	n.a
E*: COVID-19 affected populations and adolescent girls in the epicentres, refugees and displaced benefit from enhanced social behavioural change communication from partners.												
E*.4	Number of people reached through interpersonal SBCC approaches	Number of people reached through interpersonal SBCC approaches (women)	Number	n.a	n.a	n.a	10,000	6,000	60.00%	0	0	n.a

n.a. = Not applicable (the indicator was not included in the version of the log frame valid at the time of ACR reporting).

Red: target less than 50 percent achieved; **Yellow:** target between 50 percent and 80 percent achieved; **Green:** target achieved over 80 percent.

Source: COMET report CM-R008 2019, 2020 and 2021. ACR 2019, 2020 and 2021.

Table 17: T-ICSP cross-cutting indicators

Cross-cutting indicator	Modality	Baseline set (2017)	2018		T-ICSP-end target
			Year-end target	Follow-up	
		Overall	Overall	Overall	Overall
C.1 Affected populations are able to hold WFP and partners accountable for meeting their hunger needs in a manner that reflects their views and preferences.					
C.1.1: Proportion of assisted people informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, length of assistance)	Commodity voucher	70	=90	69	=90
	Commodity voucher	96.67	=90	100	=90
	Commodity voucher	62.96	=90	89.8	=90
	Cash	70	=90	94.41	=90
C.1.2: Proportion of project activities for which beneficiary feedback is documented, analysed and integrated into programme improvements	Commodity voucher	100	= 100	100	= 100
	Commodity voucher	100	= 100	100	= 100
	Commodity voucher	100	= 100	100	= 100
	Cash	100	= 100	100	= 100
C.2 Affected populations are able to benefit from WFP programmes in a manner that ensures and promotes their safety, dignity and integrity.					
C.2.1 - Proportion of targeted people accessing assistance without protection challenges	Commodity voucher	100	= 100	100	= 100
	Commodity voucher	100	= 100	100	= 100
	Commodity voucher	100	= 100	100	= 100
	Cash	100	= 100	100	= 100
C.3 Improved gender equality and women's empowerment among WFP-assisted population.					
C.3.1 - 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	Commodity voucher	86.2	= 50	59.83	= 50
	Commodity voucher	3.33	= 50	3.85	= 50
	Commodity voucher	11.11	= 50	2.04	= 50
	Cash	86.2	= 50	48.95	= 50
C.3.1 - 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	Commodity voucher	8.3	= 25	15.72	= 25
	Commodity voucher	6.67	= 25	1.92	= 25
	Commodity voucher	37.04	= 25	8.16	= 25
	Cash	8.3	= 25	9.73	= 25
C.3.1 - 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	Commodity voucher	4.2	= 25	24.45	= 25
	Commodity voucher	90	= 25	94.23	= 25
	Commodity voucher	50.85	= 25	89.8	= 25

	Cash	4.2	= 25	47.55	= 25
C.3.3 - Type of transfer (food, cash, voucher, no compensation) received by participants in WFP activities, disaggregated by gender and type of activity					
C.4 Targeted communities benefit from WFP programmes in a manner that does not harm the environment.					
C.4.1: Proportion of activities for which environmental risks have been screened and, as required, mitigation actions identified	Capacity strengthening	100	= 100	100	= 100

Source: COMET report CM-R009b 2018. ACR 2018.

Table 18: CSP cross-cutting indicators

Cross-cutting indicator	Modality	Baseline set (2018)	2019		2020		2021		CSP-end target
			Year-end target	Follow-up	Year-end target	Follow-up	Year-end target	Follow-up	
		Overall	Overall	Overall	Overall	Overall	Overall	Overall	Overall
C.1 Affected populations are able to hold WFP and partners accountable for meeting their hunger needs in a manner that reflects their views and preferences.									
C.1.1: Proportion of assisted people informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, length of assistance)	Commodity vouchers	24.63	≥ 24.63	25.56	≥ 60	37.53	≥ 60	22.96	= 80
C.1.2: Proportion of project activities for which beneficiary feedback is documented, analysed and integrated into programme improvements	Capacity strengthening, commodity voucher	100	= 100	100	= 100	100	= 100	100	= 100
C.2 Affected populations are able to benefit from WFP programmes in a manner that ensures and promotes their safety, dignity and integrity.									
C.2.2: Proportion of targeted people receiving assistance without safety challenges (new)	Commodity vouchers	99.77	= 90	98.87	= 90	98.63	= 90	99.96	= 90
C.2.3: Proportion of targeted people who report that WFP programmes are dignified (new)	Commodity vouchers	87.5	= 90	95.85	= 90	99.39	= 90	97.15	= 90
C.2.4: Proportion of targeted people having unhindered access to WFP programmes (new)	Commodity vouchers	95.47	= 100	94.93	= 100	99.72	= 100	81.99	= 100
C.3 Improved gender equality and women's empowerment among WFP-assisted population.									

