



WFP-UNHCR Joint Evaluation



WFP-UNHCR Joint Evaluation of the  
Pilot Food Distribution Projects  
Full Report – Volume I

*Rome, January 2006*

*Ref. OEDE/2006/2*





## Acknowledgement

The Evaluation team would like to express its appreciation for the support given to the team by WFP and UNHCR staff, representatives of the governments in the five countries, the Implementing Partners (IPs) and the refugees. This includes the staff of WFP and UNHCR in headquarters in Rome and Geneva, as well as in the country and field offices in Pakistan, Kenya, Sierra Leone, Uganda and Zambia. Dedicated staff members working in isolated and often dangerous areas were key to the success of the pilot food distribution project; their cooperation and assistance in providing information greatly facilitated the work of the mission.

The governments of the five countries supported the implementation of the pilot project. Their contribution was noted with appreciation.

The IPs of both UNHCR and WFP ensured that the pilot project was successfully implemented. They were instrumental in the distribution of food and, through the institutional memory of their staff, contributed valuable information to the evaluation.

Finally, the refugees themselves, those who benefited from the food distribution, provided valuable input to the implementation of the pilot food distribution project in their camp or settlement. Their participation and support during the Evaluation team interviews, particularly those of the elected leaders and Food Committee members, were essential for the five case studies.

The views expressed in this report are those of the Evaluation team members and do not necessarily represent the views of the two commissioning agencies, UNHCR and WFP.

## Mission Composition

- Mitchell Carlson, Team Leader
- François de Meulder, Team Member
- Paolo Mattei/Julian Lefevre, Evaluation Managers



# Acronyms

CD	Country Director
CO	Country Office
COMPAS	Commodity Movement Processing and Analysis System
DSC	Direct Support Costs
ECW	Enhanced Commitments to Women
EDP	Extended Delivery Point
EM	Evaluation Mission
EMOP	Emergency Operation
EVI	Extremely Vulnerable Individuals
FBM	Food Basket Monitoring
FD	Food Distribution
FDP	Final Delivery Point
FM	Food Management
FNA	Food Needs Assessment
HLM	High Level Meeting
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IP	Implementing Partner
ISC	Indirect Support Costs
JAM	Joint Assessment Mission
Kcal	Kilocalorie
KEN	Kenya
LOG	Logistics
LoU	Letter of Understanding
LTSH	Landside Transport, Storage and Handling
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MCN	Mother and Child Nutrition
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MT	Metric Ton
NBI	Nairobi
NFI	Non-food Items
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PAK	Pakistan
PDM	Post Distribution Monitoring
PP	Pilot Project
PRRO	Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation
RFQ	Request for Quotations
SGBV	Sexual and Gender Based Violence
SFP	Supplementary Feeding Programme
SIL	Sierra Leone
SUM	Summary
TPR	Tripartite Agreement
TFP	Therapeutic Feeding Programme
ToR	Terms of Reference
UAG	Uganda
UNHCR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
VAM	Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping
WFP	World Food Programme
ZAM	Zambia



# Table of Contents

## Volume I

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>I. Cost and Logistics</b>	<b>2</b>
Introduction	2
1. The Choice of IPs for Food Management and Food Distributions	2
2. The Organization of Food Distribution before and after the Pilot Project	2
3. The Organization of Secondary Transport	3
4. Contractual Arrangements between UNHCR, WFP, IPs and Government	4
5. Evaluation of the Cost of the Pilot Project for UNHCR and WFP	5
6. The Registration and Revalidation of Refugees	6
7. Staffing	7
8. The Transfer of Assets	7
9. Non-food Items (NFIs)	8
10. Milling Operations	8
<b>II. Management and Coordination</b>	<b>9</b>
Introduction	9
1. Coordination between UN Agencies	9
2. Coordination with Governments	9
3. Coordination with Implementing Partners (IPs)	10
4. Coordination with Beneficiaries	10
5. Monitoring	10
6. Reporting	10
7. Training/capacity Building	11
<b>III. Beneficiaries and Protection</b>	<b>12</b>
Introduction	12
1. Participation and Perception of the Beneficiaries	12
2. Protection and Food Delivery	12
3. Identification, Ration Cards and Registration	13
4. Gender	13
5. Training/capacity Building	14
6. Other Issues Raised by the Refugees	14
<b>IV. Concluding Remarks</b>	<b>15</b>



## **Annexes**

- Annex 1 Summary Table of Five Countries Included in the Pilot Food Distribution Project
- Annex 2 Theoretical Approximation of WFP Direct Extra Costs over 12 Months
- Annex 3 Summary Table of Refugee Population and Questionnaires by Country
- Annex 4 Summary Results of Discussions with the Beneficiaries
- Annex 5 Revised MoU between WFP and UNHCR (July 2002)
- Annex 6 Terms of Reference for the WFP-UNHCR Joint Evaluation of the Pilot Food Distribution Projects (March 2004)
- Annex 7 Methodology for the WFP-UNHCR Joint Evaluation of the Pilot Food Distribution Projects

## **Volume II**

- Case Study No 1 Pakistan (12 - 25 July 2004)
- Case Study No 2 Sierra Leone (28 October - 11 November 2004)
- Case Study No 3 Uganda (17 November - 01 December 2004)
- Case Study No 4 Zambia (03 - 16 May 2005)
- Case Study No 5 Kenya (05 - 17 June 2005)



# Executive Summary

The World Food Programme (WFP) and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) have worked together over many years to provide humanitarian assistance to refugees and displaced persons. Collaboration between the two United Nations agencies was strengthened through a revised Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed in July 2002. As a part of this MoU both agencies agreed that WFP would take over, on a pilot basis and at its own expense, the responsibility for the entire food distribution programme in five countries, namely Kenya, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Uganda and Zambia. The pilot projects in each country were to be evaluated after one year of implementation.

WFP and UNHCR jointly recruited two consultants to evaluate the pilot project in the five countries. Together the UN agencies prepared Terms of Reference (ToRs) and agreed to an evaluation methodology. The ToRs focused on three key issues: Cost and Logistics; Management and Coordination; and Beneficiaries' Perspectives and Protection. Based on these two documents, the consultants prepared a framework for the evaluation and used the same reporting format in all five countries. The five case studies were undertaken over the course of one year; each study described the existing situation and summarized key findings for that particular country.

The objectives of the evaluation were to assess the overall effectiveness of the new food distribution arrangement piloted in the five country operations. The evaluation findings were intended to (i) inform policy makers of both organizations; (ii) facilitate future decision making on whether or not the food distribution should be handed over to WFP in more countries and (iii) provide accountability to the Executive Board of both agencies.

This full synthesis report of the evaluation of the Pilot Food Distribution Project follows the same format as the individual country case studies. It highlights general trends and outlines lessons learned and best practices for the pilot project as described in the five country case studies.

Under the pilot food distribution project, WFP assumed responsibility from UNHCR for food distributions in the refugee camps/settlements. Changes occurred during the pilot project, but did not greatly affect food distribution; they were designed to improve the overall food delivery system.

The pilot project facilitated a more streamlined and integrated logistics operation which linked all aspects of food distribution from "port to mouth." Although costs savings were difficult to measure for each of the five case studies, it is estimated that there was a shift in costs from UNHCR to WFP of between US\$8 to 26 per metric ton depending on the country.

A positive outcome was that collaboration was strengthened and joint planning and management between the two UN agencies improved.

WFP, in close consultation with UNHCR, attempted to use the same Implementing Partners as UNHCR had contracted before the pilot project. Although Government officials were not always aware of the revised MoU between UNHCR and WFP, representatives in all five countries supported the implementation of the pilot project.

The perception of the refugees that UNHCR was the lead agency responsible for their protection did not change. Government, refugees and the IPs appreciated the stronger WFP presence in the field. The implementation of the pilot project allowed WFP, as the UN Food agency, to assume full responsibility for all food-related activities for the refugees in the five pilot countries.



The findings of this evaluation are to be reviewed by UNHCR and WFP at the next High Level Meeting (HLM) planned for early 2006 and a decision taken on whether or not to expand the pilot phase.