C.3.1 - 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	Commodity vouchers	31.59	= 50	23.15	≥ 50	11.7	≥ 50	41.43	= 50
C.3.1 - 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	Commodity vouchers	8.51	= 25	2.4	≤ 25	1.92	≤ 25	20.48	= 25
C.3.1 - 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	Commodity vouchers	59.54	= 25	74.45	≤ 25	86.38	≤ 25	38.1	= 25
C.4 Targeted communities benefit from WFP programmes in a manner that does not harm the environment.									
C.4.1: Proportion of activities for which environmental risks have been screened and, as required, mitigation actions identified	Capacity strengthening	100	= 100	100	= 100	100	= 100	100	= 100

Source: COMET report CM-R009b 2019, 2020 and 2021. ACR 2019, 2020 and 2021.

Annex X: Key informants' overview

Organization	Female	Male
Abubakar Sadiq Primary School		2
Alpha Communications and Health Foundation	1	
Asokore Manpong Health Administration	1	
Association of Ghana Industries		2
Beneficiaries activity 1 and 2 (T-ICSP) and activity 1 (CSP)	1	
BOBGU NYE YAAFarmers Coop	1	1
CARE International	1	
Care International in Ghana	1	4
Choggu Health Centre	3	
Covid-19 CBT beneficiaries		1
District Nutrition Office-Bosomtwi	1	
Emergency coordination		1
Emergency coordination (instead of emergency coordinator)		1
European Union	1	
FAO		2
Farm International		1
Farm Radio International		1
Food and Drugs Authority		2
Ghana Aids Commission		1
Ghana Red Cross		1
Ghana School Feeding Programme	2	
GHS	5	2
GHS/FHD/Nutrition	1	
Kanvili Health Centre	3	
KokoPlus Foundation	2	1
KokoPlus Foundation/GHS	1	
Kuffour Foundation	1	
Liberty Enterprise	1	
Loyal Enterprise	1	
Marvvmay Enterprise	1	
Minash Shopping Centre	1	
Ministry of Agriculture		1
Ministry of Finance	1	1
Ministry of Food and Agriculture	1	2
Ministry of Food and Agriculture - SRID		1
Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection	1	
Ministry of Social Welfare and Gender	1	
NADMO		2
National Disaster Management Organization	1	
NDPC	1	
Network of People Living with HIV (NAP+)	1	

RCO	1	1
Regional Nutrition Office-Ashanti	1	
Savannah Signatures	1	
Sesi Technologies		1
SWIDA		3
UNCDF	1	
UNHCR		1
UNICEF	1	3
USAID	1	
Wesh- Pat Enterprise	1	
WFP country office	18	14
World Bank	1	
Yepala Village	1	
Zisung Farmer Cooperative	1	1
Grand Total	65	54

Annex XI: Acronyms

AAP	Accountability to affected populations
ACR	Annual Country Report
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CBTs	Cash-based transfers
CCS	Country capacity strengthening
CEQAS	Centralized Evaluation Quality Assurance Systems
CFM	Complaint feedback mechanism
CFSVA	Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis
CO	Country office
CPESDP	Coordinated Programme of Economic and Social Development Policies
CSP	Country Strategic Plan
CSPE	Country Strategic Plan Evaluations
DDoE	Deputy Director of Evaluation
DHS	Demographic and Health Survey
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EM	Evaluation manager
ENVAC	Enhanced Nutrition and Value Chain
ET	Evaluation team
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FBO	Farmer-based organization
FDA	Food and Drugs Authority
FIS	Flood information system
FSN	Food security and nutrition
FSNMS	Food security and nutrition monitoring system
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEWE	Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

GHS	Ghana Health Service
GNI	Gross national income
HGSF	Home-grown school feeding
HQ	Headquarters
IDPs	Internally displaced persons
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IR	Inception report
IRG	Internal reference group
IYCF	Infant and young child feeding
KII	Key informant interview
LEAP	Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty
LMIC	Lower-middle income country
LoS	Line of sight
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MAM	Moderate acute malnutrition
MoFA	Ministry of Food and Agriculture
MoGCSP	Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection
MoU	Memorandum of understanding
NADMO	National Disaster Management Organization
NBP	Needs-based plan
NDPC	National Development Planning Commission
NGOs	Non-governmental organizations
NHIS	National Health Insurance Scheme
NMTDPF	National Medium Term Development Policy Framework
ODA	Official development assistance
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee
OEV	Office of Evaluation
OFSP	Orange-flesh sweet potatoes