## Introduction

The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) is the lead UN agency responsible for the protection of and assistance to refugees, while the World Food Programme (WFP) is the Food Aid Organization of the United Nations. The two UN agencies have worked together over many years to provide humanitarian assistance, including food, to refugees. Several Memoranda of Understanding (MoU) were signed by WFP and UNHCR (1985, 1994 and 1997), the most recent revision being in July 2002.

One major change in the most recently revised MoU was that both UN agencies agreed that WFP would take over responsibility for the entire food distribution system at its own expense, including the secondary transport from the Extended Delivery Points (EDPs) to the Final Delivery Points (FDPs) in five pilot countries. In the past the final transport leg and distribution in camps/settlements had been done by UNHCR and its Implementing Partners (IPs). It was anticipated that this would help to rationalize the food transportation arrangements and food pipeline management, while possibly leading to cost savings in the longer-term.

As a part of the pilot project, both UN agencies agreed that the projects in the five countries would be evaluated after one year of operation. A Joint Pilot Food Distribution Evaluation Mission was established to review the lessons and best practices and to prepare case studies for each of the five countries.

Two consultants were jointly selected by UNHCR and WFP to undertake the Evaluation Mission (EM) which began with briefings with WFP in Rome, followed by similar meetings with UNHCR in Geneva (6-9 July 2004.) The EM then traveled to Pakistan in July 2004, followed by Sierra Leone (October 2004), Uganda (November 2004), Zambia (May 2005) and Kenya (June 2005). Case studies were produced for each of the five countries.

The EM's Terms of Reference (ToR) and the methodology developed for the evaluation outline the content and basic reporting format for the case studies. The basic data collection tools, questionnaires and interviews with local stakeholders were established during the first mission to Pakistan and continued to be used in the other case studies. Each study summarized the situation before and after the implementation of the pilot project and identified common themes and unique characteristics for the country.

This synthesis report highlights the main lessons and best practices of the five country case studies. It follows the same reporting format and focuses on the three main issues outlined in the ToRs. These are:

- Cost and Logistics Considerations
- Management and Coordination
- Beneficiaries' Perspective and Protection



## I. Cost and Logistics

### Introduction

The food distribution process was comprised of three major components: the food management at the EDPs; the secondary transport from the EDPs to the FDPs; and the actual distribution of the food aid from or near the FDPs to the refugees. This chapter reviews the impact of the pilot project on each of these three components and gauges the consequences for UNHCR, WFP and the Implementing Partners (IPs) involved.

#### 1. The Choice of IPs for Food Management<sup>1</sup> and Food Distributions<sup>2</sup>

The implementation of the pilot project was an opportunity to review the appointment of the IPs for “food management” and/or “food distribution.” In all five countries UNHCR and WFP actively tried to streamline and integrate the food distribution operations; however the practical implementation of this objective was not identical in the countries participating in the pilot project.

In the past UNHCR and WFP consistently tried to appoint the same IPs for both the food management and the food distribution activities. Although not applied throughout all the refugee camps, since the inception of the pilot project WFP has reviewed and even tried to reduce the number of IPs. This was the case in four out of five countries. In Kenya, where WFP is solely responsible for the food management, the situation remained the same during the pilot. No conflicts of interest have arisen as a result of the same IP being in charge of both the food management and the food distribution.

In some camps the food management at the EDP/FDP was retained by WFP. This was the case in the camps of the North-west Frontier Province (NWFP) in Pakistan and in Dadaab and Kakuma camps in Kenya. In Zambia, WFP decided to take a different course of action and, as of the 1 July 2005, contracted the IP in charge of distribution to be responsible for the food management.

In some camps the integration was carried further where the IP appointed by WFP for food management and food distribution was also the UNHCR appointed camp manager.

Although the degree of integration achieved in each of the five countries differs under the pilot project, both UNHCR and WFP realized the importance of streamlining the selection of IPs for food management and final distribution.

#### 2. The Organization of Food Distribution before and after the Pilot Project

In all five countries the pilot project was an opportunity to review the food distribution process. The improvement in the quality of services to the refugees was the prime objective. Increased accountability from improved monitoring and reporting was the second objective. In four of the five countries, WFP conducted a review of the then existing food distribution situation in the refugee camps to obtain necessary baseline information before embarking on the pilot project. Great attention was devoted to the logistical implications of the change.

The pilot project did not influence the WFP food pipeline system from point of origin to the EDPs. The secondary transport from the EDPs to the final distribution points had to be adapted to the new situation and the final food distribution at the FDPs had to be reassessed and adapted.

<sup>1</sup> The “food management” at the EDPs and/or at the FDPs covers the reception of the food commodities inside the warehouses, stacking of the food in line with good store-keeping practices, stock movement reporting, delivery of the food to the IP in charge of distribution, etc.

<sup>2</sup> The “food distribution” is the practical organisation of the food distribution at the FDP, the calling forward of beneficiaries, the checking of food ration cards with the food manifest, the physical distribution of the food, monitoring the distribution, handling claims and discrepancies, and the final reporting to both UNHCR and WFP.



The distribution calendar was adjusted in some countries; fixed monthly distribution dates were established, and some countries switched from a monthly to a fortnightly distribution system. Simultaneously WFP improved the lay-out of the distribution points, creating more and/or wider distribution corridors, building new distribution centres where none existed and, at the same time, merging warehousing and distribution functions into one comprehensive unit (e.g. Sierra Leone). Where necessary large shaded waiting areas were built or rehabilitated.

All countries except Uganda adopted the individual scooping system where food distribution is organized by family size. A group distribution system was favored in Uganda, based on the premise that it encourages greater refugee participation in food distribution, as the camps are divided into groups and they distribute the food themselves to families in the group.

Greater attention was paid to the identification of the beneficiaries, although the method varied between countries. The control of the quantities distributed to the beneficiaries was standardized, due in part to the introduction of more modern weighing scales. Random spot checks of the food distributed (minimum 1/10 recipients) were organized near the distribution centres. Monthly food basket monitoring and quarterly post distribution monitoring were carried out more uniformly under the pilot.

The increased presence of WFP and IP officers during food distribution resulted in a better visibility. Problems and discrepancies were resolved on the spot. In most camps better organization of the distribution resulted not only in a reduced distribution cycle but a reduction in the time required for each individual to collect food.

Pipeline breaks occurred and occasionally disrupted the distribution calendar. The reasons for the breaks were many and varied, but were not related to the implementation of the pilot project. In close consultation with UNHCR, WFP attempted to compensate for any food shortages in order to meet the daily calorie requirements.

The refugees felt that the food basket had been reduced under the pilot project. Although the basic calorie level remained the same, donations and the provision of complementary foods distributed by UNHCR diminished over time.

All in all the changes brought about by the pilot project were perceived as minimal and often seen as an improvement. To monitor the changes, the country offices of the two UN agencies in Kenya, identified “performance indicators” and carried out an evaluation after the pilot project had been operating for six months.

In Sierra Leone the pilot project was used as an opportunity to reduce the number of pipeline agencies involved in the movement of food from the port to designated refugee camps from four different agencies responsible to one.

The effect of the pilot project on the quality of the monitoring, the reporting and the programming of the food pipeline itself was negligible. The pipeline monitoring and reporting systems as such remained unchanged.

### **3. The Organization of Secondary Transport**

UNHCR and WFP each had a different approach to secondary transport.<sup>3</sup> UNHCR considers the secondary transport to be one of the many short distance, low density transport services it is expected to provide, together with its IP, as part of the camp management. The cost of this operation is not disaggregated from other transport activities and often the exact costs are not available. WFP's approach is quite different and often inspired by its experience in long distance, high-density transport charged on a per tonnage basis. WFP eventually organized the secondary transport differently in each of the five countries. The final costs often dictated the secondary transport mode chosen by WFP.

In Pakistan there were no changes in the way secondary transport was organized before or after the pilot project; commercial haulers were used in Baluchistan, while WFP trucks were used in the NWFP.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> The secondary transport is the transport of food aid from the EDPs to the FDP warehouses or centres inside the refugee camps.