P4P	Purchase for progress
PDM	Post-distribution monitoring
PHL	Post-harvest loss
PLHIV	People living with HIV
PLW	Pregnant and lactating women
PPF	Private Partnerships and Fundraising Division
PRP	programme review and approval process
PSEA	Protection from sexual exploitation and abuse
PWD	Persons with disability
QA	Quality assurance
RB	Regional bureau
RBA	Rome-based agencies
RC	Resident Coordinator
SBCC	Social and behavioural change communication
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SFP	School feeding programme
SHF	Smallholder farmers
SNF	Specialized nutritious foods
SO	Strategic Outcome
SUN	Scaling Up Nutrition
SWIDA	Savanna Women Integrated Development Agency
TA	Technical advisor
TFR	Total fertility rate
T-ICSP	Transition Interim Country Strategic Plan
TL	Team leader
ToC	Theory of change
UNCT	United Nations country team
UNEG	United Nation Evaluation Group

UNICEF	The United Nations Children's Fund
UNSDP	United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership
WFP	World Food Programme

Annex XII: Bibliography

- African Post-Harvest Losses Information System** 2020. *Postharvest Losses – Ghana*.
<https://www.aphlis.net/en/data/tables/dry-weight-losses/XAF/all-crops/2020?metric=prc>, accessed 7 June 2022.
- Aryeetey, R., Atuobi-Yeboah, A., Billings, L., Nisbett, N., van den Bold, M. & Toure, M.** 2021. Stories of change in nutrition in Ghana: a focus on stunting and anemia among children under-five years (2009–2018). *Food Security*, 14(2): 355–379. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12571-021-01232-1>.
- Asante & Taabazuig** 2016. Report on Farmer-Based Organizations (FBOs) Strategy. *Chemonics International*.
- Azupogo, F.** 2022. The Interrelations between Nutrition, Social and Economic Trajectories during Adolescence among Girls in Ghana, *Ph.D. thesis*, Wageningen University.
- Bündnis Entwicklung Hilft** 2021. WorldRiskReport 2021. Available at: <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/worldriskreport-2021-focus-social-protection>.
- Coomson, J. & Aryeetey, R.** 2022. Scoping review of diet-related health outcomes and associated risk factors in Ghana. *African Journal of Food, Agriculture, Nutrition and Development*, 22(2): 19496–524.
- DGAP** 2021. Report: *Ghana as the EU's Migration Partner*. Report No. 7: 21 pp.
<https://dgap.org/en/research/publications/ghana-eus-migration-partner>, accessed 6 June 2022.
- Environmental Protection Agency** 2020. *Ghana's Fourth National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*. Available at: https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Gh_NC4.pdf.
- Germanwatch** 2021. *Global Climate Risk Index 2021*. Available at: <https://www.germanwatch.org/en/19777>.
- Ghana Aids Commission** 2016. *National HIV & Aids Strategic Plan (2016–2020)*. Available at: https://www.prepwatch.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/National_HIV_and_AIDS_Strategic_Plan_2016-2020.pdf.
- Ghana's National Disaster Management Organization** 2020. Weekly Flood Status Report: Aug 12–19, 2020.
- Ghana's National Disaster Management Organization** 2020. Weekly Flood Status Report: Aug 05–12, 2020.
- Ghana's National Disaster Management Organization** 2020. Weekly Flood Status Report: Aug 19–26, 2020.
- Ghana's National Disaster Management Organization** 2020. Weekly Flood Status Report: Aug 26–02, 2020.
- Ghana's National Disaster Management Organization** 2020. Weekly Flood Status Report: Sep 02–09, 2020.
- Ghana's National Disaster Management Organization** 2020. Weekly Flood Status Report: Sep 16–23, 2020.
- Ghana's National Disaster Management Organization** 2020. Weekly Flood Status Report: Sep 23–30, 2020.
- Ghana's National Disaster Management Organization** 2021. Flood Assessment Report 2021 – Northern Region.
- Ghana National Household Registry** 2021. *Cash Transfers to COVID-19 affected Daily Wage Earners*.

Ghana Statistical Service n.d. Sectoral Share of GDP – Ghana. <https://www.statsghana.gov.gh/gdpgraph.php?graphindicators=MTE4NzYxMzIxNi45NDI1/gpdgraph/49pp7266p8>, accessed 27 June 2022.

Ghana Statistical Service 2010. *Population & Housing Census Report – Disability in Ghana*. Available at: <https://www2.statsghana.gov.gh/docfiles/2010phc/Mono/Disability%20in%20Ghana.pdf>.

Ghana Statistical Service 2015. *Demographic and Health Survey 2014*. Available at: <https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/fr307/fr307.pdf>.

Ghana Statistical Service 2018. *Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS2017/18)*, Survey Findings Report. https://mics-surveys-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/MICS6/West%20and%20Central%20Africa/Ghana/2017-2018/Survey%20findings/Ghana%202017-18%20MICS%20Survey%20Findings%20Report_English.pdf.

Ghana Statistical Service 2018. *Poverty Trends in Ghana (2005–2017)*. Available at: https://www2.statsghana.gov.gh/docfiles/publications/GLSS7/Poverty%20Profile%20Report_2005%20-%202017.pdf.

Ghana Statistical Service 2019. *Ghana Living Standards Survey (GLSS) 7 – Main Report*. Available at: https://www.statsghana.gov.gh/gssmain/fileUpload/pressrelease/GLSS7%20MAIN%20REPORT_FINAL.pdf

Ghana Statistical Service 2020. *2017/18 Ghana Census of Agriculture, Main Report*.

Ghana Statistical Service 2021. <https://www.statsghana.gov.gh/>, accessed 6 June 2022.

Ghana Statistical Service 2021a. *Ghana 2021 Population and Housing Census – General Report Volume 3A*. Available at: <https://census2021.statsghana.gov.gh/>.

Ghana Statistical Service 2021b. *Ghana 2021 Population and Housing Census – General Report Volume 3B*. Available at: <https://census2021.statsghana.gov.gh/>.

Welthungerhilfe and Concern Worldwide 2021. *Global Hunger Index 2021: Ghana*. Available at: <https://www.globalhungerindex.org/pdf/en/2021/Ghana.pdf>.

Government of Ghana 2015. *Gender and Agricultural Development Strategy II (GADS II)*. Available at: <https://faolex.fao.org/docs/pdf/gha191457.pdf>

Government of Ghana 2015. *School Feeding Policy*. Available at: <http://www.mogcsp.gov.gh/mdocs-posts/national-school-feeding-policy/>.

Government of Ghana 2016. *Long-Term National Development Plan for Ghana (2018–2027)*. Available at: https://www.cabri-sbo.org/uploads/bia/ghana_2018_planning_external_national_plan_author_region_english_.pdf.

Government of Ghana 2016. *National Nutrition Policy*. Available at: <https://www.unicef.org/ghana/media/1311/file/UN712528.pdf>.

Government of Ghana 2017. *The Coordinated Programme of Economic and Social Development Policies 2017–2024*. Available at: [https://s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/new-ndpc-static1/CACHES/PUBLICATIONS/2018/04/11/Coordinate+Programme-Final+\(November+11,+2017\)+cover.pdf](https://s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/new-ndpc-static1/CACHES/PUBLICATIONS/2018/04/11/Coordinate+Programme-Final+(November+11,+2017)+cover.pdf).

Government of Ghana 2018. *An Agenda for Jobs: Creating Prosperity and Equal Opportunity for All (First Step) 2018–2021*. Available at: <https://s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/new-ndpc-static1/CACHES/PUBLICATIONS/2018/08/23/Medium-term+Policy+Framework-Final+June+2018.pdf>.

Government of Ghana 2019. *Education Strategic Plan 2018–2030*. Available at: <https://assets.globalpartnership.org/s3fs-public/2019-05-education-strategic-plan-2018-2030.pdf?VersionId=vEGK.kIV26xMQ.hDq0G3SRm2GwPsqd5>.

Government of Ghana 2019. *Ghana Beyond Aid Charter and Strategy Document*. <https://docplayer.net/151965741-Ghana-beyond-aid-charter-and-strategy-document.html>.

Government of Ghana 2020. *2017/2018 Ghana Census of Agriculture, National Report*.

Government of Ghana & United Nations in Ghana 2018. *United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership 2018–2022 - Ghana*.

Government of Ghana & United Nations in Ghana 2019. *UNSDP Result Area 1, JWP 2018–2019 (Excel Document)*.

Government of Ghana & United Nations in Ghana 2022. *End of Programme Evaluation of United Nations Ghana Sustainable Development Partnership 2018–2022*.

Government of Ghana & United Nations in Ghana 2022. *UNSDP Result Area 1, JWP 2021–2022 (Excel Document)*.

Government of Ghana 2019. *Ghana Beyond Aid Charter and Strategy Document*. Ghana. Available at: http://osm.gov.gh/assets/downloads/ghana_beyond_aid_charter.pdf.