<sup>4</sup> To be noted is that the feeding operation in Pakistan closed soon after the evaluation mission visited the country.



In Sierra Leone WFP organized the transport directly from the port to the camps with private long distance haulers. This eliminated the need for intermediate EDPs and a small fleet of WFP-managed 8 ton trucks.

In Uganda WFP entered into an agreement with UNHCR where six of the eight UNHCR trucks were rented on an “as and when required” basis. This fleet was supplemented with two WFP trucks, operating out of Kampala on an ad hoc basis.

In Zambia, after conducting a detailed costing exercise, WFP chose to use commercial haulers. The control over these private transport companies was sometimes weak and fractious. The WFP Request for Quotations (RFQ) and tender procedures are protracted; as a result, in Zambia the food distribution schedule suffered from erratic transport operations.<sup>5</sup> The CO argues, however, that these procedures are necessary to ensure transparency, accountability and to enable WFP to get the best value for money.

In Kenya WFP replaced the life-expired UNHCR trucks with its own fleet of four new WFP trucks. The secondary transport operations ran very smoothly.

The choices made by WFP in the five countries were justified in their own right, but the quality of the services and standards varied from country to country.

#### **4. Contractual Arrangements between UNHCR, WFP, IPs and Government**

It was necessary to review the contractual arrangements between the major stakeholders - UNHCR, WFP, the IPs and the government. Both UNHCR and WFP country offices negotiated new, sometimes comprehensive and often well drafted, contracts with their partners. This was done to the best of their knowledge, with the expertise at their disposal, but apparently with little guidance from the respective headquarters. The result was that, for similar contracts for services to be provided under the project, the contracts varied greatly from one country to another.

Before the pilot project took effect the food distribution activity was incorporated in the “General Care and Services Agreement” UNHCR signed with the IP contracted as camp manager. The contracts had a validity of twelve months from January to December. The remuneration for food distribution was budget-based and was included with all the other camp services, making it almost impossible to determine the exact cost of the food distribution. As a rule, UNHCR had mid-term reviews and allowed for budget revisions, if justified. On the other hand, if the food management in the EDPs was contracted to an IP WFP reimbursed on a per tonnage basis. The exception was Pakistan, where the IP was reimbursed based on the amount agreed with WFP.<sup>6</sup>

After the start of the pilot project the contractual arrangements for both food management and food distribution varied by country. In Pakistan first tripartite agreements (WFP, UNHCR and the IP) and later bilateral agreements (WFP/IP) were introduced. In Kenya, Sierra Leone and Zambia bilateral agreements were used; in Uganda tripartite agreements were the standard contract arrangements. WFP used several methods to reimburse the IP for services depending on the country; it could be budget-based supported by documentary evidence, strictly on a rate per ton basis, or a hybrid of both approaches, where payment was made on a part budget basis and part rate per ton basis. Some agreements fail to specify clearly how the IP remuneration will be calculated, however.

<sup>5</sup> According to a response to a draft of this report from the Zambia Country Office, the pilot for Zambia started on 1 January 2004 for two years, while the evaluation country case study took place in May 2005 (16 months later). The system has been better established now, compared to the early months of the pilot. The CO provided a lengthy response to the statement about “erratic transport operations” to the effect that, while difficulties were experienced in delivering food to some 20,000 refugees in Nangweshi camp, the situation should not be generalized to all the five refugee settlements/camps in the country. Road access across the Zambezi river to Nangweshi camp in the Western Province is a problem, particularly in the rainy season. The sinking of a WFP-hired pontoon in late April 2005, just before the mission’s visit, had led to some food losses and temporary breaks in the pipeline. In the other four camps the food distributions were said to be very regular.

<sup>6</sup> A WFP Operations Department directive states that reimbursement should be made on the basis of an approved budget and not on a cost per ton basis, however.



In two countries—Kenya and Uganda--the agreements mentioned above were also covered by tri-partite or even quadripartite<sup>7</sup> agreements, simply to stress the existing commitment between the three or four partners involved. These agreements were prepared as part of the pilot project and had no financial implication for the signatories. Some clauses of these tri/quadripartite agreements contradicted provisions in the bi-lateral agreements and could generate confusion.

Some of the bilateral agreements had a validity of one calendar year, while others ran parallel with the validity of ongoing WFP Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO). The contracts in Kenya were special, in that they ran for the one year of the pilot project, which did not correspond necessarily with the on-going PRROs.

Given the special situation created by the pilot projects some country directors found it appropriate and necessary to prepare Tripartite Agreement (TPRs) between UNHCR, WFP and the government; this was the case in Kenya and Uganda. In other countries LOUs were serving more or less the same purpose.

The agreements entered into by UNHCR and its IPs are relatively standardized and uniform, having been used over many years. WFP Country Offices need to standardize their contracts and reporting formats with the IPs, however. WFP has a standard Field Level Agreement (FLA) for working with NGOs. The revised version of this agreement, the subject of extensive consultations with WFP's major NGO partners, was disseminated to the field under a recent Directive from the Operations Department.<sup>8</sup>

## 5. Evaluation of the Cost of the Pilot Project for UNHCR and WFP

The food distribution process comprises three major cost components, namely (i) the management of the food at the EDPs (ii) the secondary transport and (iii) the distribution of the food to the beneficiaries at or near the FDPs. Under the pilot project the two latter components were the responsibility of WFP and entailed a shift of costs previously borne by UNHCR to WFP. Consequently, there was a saving for UNHCR and an extra expense for WFP. The pilot project also created opportunities to rationalize the operations.

Before the pilot project UNHCR had limited information on the secondary transport and distribution costs. WFP had a better knowledge of the EDP running costs. The pilot project gave WFP the opportunity to negotiate a contract for services for both the EDP and the FDP with one IP, thus reducing the amount paid by WFP for the IP's overhead costs. Similarly, WFP was in a position to choose the secondary transport set-up which it felt gave the best cost/service ratio. The rates were usually worked out on a tonnage basis. Therefore more accurate costing figures for these services were available under the pilot project.

The combined food management (EDP) and final distribution (FDP) costs varied from US\$12 to 25 per ton in the five countries, with Pakistan being the least expensive and Zambia the most expensive.<sup>9</sup> Just over a third of the costs were for the EDP, while the remaining 65 percent were for the operation of the FDP. Therefore, under the pilot project, WFP had to support an extra FDP cost which varied between US\$6 to 21 per ton.

In Pakistan the combined EDP/FDP costs decreased by as much as 21 percent with the implementation of the pilot. The switch to tonnage based rates explains part of this decrease. In the four other countries it was not possible to make an accurate cost comparison before and after the pilot project.

For the secondary transport<sup>10</sup> it was not possible to make meaningful cost comparisons, since the operating conditions were different in each of the five countries. In Sierra Leone, however, the long haul transport cost was reduced on average from US\$86 per ton in 2003 to US\$66 per ton in 2004 - a saving of US\$20 per ton, by completely reorganizing, in September 2004, the long distance haulage and doing away with the need for secondary transport.

<sup>7</sup> This is the case in Sierra Leone when the IP contracted by WFP for the food-management and the food-distribution is different from the IP contracted by UNHCR as camp manager.

<sup>8</sup> Directive OD/2004/02 of 7 May 2004.

<sup>9</sup> In a response to a draft version of this report the WFP Zambia CO pointed out that remoteness and difficult operating conditions push up internal transport costs, particularly in the case of the small Ukwimi refugee camp, which has a small caseload and comparatively high per ton delivery costs.

<sup>10</sup> "Secondary transport" or as also listed in the WFP budgets as "transport beyond EDP".



Combining the costs for the secondary transport and the final distribution points (FDPs) it appears that WFP had to support an extra cost of between US\$8 to US\$ 26.25 per ton, depending on the country. The increase is the smallest in Pakistan and the highest in Zambia. Based on the tonnage of food aid distributed during the years 2003 or 2004 in the five countries where the pilot project was being implemented, the average direct extra cost per ton works out to be US\$15.61 per ton for 149,492 metric tons distributed, or some US\$2.3 million in the five pilot countries for a twelve months period (see Annex 2 for details).

This average rate does not include various indirect costs/charges borne by WFP including:

- increased physical presence of WFP staff inside the camps, particularly during the distribution cycle;
- closer involvement of WFP staff with the monthly or bi-monthly post-distribution monitoring (PDM) and the quarterly food basket monitoring (FBM) exercises;
- handling of claims and complaints lodged by refugees;
- the compulsory attendance at regular camp management meetings;
- the monitoring of the IPs' operations and their reporting;
- the organization and the follow-up of the secondary transport;
- the additional administrative work within WFP at both the field and CO level;
- the building of new food distribution centres (Sierra Leone) or the enlargement of existing ones (Zambia).

These indirect costs were not easy to identify, as they were listed under various WFP direct support cost (DSC) and other direct operational cost (ODOC) budget lines or covered by the country office general budget. One may conclude that the real extra charge borne by WFP is in excess of the US\$15.61 per ton shown above and possibly closer to US\$18 per ton.

Logically, what is an increase in charges for WFP should be a saving for UNHCR and appear in the UNHCR budget as a saving. This was not the case; it is understood that any savings to UNHCR were re-apportioned over other budget lines to meet cost increases or address other budgetary constraints. To a certain extent the extra charges for WFP show up in the LTSH breakdowns, although the changes are not strictly commensurate since other costs and other sub-projects may influence the LTSH calculations as well.

Overall, the combined cost for the secondary transport and the final food distribution remained much the same or decreased slightly thanks to opportunities to improve the entire distribution system. It increased for WFP, but decreased for UNHCR, and provided both agencies a better understanding of the cost structure for each of the three food distribution components.

## 6. The Registration and Revalidation of Refugees

Accurate caseload figures are a prerequisite for the efficient planning of food distribution operations. UNHCR, with or without the assistance of the host government, is expected to keep the master database up to date and to organize the issuance of food ration cards or their replacement. The pilot project did not alter the distribution of these major tasks. Being now directly responsible for the food distribution, WFP became more concerned about the accuracy of the camp population figures and the presentation by the refugees of tamper-proof and legible ration cards.

In Kenya UNHCR managed the entire registration, identification and revalidation process in a manner which contributed to an efficient distribution operation. The role of WFP and its IP was kept to a minimum: checking the ration cards, matching them with the name on the manifest and validating the distribution by punching a hole in the designated space on the ration card.

In Uganda the registration situation was quite different - ration cards were illegible, expired and food manifests had not been updated for months, forcing WFP to resort to various self-imposed, makeshift and tedious control mechanisms. The system was in such disarray that food distributions were either seriously delayed or scrapped altogether.<sup>11</sup> WFP and the IP tried to circumvent the shortcomings of the system in some settlements by a bottom-

<sup>11</sup> The November and December 2004 food distributions were delayed in the Adjumani-Pakelle settlements in Uganda for lack of accurate records. In July 2004 the food distribution had to be cancelled in the same settlements.



up control system whereby the community leaders updated the food-manifests before the food distributions took place.

UNHCR was aware of the situation in Uganda and had introduced the PROGRESS registration software in the southern camps. The same was true for Sierra Leone where UNHCR used laptop computers at the distribution points to verify and cross check the beneficiaries through photographs and family records.

In Zambia WFP is introducing its own food ration cards or individual food distribution record cards which are kept at each distribution centre. This initiative is an attempt to improve food distributions; however, it has cost and administrative implications.

## **7. Staffing**

The pilot project did not bring about major changes in the staff strength of UNHCR, WFP or the IPs. Any UNHCR staff member made redundant as a result of the transfer of activities to WFP was reassigned to offset staff reductions caused by funding problems. With the exception of isolated cases, WFP and the IP staff strength remained almost unchanged; consequently the effect of the pilot project on personnel costs is negligible. WFP and UNHCR endeavoured to increase their presence in the camps during food distributions. UNHCR and WFP in Uganda were understaffed to meet this obligation.

In Pakistan the shift from a budget-based remuneration system to a tonnage-based system for payment to the IP should have reduced the amount of administrative work for WFP. Redundancies were envisaged, although these staff may be used for other WFP projects.

In Zambia, as of 1 July 2005, WFP transferred the management of two EDPs to the IPs. This should make some WFP staff redundant, but it is likely that they will be re-appointed by the contracted IPs.

In Dadaab, Kenya, WFP increased its staff from fourteen to eighteen people for the pilot project.

Although not directly related to the pilot project, WFP/Sierra Leone increased its staff as a result of WFP taking over the activities of three food pipeline agencies. Directly related to the pilot project, the major re-organization of the long distance road haulage resulted in the reduction of seven staff posts.<sup>12</sup>

## **8. The Transfer of Assets**

The absence of specific guidelines on the transfer of assets led to each country office coming up with its own, sometimes disparate, solution. The transfer of assets (mainly distribution centres, pre-fabricated warehouses and shelter areas) was limited to UNHCR informally granting the "right of use" to WFP. This created some grey areas in respect of the party responsible for the maintenance and insurance of such assets.

Only in Kenya was the right of use formally recorded in a Tripartite Agreement (TPR) between UNHCR, WFP and the government, specifying that WFP was responsible for the maintenance of the transferred assets. Also in Kenya much attention was paid to the inventory of the small ancillary equipment (troughs, scooping material and weighing scales) placed by UNHCR in the custody of WFP.

In Moyo/Adjumani (Uganda) six UNHCR trucks required for the secondary transport were transferred to WFP under a special "right of use agreement" stipulating the rate per kilometer to be paid by WFP. One of the side effects of this was that the trucks and tarpaulins still had UNHCR logos, which created visibility problems for WFP, and confusion for the refugees as to which agency was responsible for food distribution.

<sup>12</sup> The EDP at Bo was closed because the centre of focus of the Sierra Leone Country Programme had shifted from the southern districts (for which Bo was the main EDP) to the northern districts. This led to the opening to a new EDP at Magbuaraka. The closure of the Bo EDP was not linked to the new WFP-UNHCR direct distribution arrangements.



## 9. Non-food Items (NFIs)

The procedures for the handling and distribution of NFIs were not modified as a result of the pilot project and remained the responsibility of UNHCR.

Only bouillon cubes in Sierra Leone and soap in all five countries were provided by UNHCR and distributed together with the basic food ration. In some of the camps in Sierra Leone the camp management implementing partner distributes NFIs under an agreement with UNHCR and is the same IP doing food distribution under an agreement with WFP.

## 10. Milling Operations

For practical reasons milling was considered to be outside the scope of the pilot project. UNHCR and WFP did not always share the same approach to milling and the involvement of the two agencies varied from one country to the other; however, milling was key to reducing the amount of food sold and therefore not consumed by the beneficiaries. The availability of funds for milling seemed to be the governing factor.

The EM noted that the price paid – in kind or cash - by the refugees for the commercial milling of their cereals ration was often very high. Milling activities managed by the refugees themselves not only provided income generation opportunities, particularly to women's groups, but also encouraged the refugees to consume the calories provided by the basic ration as in-camp milling costs were much lower.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> In Sierra Leone, although the provision of milling machines was not part of the agreement, small table-top milling machines were provided by WFP to the refugees; control and management rested with a management committee of women in each camp.





## **II. Management and Coordination**

### **Introduction**

The pilot project involved coordination and planning between UNHCR and WFP, as well as with IPs, governments and the beneficiaries. Key documents included the revised global MoU signed between the two agencies (July 2002) which proposed the pilot project (but did not identify the participating countries), annual work plans prepared at the country office and field level and agreements with partners. The following sections summarize key elements of the management and coordination during the pilot project in the five countries.

### **1. Coordination between UN Agencies**

Selection of a country to participate in the pilot project seemed to vary from "top down" or "Headquarters driven," to a collaborative effort by the two UN agency country office directors to include their country in the pilot.

Headquarters support to country offices varied; no real guidelines were produced. Support could have been more forthcoming as the first country in the pilot (Pakistan) had already completed the initial year when the later countries were just starting their pilot project for food distribution.

Communication between Headquarters and the country offices was not always as strong as it could have been. Contact between the countries participating in the pilot project was almost non-existent and would have provided participating countries valuable insight into lessons learned, etc.