Government of Ghana – Ministry of Education 2020. *Ghana Education Fact Sheets*.

Government of Ghana – Ministry of Environment, Science and Technology 2013. *National Climate Change Policy*. Available at: <https://www.un-page.org/files/public/ghanacimatechangepolicy.pdf>.

Government of Ghana – Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation 2015. *Ghana National Climate Change Master Plan Action Programmes for Implementation: 2015–2020*.

Government of Ghana – Ministry of Food and Agriculture 2018. *Investing for Food and Jobs, an Agenda for Transforming Ghana's Agriculture (2018–2021)*. Available at: https://mofa.gov.gh/site/images/pdf/National%20Agriculture%20Investment%20Plan_IFJ.pdf.

Government of Ghana – Ministry of Food and Agriculture 2020. *Food security and nutrition monitoring system Ghana*. 1st Edition.

Government of Ghana – Ministry of Food and Agriculture 2021. *Food security and nutrition monitoring system Ghana*. 1st Quarter Edition. Available at: <https://reliefweb.int/report/ghana/food-security-and-nutrition-monitoring-report-fsnms-ghana-1st-edition-june-2020>

Government of Ghana – Ministry of Food and Agriculture 2021. *Food security and nutrition monitoring system Ghana*. 2nd Quarter Edition. Available at: https://srid.mofa.gov.gh/sites/default/files/2nd%20Quarter%202021%20Edition%20of%20Food%20Security%20and%20Nutrition%20Monitoring%20System_final.pdf.

Government of Ghana – Ministry of Food and Agriculture 2021. *Food security and nutrition monitoring system Ghana*. 3rd Quarter Edition. Available at: https://srid.mofa.gov.gh/sites/default/files/3rd%20Quarter%202021%20Edition%20of%20FSMNS_final%20draft%20%281%29.pdf.

Government of Ghana – Ministry of Food and Agriculture 2022. *Food security and nutrition monitoring system Ghana*. 4th Quarter Edition. Available at: https://srid.mofa.gov.gh/sites/default/files/4th%20Quarter%202021%20Edition%20of%20FSMNS_FINAL.pdf.

Government of Ghana – Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection. 2022. *Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty (LEAP)*. Available at: <https://www.mogcsp.gov.gh/projects/livelihood-empowerment-against-poverty-leap/>, accessed 6 June 2022.

Government of Ghana – Ministry of Food and Agriculture. n.d. *Food security and nutrition monitoring system Ghana – Presentation*.

Government of Ghana – Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection 2015. *National Gender Policy*. <https://www.mogcsp.gov.gh/mdocs-posts/national-gender-policy/>.

Government of Ghana – Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection 2015. *National Social Protection Policy*. Available at: <https://www.social->

protection.org/gimi/gess/RessourcePDF.action;jsessionid=huVNPOTSqPVRcsR-6O4axQkAp-1nMrtQOA3dbN9FEkNpKvp-Wg9KI445242879?id=55758.

Government of Ghana – Ministry of the Interior. n.d. Ghana Refugee Board. <https://www.mint.gov.gh/agencies/ghana-refugee-board/>, accessed 6 June 2022.

Government of Ghana 2019. *Voluntary National Review (VNR) Report on the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. Available at: https://ghana.un.org/sites/default/files/2019-10/23420VNR_Report_Ghana_Final_print.pdf.

Government of Ghana 2021a. *Facts & Figures: Agriculture in Ghana, 2020*. Available at: https://srid.mofa.gov.gh/sites/default/files/Agriculture%20In%20Ghana%20Facts%20%26%20Figures_%20020%20FINAL.pdf.

Government of Ghana 2021b. *National Medium-Term Development Policy Framework 2021–2025*.

Human Rights Watch 2022. Ghana Disability Rights Convention Ratified. <https://www.hrw.org/news/2012/08/22/ghana-disability-rights-convention-ratified>, accessed 3 June 2022.

IDMC. n.d. Country Profile Ghana, *Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre*. <https://www.internal-displacement.org/countries/ghana>, accessed 6 June 2022.

IOM 2019. *Migration in Ghana – A Country Profile 2019*. Available at: https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/mp-_ghana-2019.pdf, accessed 6 June 2022.

IOM 2020. *2020 Annual Report Ghana*. Available at: <https://www.iom.int/sites/g/files/tmzbd1486/files/country/docs/ghana/IOM-Ghana-Annual-Report-2020.pdf>.