Most countries prepared joint work plans, which were prepared at the country level, or at both country and field level. The series of meetings (bilateral, programme, interagency, etc.) were basically the same in all countries and provided a venue to introduce and then review the status of the pilot project. Both UN agencies and their IPs usually participated in Joint Assessment Missions (JAMs) which were normally scheduled annually and provided valuable information on the food situation in the refugee camps.

Sharing the same compound or having adjacent offices increased communication and facilitated problem solving between the two UN agencies. This had other economic advantages (shared communication equipment, security guards, etc.).

Registration of the refugees remained the responsibility of both UNHCR and the government, but was crucial to WFP and the IP, as accurate figures are required for food distribution. The amount of government involvement varied between countries (with Uganda the most involved for the operations in the north of the country and Kenya the least). Discrepancies between population and beneficiary figures created some tensions in the northern Uganda operation.

Ration cards, issued by UNHCR, were key components of the registration and food distribution. WFP and UNHCR along with the Government and IPs need to continue to work together on improving registration and related ration card issuance.

### **2. Coordination with Governments**

Both UNHCR and WFP had legal agreements with the government in each pilot country. A Tripartite Agreement (TPR) was drawn up between the two UN agencies and the Government of Kenya for the pilot project, while in other countries the Letters of Understanding (LoU) were bilateral agreements covering food assistance for refugees.

Government officials participated in the inter-agency coordination meetings and were informed about the pilot project through these. Many government officials were not aware of the MoU signed between the two UN agencies; reviewing this jointly could facilitate communication and understanding between the UN agencies and government.



### **3. Coordination with Implementing Partners (IPs)**

The IPs were informed of the pilot project through inter-agency coordination meetings. WFP consulted closely with UNHCR and tried to use the same IPs as UNHCR had used for food distribution. The use of the same IPs for camp management and food distribution was the most efficient and cost effective.

UNHCR used Tripartite Agreements signed by the IP and government with budgets for each activity.

The majority of IPs felt that the stronger presence of WFP in the field was a positive outcome.

### **4. Coordination with Beneficiaries**

Beneficiaries were informed of the pilot project and the handover of the food distribution from UNHCR to WFP through camp coordination and food distribution meetings, which occurred at least monthly. The refugee leaders were to inform the general population; the "trickle down" effect varied within camps and between countries, however.

Although UNHCR and government had developed general ToRs for the various refugee committees in most countries, these could be strengthened and need to be regularly reviewed with the camp populations, particularly after an election or change in personnel.

Sensitization/awareness campaigns on food distribution and the roles and responsibilities of the UN agencies, the IPs, government and the refugee committees themselves need to be continued in all countries.

### **5. Monitoring**

Prior to the pilot project, WFP had only a limited presence in many of the camps/settlements; with the start of the pilot, WFP recruited or re-allocated staff to ensure enhanced monitoring of the food distribution. It was suggested in some pilot countries that the best situation would be to have a separate NGO for monitoring the food distribution,<sup>14</sup> although not all Country Offices agreed, believing that the WFP Country Office should retain primary responsibility for monitoring.

Post distribution monitoring (PDM) was well established in most countries and done on a quarterly basis involving UNHCR, the IPs and WFP.

UNHCR and its IP responsible for health conducted nutrition surveys in all pilot countries. These were annual and involved WFP and the IP in charge of food distribution.

Joint Assessment Missions (JAMs) were undertaken in all the five pilot countries and were particularly important to determine food security for those refugees "weaned off" the food ration (based on availability of land, two successful harvests and with the refugees being considered as self sufficient in food; e.g. Uganda, Zambia).

### **6. Reporting**

Both UN agencies required their own reporting based on their bilateral agreements with the IPs. Each developed standard reporting formats, some of which continued to evolve during the pilot project (e.g. WFP in Zambia).

While both UNHCR and WFP have separate obligations to the donors, and the IPs were required to account for the funding they received, the two UN agencies should review and streamline their reporting requirements.

---

<sup>14</sup> For example, in Zambia in Nangweshi and Mayukwayukwa camps.



## 7. Training/capacity Building

Training and capacity building are included as joint activities in the revised MoU. This includes strengthening the capacity of the refugees to manage their own affairs in the camps.

Although ToRs which outline the basic roles and responsibilities of camp committees were prepared by the government and/or UNHCR in most countries (Kenya, Sierra Leone, Uganda and Zambia) these varied between camps in the same country in some cases (Uganda, Zambia). ToRs need to be regularly revised and reviewed through workshops with the beneficiaries, government, IPs and the two UN agencies.<sup>15</sup>

UNHCR provided specific protection training to WFP, IPs, government personnel and refugees in all countries during the pilot phase. Continued training in protection issues, including basic reporting procedures, was requested in most countries.

WFP undertook training of the IP staff in logistics, warehouse management, gender and M&E during the pilot project. In Kenya and Zambia WFP was concerned that repeated training, due to the high turnover of IP staff, entailed significant costs.

Joint sensitization workshops in gender, Sexual and Gender-based Violence (SGBV) and HIV/AIDS were undertaken by WFP and UNHCR in some countries and should be continued in collaboration with other with other UN agencies and interested partners.

Regional training workshops to raise awareness on issues related to the revised MoU were jointly organized by UNHCR and WFP, with participants from government and at least some of the IPs during the pilot project (Accra and Cairo). In Dar es Salaam, in 2005, the regional workshop aimed to train staff and partners in how to conduct good quality Joint Assessment Missions, according to the new Joint Assessment Guidelines (JAG). Sessions on the MoU were included in the JAG training. Similar workshops should be held in other regions and at the country level if the pilot project is to be continued and/or introduced in other countries. The workshops could also include a review of sample joint work plans (as already included in some instances), TPRs and other key documents relevant to the two UN agencies and to the pilot food distributions.

---

<sup>15</sup> The EM provided copies of the TORs used in Sierra Leone and Uganda (for refugee committees) to UNHCR and WFP country and field offices in Zambia and Kenya.



### III. Beneficiaries and Protection

#### Introduction

Refugees were encouraged to participate in the food distribution in all countries. Their input into the evaluation was essential. A standard questionnaire was developed in Pakistan and used throughout the mission. A total of 271 questionnaires covering 39 camps/settlements was completed. A summary of the main findings from the surveys is included in Annex 3 and highlights for all five countries are included below.

#### 1. Participation and Perception of the Beneficiaries

Although there seemed to be a general understanding in the camps of the roles and responsibilities of the two UN agencies and their IPs, periodic briefings on the role of each UN agency, the IP and the government should be continued, particularly after every election or change in the refugee committee staff.

In no country did the refugees' perception of UNHCR as lead agency responsible for refugee protection and assistance change with the implementation of the pilot project.

ToRs for refugee committees should be reviewed periodically with the refugees and shared between camps and countries. UNHCR, WFP, the government and the IPs should work together with the refugees to prepare/revise these. If possible exchange visits should be arranged to provide refugees an opportunity to compare best practices and lessons learned between camps or countries/regions.

#### 2. Protection and Food Delivery

Although the majority of refugees interviewed were aware of the basic ration in each country, there was confusion at times over the number of scoops versus the weight of the ration. Monthly and bi-monthly distributions were the norm. Several of those interviewed commented that the ration was not enough to cover the time period (15 or 30 days) particularly for single people and/or small families.

Delays in delivery and problems with the pipeline occurred; however, they were not necessarily related to the implementation of the pilot project. Although informed of the delivery problems, delays or reductions in rations did increase the risks of the refugees, as they had to make additional efforts, which often meant leaving the camp to supplement their ration. Delays in food delivery created additional burdens for refugees, which in some countries led to protection problems, particularly for female headed households.

Monotony of the basic ration diet was a complaint in most countries, but this issue is not directly related to the pilot project. Complaints of food quality were common and some groups protested when the cereal component of the basic ration changed (Kenya and Zambia).