IOM 2020. *The Socio-Economic Impact of COVID-19 on Migrants in Ghana*. Available at: https://www.iom.int/sites/g/files/tmzbd1486/files/press_release/file/no6_un_ghana_covid-19_briefing_note_iom_impact_on_migrants_29june2020.pdf.

IOM Migration Data Portal 2020. *Total number of international migrants at mid-year 2020*. https://www.migrationdataportal.org/international-data?i=stock_abs_&t=2020&cm49=288, accessed 6 June 2022.

National Disaster Management Organization. n.d. *Comprehensive Situational Reports on Flood Disasters in the Upper West Region*.

National Development Planning Commission 2016. *The Cost of Hunger in Africa: Social and Economic Impact of Child Undernutrition on Ghana's Long-Term Development*.

OCHA 2016. Financial Tracking Services: Country Data – Ghana.

OECD. n.d. Official ODA data. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-data/aid-at-a-glance.htm>, accessed 3 June 2022.

Overseas Development Institute 2018. *Leaving No One Behind in the Health and Education Sectors – An SDG stock take in Ghana*. Available at: <https://cdn.odi.org/media/documents/12146.pdf>.

RPCA 2022. *Food and nutrition situation/Ghana – Cadre Harmonisé Analysis: Ghana*. <https://www.food-security.net/en/datas/ghana/>, accessed 30 June 2022.

Rutten, M. & Verma, M. 2014. *The Impact of Reducing Food Loss in Ghana*. LEI Wageningen UR.

UNDP 2018. *Northern Ghana Human Development Report 2018*. Available at: <https://hdr.undp.org/content/national-human-development-report-2018-northern-ghana>.

UNDP 2020. *Next Frontier: Human Development and the Anthropocene Report, Ghana*.

UNEG 2016. Norms and Standards for Evaluation. *UNEG Foundation Documents*. <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>, accessed 9 June 2022.

UNCT 2021. *PSEA 2021 Brief Annual Report*.

UNCT 2022. PSEA Network Meeting held on 18th March 2022.

UNHCR. n.d. *Promoting Integration through Mobility – Free Movement under ECOWAS*.

<https://www.unhcr.org/media/3-5-promoting-integration-through-mobility-free-movement-under-ecowas-regional-conference> accessed 7 June 2022.

UNHCR. n.d. Refugees – Ghana. <https://www.unhcr.org/gh/who-we-help-2/refugees/>, accessed 6 June 2022.

UNHCR. n.d. Western Region. <https://www.unhcr.org/gh/about-unhcr/where-we-work/western-region/>, accessed 7 June 2022.

UNHCR 2020. Ivorians flee to neighbouring countries fearing post-electoral violence.

<https://www.unhcr.org/news/briefing/2020/11/5fa118a44/ivorians-flee-neighbouring-countries-fearing-post-electoral-violence.html>, accessed 7 June 2022.

UNHCR 2022. *Ghana Fact Sheet January/February 2022*. Available at: https://www.unhcr.org/gh/wp-content/uploads/sites/83/2022/03/UNHCR-Ghana-Factsheet_JanFeb-2022.pdf.

UNICEF 2019. *Ghana Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2017/18 – Survey Findings Report*. Available at: <https://www.unicef.org/ghana/media/2821/file/MICS%206.pdf>.

University of Ghana et al. 2017. *Ghana Micronutrient Survey*. <https://scalingupnutrition.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Ghana-Micronutrient-Survey-2017-Summary-of-Final-Report.pdf>.

USAID 2016. *Intermediary Business Models for Improved Market System Processes and Relationships*. Available at: https://www.chemonics.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/FTF_Proof-of-Concept-Technical-Brief-1.pdf.

USAID 2017. *Climate Change Risk Profile Fact Sheet – Ghana*. Available at:

https://www.climatelinks.org/sites/default/files/asset/document/2017_USAID_Climate%20Change%20Risk%20Profile%20-%20Ghana.pdf.

USAID 2017. Agriculture Policy Support Project (APSP), *Assessing the Impact of Operations of the National Project Food Buffer Stock Company (NAFCO)*.

USAID 2020. *Gender Analysis Report 2020*.

USAID 2020. *USAID/Ghana Analysis Report April 2020*. Available at: <https://banyanglobal.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/USAID-Ghana-Gender-Analysis-Report.pdf>.

USAID 2022. *Business Development Services Market System Analysis Report*. Available at: https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00ZJPD.pdf.

World Bank. n.d. Education Statistics – Ghana. *World Bank Data*.

<https://datatopics.worldbank.org/education/country/ghana>, accessed 9 June 2022.

World Bank 2016. Gini Index – Ghana. *The World Bank Data*,

<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.GINI?locations=GHe>, accessed 3 June 2022.

World Bank 2017. *Creating Markets in Ghana – Country Private Sector Diagnostics*. Available at:

<https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/30212/WP-GH-CPSD-Creating-Markets-in-Ghana-Nov-2017-PUBLIC.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.

World Bank 2018. *Ghana – Priorities for Ending Poverty and Boosting Shared Prosperity*. Available at:

<https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/30974/132010-SCD-corrigendum-PUBLIC.pdf?sequence=5&isAllowed=y>.

World Bank 2021. *Climate Risk Country Profile – Ghana*. Washington.

<https://climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org/country-profiles>, accessed 15 May 2022.

World Bank. n.d. *Ghana Country Profile*. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/ghana/overview>, accessed 15 May 2022.

WFP reports

WFP 2004. *Policy on Humanitarian Principles*.

WFP 2006. *Policy on Humanitarian Access and its Implications*.

WFP 2012. *Protection Policy*.

WFP 2014. *Corporate Partnership Strategy (2014–2017)*. Available at: <https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/communications/wfp282072.pdf>.

WFP 2014. *WFP People Strategy, A People Management Framework for Achieving WFP's Strategic Plan (2014–2017)*.

WFP 2014. *Humanitarian Protection Policy Update*.

WFP 2015. *Gender Policy (2015–2020)*. Available at: <https://www.wfp.org/publications/2015-wfp-gender-policy-2015-2020-0>.

WFP 2016. *Addressing Sustainable Development Goal 2: The Ghana Zero Hunger Strategic Review Summary Report*. Available at: https://ghana.un.org/sites/default/files/2019-10/Addressing%20Sustainable%20Development%20Goal%20The%20Ghana%20Zero%20Hunger%20Strategic%20Review_Summary%20Report.pdf.

WFP 2016. *Policy on Country Strategic Plans*. Available at: https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/eb/wfp286746.pdf?_ga=2.231259421.345602599.1655368805-1980762176.1655368805.

WFP 2016. *WFP's Strategy for Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP)*. Available at: https://fscluster.org/sites/default/files/documents/wfp_aap_strategy_2016-21_0.pdf.

WFP 2016. *WFP Strategic Plan (2017–2021)*. Available at: https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000019573/download/?_ga=2.160477887.345602599.1655368805-1980762176.1655368805.

WFP 2017. *Addressing Sustainable Development Goal 2: The Ghana Zero Hunger Strategic Review Full Report*. Available at: https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000071730/download/?_ga=2.47054116.2038938788.1535558371-1957203229.1486643929.

WFP 2017. *Climate Change Policy*. Available at: https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000023971/download/?_ga=2.111963200.574995786.1667904193-167072062.1659525170.

WFP 2017. *Environmental Policy*. Available at: https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000019504/download/?_ga=2.153890044.574995786.1667904193-167072062.1659525170.

WFP 2018. *Evaluation brief, Evaluation of WFP Policy on Humanitarian Protection*.

WFP 2018. *Gender and Age Marker*. Available at: <https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000072686/download/>.

WFP 2018. *Ghana Annual Country Report 2018*. Available at: <https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000104206/download/>.

WFP 2018. *Ghana Country Strategic Plan (2019–2023)*. Available at: <https://www.wfp.org/operations/gh02-ghana-country-strategic-plan-2019-2023>.

WFP 2018. *Ghana CSP 2019–2023 Line of Sight*.

WFP 2018. *Ghana Transitional Interim Country Strategic Plan (Year 2018)*. Available at: <https://www.wfp.org/operations/gh01-ghana-transitional-icsp-january-december-2018>.

WFP 2018. *WFP and the Humanitarian, Development and Peace Nexus*.

WFP 2019. *What is the Nexus?*

WFP 2019. *Ghana Annual Country Report 2019*. Available at: <https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000113876/download/>.

Ministry of Food and Agriculture, Ghana Statistical Service, WFP and FAO 2020. *Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA) Ghana*. Available at: <https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000137744/download/>.

WFP 2020. *Country Strategic Plan Revision 01 Approved*. Available at: <https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000115678/download/>.

WFP 2020. *Evaluation of the Gender Policy (2015–2020) Volume I*. Available at: https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000116033/download/?_ga=2.262011407.345602599.1655368805-1980762176.1655368805.

WFP 2020. *Mid-term review of the WFP Strategic Plan (2017–2021)*. Available at: [https://executiveboard.wfp.org/es/document_download/WFP-0000115162#:~:text=The%20mid%2Dterm%20review%20\(MTR.collaboration%20with%20relevant%20WFP%20divisions](https://executiveboard.wfp.org/es/document_download/WFP-0000115162#:~:text=The%20mid%2Dterm%20review%20(MTR.collaboration%20with%20relevant%20WFP%20divisions).