The majority of the refugee responses said women were safe during food distribution. Examples of food-related protection incidents included: ration card issues (unregistered, missing family members, lost cards,) husband taking the food from the family, collection of food for repayment of loans, selling food, etc.<sup>16</sup>

Over one third of the responses to the surveys said there were specific protection problems related to women, although many said these were not food related, and some said these problems affected both sexes. Examples of specific protection problems for women included beating, polygamy, "property grabbing," divorce, etc.

Depending on the country, culture, and the structures in place in the refugee camp, special attention was given to the extremely vulnerable individuals (EVI) for food distribution; protection issues for the vulnerable were minimal. Examples of special assistance to the vulnerable included separate distributions or distribution areas, assistance from the camp leaders and/or food committees, support from community services, etc. Several responses said that friends or relatives helped the vulnerable take their food home.

<sup>16</sup> In Sierra Leone, food-related protection issues, especially with regard to women in polygamous homes, were avoided by having these women register in their separate names; they were then issued with their own ration cards.



In at least two countries (Uganda and Zambia) some of the refugees were "weaned" off of the food ration. In Zambia the host government had provided these refugee families with 2.5 ha of land. Although no major issues were raised by the refugees who no longer receive the food ration, the governments concerned and the two UN agencies need to continue to monitor this population, particularly in light of the present drought and poor harvests in some countries. This is outside the scope of the pilot project, however.

### 3. Identification, Ration Cards and Registration

Registration and ration cards varied between and even within countries. The role of government also varied, but it was generally understood that UNHCR was in charge of registration, issuing ration cards, and providing WFP and its IP with the updated population manifests for the food distribution.

Ration cards served as a means to receive food. UNHCR took the lead to revalidate and re-issue ration cards; in Zambia, however, WFP was considering issuing its own "internal" ration cards to be kept at the distribution site.<sup>17</sup>

Refugees complained that registration of new-born infants took too long (no one raised the issue of removing the dead from the food rolls, however) and that some family members (or ethnic groups in the case of the Somalis in Kenya) were excluded from the ration cards.

Registration of refugees and issuance of ration cards is the responsibility of UNHCR and the government. Under the pilot project WFP became more involved in requiring accurate population figures for food distribution. As noted earlier in this report, UNHCR and WFP need to continue to work closely together to resolve any registration or ration card issues.

### 4. Gender

The key documents issued under the pilot project are the revised MoU and the LoUs between the governments, WFP and UNHCR. Under the WFP Enhanced Commitments to Women both UN agencies confirmed support for the role of women in refugee situations, particularly food distribution. Both names of the head of household (HH) and the spouse appeared on new registrations and any revalidation; husband and wife served as co-recipients on food ration cards, with both UNHCR and WFP encouraging women to be the main recipients of food aid.

The majority of responses confirmed that women participate in the food distribution. While most preferred to have more women involved in the food distribution, several noted that men were required for unloading and heavy work and said the ratio of men to women working in food distribution should be balanced. Reasons for involving women in the food distribution included the perception that women "take better care of food and are in charge in the kitchen," women don't over-scoop and that they reduce pilferage.

Both WFP and UNHCR made efforts to recruit more women in responsible positions in the camp management and food distribution. Although cultural barriers limited participation in some countries (Pakistan), women were elected as camp leaders (notably Sierra Leone) and served on food committees; however, they did not regularly attend meetings and did not often serve in senior positions. Women seldom chaired refugee committees, but often served as deputies or assistants.

WFP can and does provide food commodities to encourage women to participate in education, gender, development, family planning, health and nutrition training.

<sup>17</sup> According to a response from the CO to a draft version of this report, in Zambia, the issuance of a food ration card by WFP was discussed with UNHCR, Government and implementing partners in the field. The card is designed to capture the information provided by UNHCR/Government and the Refugee Identification Card (RIC). It does not replace the RIC, which is the basic protection document for the holder. Inter alia, the food ration card should assist IPs to have more control on food distributions, improve their accountability to WFP and help identify those refugees who are eligible for food rations (as some are considered self-sufficient after two successful harvests). UNHCR does not agree with this approach, however, believing that the inclusion of personal bio-data on a beneficiary card can have protection implications for the holder.



## 5. Training/capacity Building

Both UN agencies and their partners supported building the capacity of refugees through training in all five of the countries. This included developing ToRs for the refugee administration, including the food committees. Reviewing the roles and responsibilities of camp committees, and training in monitoring and reporting should be ongoing and repeated anytime there is a change in food committee members or a new election. WFP, UNHCR, the government and IPs should participate and facilitate these workshops.

UNHCR organized periodic protection workshops in most countries during the pilot project which included participants from WFP, the government, refugees and host communities and the IPs. These workshops need to be repeated annually.

Both UN agencies should continue to work together and with other partners to support training on the "cross cutting" themes of Joint Assessment Guidelines (JAG), gender, SGBV, and HIV/AIDS.

Both UN agencies (with UNHCR taking the lead role) could participate in sensitization/awareness campaigns for repatriation. This could include mine awareness training for the returning population.

## 6. Other Issues Raised by the Refugees

The survey included a question on suggestions, complaints and recommendations for the food distribution. Although the responses from the five countries are too long to include here, some of the general comments common to all five countries are summarized below:

- On the Food Distribution System
  - Improve communication with the refugees
    - know what food to give and ensure it is culturally acceptable;
    - consult; do not just inform the refugees;
    - visit and listen to the refugees, pay attention to their complaints;
    - change the food committee members periodically;
  - Observe the delivery schedule and improve transport
  - Regularly replace ration cards
  - Weigh all food
  - Help EVIs and give specific cases priority during distribution
- On the Food Ration
  - Increase food rations, particularly for single and small households
  - Improve food quality
  - Change the food basket; add variety to avoid monotony
  - Issue NFIs more regularly (for UNHCR)
  - Distribute empty containers



## IV. Concluding Remarks

### Introduction

According to the Terms of Reference (ToRs) the Evaluation team was not asked to make any recommendations, particularly regarding the possible extension or continuation of the pilot project. The individual country case studies were to summarize best practices and lessons for each country. In general the Evaluation found that the pilot project was seen as a positive development by UNHCR, WFP, the IPs, governments and, most importantly, the refugees. Overall, it had a positive impact on food distribution for the refugees.

### 1. Cost and Logistics

- In general, the pilot project allowed for a more streamlined and integrated logistical approach to the three major components of the food distribution process.
- Changes in food distribution were kept to a minimum and any changes were designed to improve the system.
- Opportunities created by the pilot project to reduce the costs of the distribution were used to the fullest. There has been a shift of costs from UNHCR to WFP estimated to be in the range of US\$8 to 26 per metric ton.
- The pilot project clarified practice in relation to responsibilities of WFP, UNHCR and the Implementing Partners, rather than the responsibilities themselves, as these are well documented in the MoU, EDP guidelines and other related documents.

### 2. Management and Coordination

- Coordination and communication improved between the two UN agencies and their partners during the pilot project; communication between headquarters and the field, and between participating country offices, in the pilot project could be improved, however. This could include policy guidelines, lessons learned in other countries, formats for agreements, workplans, indicators, etc.
- Although refugees were informed of the pilot project, communication with them needs to remain open, with regular sensitization and awareness campaigns.
- Accurate registration of refugees is an ongoing process and is a fundamental issue of concern, not limited to the pilot project. UNHCR, with support from WFP, needs to update and implement the registration system.
- Food distribution monitoring was on-going in all countries with the separation of distribution and monitoring responsibilities being a good check and balance. The number of monitoring forms needs to be minimized to avoid duplication and ensure that the refugees are not interviewed too often for the same information. UNHCR and WFP need to work together to streamline reporting procedures for the IPs to minimize duplication and reporting time.

### 3. Beneficiaries and Protection

- The pilot project had no impact on the beneficiaries' perception of UNHCR as lead agency responsible for refugee protection and assistance.
- WFP, UNHCR and its IPs need to be aware that delays in food delivery or breaks in the food pipeline can create potential protection problems and add to the burden of the refugees.
- As noted above periodic awareness campaigns should be held regularly with the refugees to ensure their understanding of the roles of the UN agencies, the IPs, government and refugee committees. This can include the preparation and review of ToRs on the roles and responsibilities of the refugee committees.
- UNHCR was requested to provide/continue basic protection training in almost all of the countries. WFP and IP staff working in the camps should attend, along with government, host community representatives and refugees. Both UN agencies should coordinate their training in the cross-cutting themes of Joint Assessment Guidelines, Gender, SGBV and HIV/AIDS.







# Annexes





## Annex 1

# Summary Table of Five Countries Included in the Pilot Food Distribution Project





**Annex 1 - Summary Table of Five Countries Included in the Pilot Food Distribution Project<sup>1</sup>**

COUNTRY	PAKISTAN	SIERRA LEONE	UGANDA	ZAMBIA	KENYA
PP since	1 January 2003 to mid-2004	1 March 2003	1 April 2003	1 January 2004	1 April 2004
Before PP	<p>NWFP: 7 camps. Baluchistan: 7 camps.</p> <p>FM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In NWFP by WFP itself.</li> <li>- In Baluchistan by IPs appointed by WFP.</li> </ul> <p>FD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In NWFP 5 IPs.</li> <li>- In Baluchistan 2 IPs.</li> </ul>	<p>Total of 7 camps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4 pipeline agencies in charge of entire food chain (CARE, WVI, CRS and WFP)</li> <li>- CARE, WVI and CRS took charge of FM and FD.</li> <li>- WFP had sub-contracted 2 IPs for FD.</li> </ul>	<p>Total of 11 camps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In all 11 camps the same IP was in charge of FM and FD.</li> <li>- The services of 5 IPs were retained.</li> </ul>	<p>Total of 6 camps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In 4 camps same IP in charge of FM and FD.</li> <li>- In 2 camps WFP was itself in charge of FM and 2 IPs in charge of FD.</li> </ul>	<p>Total of 2 camps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FM at 2 EDPs is managed by WFP.</li> <li>- 2 IPs in charge of FD at 2 FDPs.</li> </ul>
After PP	<p>NWFP: 7 camps.</p> <p>Baluchistan: 6 camps.</p> <p>FD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In NWFP by WFP itself.</li> <li>- In Baluchistan by IPs appointed by WFP.</li> </ul> <p>FD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In NWFP 4 IPs.</li> <li>- In Baluchistan: only one IP for 6 camps.</li> </ul>	<p>Total of 8 camps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- WFP has replaced all 4 food pipeline agencies.</li> <li>- Inside the 8 camps same IP in charge of FM and FD.</li> <li>- For 8 camps WFP contracted 5 IPs.</li> </ul>	<p>Total of 11 camps.</p> <p>Situation unchanged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In all 11 camps the same IP was in charge of FM and FD.</li> <li>- The services of 5 IPs were retained but only 4 IPs were same as before P.P.</li> </ul>	<p>Total of 6 camps later reduced to 5.</p> <p>Situation unchanged</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In 4 camps same IP in charge of FM and FD.</li> <li>- In 2 camps WFP was itself in charge of FM and 2 IPs in charge of FD.</li> </ul>	<p>Total of 2 camps.</p> <p>Situation unchanged</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FM at 2 EDPs is managed by WFP.</li> <li>- 2 IPs in charge of FD at 2 FDPs.</li> </ul>
Remarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In NWFP FM has remained under WFP's responsibility.</li> <li>- Drive to reduce the number of IPs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In 5 camps the IP in charge of FM and FD was also UNHCR appointed camp manager.</li> <li>- Drive to appoint IP in charge of FM and FD also as camp manager.</li> </ul>	<p>In 2005 number of IPs reduced to 4.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- On 01/07/05 WFP transferred FM in 2 camps to IPs.</li> <li>- As from 01/07/05 in all 5 camps same IP was in charge of FM and FD.</li> </ul>	<p>On 01/07/03 the FM at Dadaab EDP was transferred from CARE to WFP.</p>

<sup>1</sup> FM: food management; FD: food distribution; IP: Implementing Partner; PP: Pilot Project.





## Annex 2

# Theoretical Approximation of WFP Direct Extra Costs over 12 Months







Annex 2 - Theoretical Approximation of WFP Direct Extra Costs over 12 Months

<u>Countries involved in the UNHCR-WFP Pilot Project</u>	<u>Period</u>	<u>Months</u>	<u>Food Distributed in MT</u>	<u>Average Cost of Secondary Transport/MT in US\$</u>	<u>Average Cost of FDP Operations/MT</u>	<u>Estimated Maintenance Cost of Distribution Centres/MT</u>	<u>Total Direct Cost/MT<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>Approximation of Total Direct Cost Supported by WFP in US\$.</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
KENYA	01/07/04 – 31/06/04	12	44,389	3,64	11.05	0.25	14.94	663,172	Tonnage figure from WFP/Kenya statistics. Secondary transport rate includes write-off, insurance, road license, driver/turn boy, maintenance in NBI, fuel. Rate for FDP operations as per contract with the IP.
ZAMBIA	01/01/04 – 31/12/04	12	24,440	10.00	16.00	0.25	26.25	641,550	Tonnage figures supplied by WFP/Zambia. Secondary transport rate derived from LTSH matrix plus allowance for stiff increase in commercial rates (since June 2003). Rate for FDP operations as per contract with IP.
UGANDA	01/04/04 – 31/03/05	12	26,687	6,10	6.00	0.25	12.35	329,584	Tonnage figures supplied by WFP/Uganda. Secondary transport rate supplied by logistics dept. WFP Uganda increased by 1 US\$/MT to cover write off cost. FDP costs arrived at by comparing IP contractual rates before and after the Pilot Project.
SIERRA-LEONE	01/01/04 – 31/08/04	8	7,333	20.20	21.00	0.25	41.45	303,953	Indicative tonnage figures supplied by WFP Sierra Leone. Secondary transport rate supplied by WFP Sierra Leone Logistics Department.
	01/09/04 – 31/12/04	4	3,667	NIL	21.00	0.25	21.25	77,923	Secondary transport discontinued after 01/09/04. FDP rate is compounded average of contracted rates with IPs.
PAKISTAN NWFP	01/01/03 – 31/12/03	12	26,836	NIL	5.50	0.25	5.75	154,307	No secondary transport. Long distance trucking straight to EDP/FDP with WFP trucks. FDP rate is IP contracted rate less cost per MT paid in 2002 by WFP for EDP food management (US\$5.50)
PAKISTAN BALOCHISTAN	01/01/03 – 31/12/03	12	16,129	NIL	9.88	0.25	10.13	163,386	No secondary transport. Long distance trucking straight to EDP/FDP with commercial haulers. FDP rate: is IP contracted rate less cost per MT paid in 2002 by WFP for EDP food management (US\$3.62)
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>149,481</b>					<b>2,333,875</b>	

<sup>1</sup> Lump sum for the maintenance of distribution centres by WFP, FDP sheds or rub-halls, sun shelters, latrines and scooping material at US\$0.25 per MT. Theoretical approximation of the direct extra cost per metric ton of food aid distributed: US\$2,333,875 for 149,481 tons or **US\$15.61 per ton**. The additional direct extra cost supported by WFP averaged between US\$8 (in NWFP and Balochistan in Pakistan) and US\$26 (Zambia).





## Annex 3

# Summary Table of Refugee Populations and Questionnaires by Country



**Annex 3 - Summary Table of Refugee Populations and Questionnaires by Country**

	Country	Initial	Population Receiving Food at time of Survey			# of Camps	# of Surveys
			Male	Female	Total		
1	Pakistan	PAK	100,223	93,265	193,488	13	19
2	Sierra Leone <sup>1</sup>	SIL	26,243	27,368	53,611	8	39
3	Uganda	UAG	87,028	81,754	168,782	11	111
4	Zambia	ZAM	46,697	49,727	96,424	5	80
5	Kenya	KEN	123,523	104,025	227,548	2	22
	<b>Total</b>		<b>383,714</b>	<b>355,839</b>	<b>739,853</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>271</b>

<sup>1</sup> The Gender Breakdown for the total population of one of the 8 Camps in Sierra Leone was not available, therefore a percentage of the total camp population was used to estimate the number of men and women.