WFP 2021. *Final Evaluation of Enhanced Nutrition and Value Chains (ENVAC) Project 2016–2021*. Available at: https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000134472/download/?_ga=2.64321131.599686397.1655302189-1374622805.1655302189.

WFP 2021. *WFP people policy*. Available at: https://executiveboard.wfp.org/document_download/WFP-0000127449.

WFP 2022. *Food Security and Nutrition Monitoring System Ghana, 4th Quarter Edition: October–December 2021*. Available at: https://srid.mofa.gov.gh/sites/default/files/4th%20Quarter%202021%20Edition%20of%20FSMNS_FINAL.pdf.

WFP 2022. *Research Assessments and Monitoring (RAM) – Regional Bureau Dakar*.

WFP 2022. *WFP Cash-based transfers (CBT) to COVID-19 affected people in Ghana*, Technical Report.

WFP 2022. *WFP Gender Policy 2022*. Available at: https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000141111/download/?_ga=2.116082626.574995786.1667904193-167072062.1659525170.

WFP. n.d. *Social and Economic Impact of Child Undernutrition on Ghana's Long-Term Development*. Available at: <https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000119786/download/>.

WFP. n.d. *Partnership Action Plan WFP Ghana (2019–2023)*.

[WFP internal data reports](#)

WFP 2018. *Corporate Results Framework Outcome and Output Indicator Compendium – January 2018 Update*.

WFP 2018. *Revised Corporate Results Framework 2017–2021*.

WFP 2019. *Country Office Ghana Annual Performance Plan 2019*.

WFP 2020. *Country Office Ghana Annual Performance Plan 2020*.

WFP 2021. *Country Office Ghana Annual Performance Plan 2021*.

WFP 2021. *Country Office Ghana Gender Action Plan 2021*.

WFP 2022. *Country Office Organigram*.

[WFP internal COMET reports on beneficiaries](#)

WFP 2022. CM-R020 Adjusted Participants and Beneficiaries Ghana. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM.R001b Annual Country Beneficiaries (CSP) Ghana. [Excel Document].

[WFP internal COMET data reports on food and cash-based transfers](#)

WFP 2022. CM-A004 Actuals – CBT & Vouchers (Detailed). [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM-R007 Annual Distribution Ghana 2018. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM-R007 Annual Distribution Ghana 2019. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM-R007 Annual Distribution Ghana 2020. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM-R007 Annual Distribution Ghana 2021. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM-R007 Annual Distribution Ghana 2022. [Excel Document].

WFP. 2022. CM-R014 2018–2022. [Excel Document].

WFP internal COMET data reports on performance indicators

WFP 2020. Detailed Ghana log frame. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM-L008b Ghana SR1. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM-L008b Ghana SR2. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM-L008b Ghana SR4. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM-L008b Ghana SR5. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM-L008b Ghana SR6. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM-R008 Outputs Ghana 2018. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM-R008 Outputs Ghana 2019. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM-R008 Outputs Ghana 2020. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM-R008 Outputs Ghana 2021. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM-R008 Outputs Ghana 2022 (Targets Only). [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM-L009b CRF Cross-Cutting Indicator Values Ghana. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM-L008b CRF Outcome Indicator Values Ghana. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM-R014 2018–2022 [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CM-L010 Detailed log frame Ghana. [Excel Document].

WFP internal COMET data reports on financials

WFP 2022. CPB Plan vs. Actual Report GH01. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. CPB Plan vs. Actual Report GH02. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. GH01 Original and Final CPB. [Excel Document].

WFP internal COMET data reports on funding

WFP 2022. CPB Grant Balances Report Ghana extracted on 25.05.2022. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. ACR1-A GH01 as at 31.12.2018. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. ACR5-5 GH01 as at 31.12.2018. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. ACR5-A GH02 as at 31.12.2019. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. ACR5-A GH02 as at 31.12.2020. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. ACR5-A GH02 as at 31.12.2021. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. ACR1-A GH02 as at 31.12.2021. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. ACR1-A GH02 as at 31.12.2023. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. Ghana Donor Earmarking 2018–2022. [Excel Document].

WFP 2022. Ghana Historical Overview extracted on 23.05.2022. [Excel Document].

WFP. 2022. Ghana CPB Resource Situation extracted on 06.05.2022. [Excel Document].

Office of Evaluation

World Food Programme

Via Cesare Giulio Viola 68/70

00148 Rome, Italy

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