## Annex 4

# Summary Results of the Discussions with the Beneficiaries





**Annex 4 - Summary Results of Discussions with the Beneficiaries<sup>1</sup>**

	Questions for Discussion	%	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total	Comments/Remarks/Observations
1	Are the beneficiaries aware of the change in the food distribution from UNHCR to WFP?	63	162	74	20	256	Comments/Remarks/Observations are included in the individual case studies
	Do they understand the role of the two agencies?	77	205	49	13	267	
	Who is Implementing Partner and are they aware of its role/responsibilities?	87	226	23	10	259	
	Is their coordination of delivery of food and non-food items? Are the refugees aware of who delivers what?	73	181	47	21	249	
2	Are the refugees aware of the community structure and communication channels for food distribution? Who represents them? Are women in leadership roles?	96	257	8	2	267	
	Are there food committees? What is the composition and what % of the food committees are women? Are the committees useful in resolving food distribution problems?	92	209	15	4	228	

<sup>1</sup> 271 Surveys from all 39 Camps/settlements in 5 countries.



	Questions for Discussion	%	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total	Comments/Remarks/Observations
3	Are they aware of the basic ration and do they receive it? Did it change between UNHCR and WFP?	91	243	19	5	267	Comments/Remarks/Observations are included in the individual case studies
	Were there any changes in the delivery schedule between UNHCR and WFP?	64	61	33	2	96	
	Are there delays in food delivery? If so why? Do they complain and if so to whom? What was the result of their complaint?	37	36	61		97	
	Have distribution points changed to make it easier to carry food?	53	141	123		264	
	Has distribution changed (scoops vs. group distribution, etc) between UNHCR and WFP?	23	22	75		97	
	Has packaging changed to facilitate transport?	3	3	90	3	96	
4	Do women participate in the distribution? What % of women are employed as scoopers? Monitors?	97	257	7		264	
	Would they prefer to have more women involved?	67	161	75	3	239	
	Are women/spouses included on the ration cards? What % of women collect the food?	96	242	8	2	252	
	Do all members of the family have access to food? Are all family members registered and included on ration cards?	88	232	31		263	
	Are they aware of or ever reported/been involved in security or protection incidents related to food distribution? Are women safe at the food distribution?	48	123	128	6	257	



	Questions for Discussion	%	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total	Comments/Remarks/Observations
	To whom would they turn to complain or report Protection Issues						Comments/Remarks/Observations are included in the individual case studies
	Are there specific protection problems that relate to women?	31	79	170	8	257	
	Are there SGBV protection issues related to food distribution?	22	20	65	6	91	
	How do the vulnerable (EVI) collect their food? Are there protection issues for the EVI related to food distribution?	52	90	78	5	173	
5	Any suggestions, complaints, recommendations, or Lessons Learned regarding the food distribution system either before with UNHCR or now under WFP?						Comments/Remarks/Observations are included in the individual case studies. See Section III above for some general comments by the refugees.





## Annex 5

# Revised MoU between WFP and UNHCR (July 2002)





---

**To:** All UNHCR Directors, Heads of Desks and Chiefs of Sections in Headquarters  
All UNHCR Representatives and Chiefs of Missions in the Field  
All WFP Division Directors, Regional Directors and Cluster Managers  
All WFP Representatives and Country Directors

**From:** James Morris, Executive Director, WFP  
Ruud Lubbers, High Commissioner, UNHCR

**Subject:** New text of the MOU between WFP and UNHCR  
Revision of 9 July 2002

---

We are pleased to share with you the Revised Version of the UNHCR/WFP Memorandum of Understanding, which came into effect on 9 July 2002 and replaces the version that has been effective since 31 March 1997. The first MOU between our agencies was signed in 1985 and this is the fourth revision.

Working arrangements between UNHCR and WFP, embodied in the MOU, have been widely viewed by the international community as a good example of effective and efficient collaboration between UN Agencies, proven in many difficult situations. However, the humanitarian situation and the circumstances of the affected people change through time, as well as the operational and policy priorities of WFP and UNHCR. New concerns and priorities are identified.

We believe that the new MOU text, signed on 9 July 2002 in Durban, South Africa, in the presence of UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, represents a step towards further improvement in the already good and strong collaboration that WFP and UNHCR have had for years, in addressing critical needs of refugees, asylum seekers, returnees and, in some circumstances, internally displaced persons. Some of the key new or revised elements are:

- The scope of the cooperation (from needs assessments to provision of relief and advocacy) has been clarified and slightly expanded to strengthen commitments to providing comprehensive support with food and related non-food items and services.
- Joint decision making, approaches to donors, public information and advocacy, as well as joint implementation of some activities have been increased and enhanced, to reflect better the coordinated efforts of our two agencies.
- More focus has been placed on and more efforts committed to the pursuance of self-sufficiency of the beneficiaries, particularly through an active search for alternative food and income generation opportunities and pursuit of durable solutions.



- More emphasis and further commitments have been made to accountability and transparency, as well as gender and age vulnerabilities and related considerations.
- Various types of information that guide joint operations are to be updated and shared more regularly and frequently than before. Beneficiary figures and data on food security situation should be updated annually, while information on possible pipeline breaks should be exchanged with at least three months notice. Country-specific local agreements are to be developed and regularly updated for all individual operations.
- The importance of distribution and post-distribution monitoring has been reconfirmed, as well as the commitment of both organisations to undertake this exercise at each field location.
- A number of ambiguities in the earlier text of the MOU document have been clarified for easier understanding and application in the future, such as the application of the usual minimum number for WFP involvement of 5,000 refugee beneficiaries per country.
- WFP will take over, on a test basis, the responsibility for final distribution of food aid in five selected operations. In light of this experience, further discussions will be held about a possible transfer of this responsibility to WFP on a longer-term basis. The most suitable country operations for these tests will be selected shortly.
- WFP and UNHCR recognize the dramatic impact of HIV/AIDS on the socio-economic situation of beneficiaries and are committed to seize every opportunity to promote prevention, care and support activities.

The key to the effectiveness of our joint efforts remains close and open cooperation and coordination and full and timely information exchange and consultation.

The joint Task Force re-established in 2000 will continue to be responsible for monitoring the implementation and effectiveness of the MOU. The practical guidelines agreed separately in the past to facilitate the implementation of joint humanitarian and recovery operations, such as those on matters of Needs Assessments, Nutrition, Food Distribution and Logistics will also be monitored, periodically reviewed and amended as needed.

We rely on you, who work each day on making our assistance to the beneficiaries more effective, to disseminate as widely as possible the new MOU, to make the best use of it and to provide feedback in order to ensure that it continues to reflect and respond to the realities and needs on the ground.

James Morris  
Executive Director  
WFP

Ruud Lubbers  
High Commissioner  
UNHCR





WFP



UNHCR

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING**

**BETWEEN**

**THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER  
FOR REFUGEES (UNHCR)**

**AND**

**THE WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME (WFP)**

**JULY 2002**

---

**UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES  
WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME**



[2]



**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN  
THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES (UNHCR)  
AND  
THE WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME (WFP)**

**1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Even before the conclusion of the 1985 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), UNHCR and WFP had established a very close partnership in the service of refugees. This was significantly strengthened with the new working arrangements introduced progressively from the start of 1992. A revised MOU, reflecting experience with these new arrangements, became effective at the start of 1994 and was further revised in 1997. This 2002 revision reflects the experience in implementing the provisions of the second revision.

1.2 The MOU sets out its objectives and scope, and establishes the division of responsibility and arrangements for, *inter alia*, needs assessment; resource mobilization; logistics; appeals; monitoring and evaluation; nutritional surveillance, reporting, and coordination. The last section describes the general conditions governing the MOU.

1.3 By virtue of its Statute (General Assembly resolution 428 (V) of 14 December 1950), the role of UNHCR is to provide international protection to refugees and to seek durable solutions to refugee problems. As regards UNHCR's assistance activities, the basic provisions of the Statute were expanded by the General Assembly in its resolution 832 (IX) of 21 October 1954. Subsequent resolutions of the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Executive Committee of UNHCR have called on the Office, in the context of its basic mandate, to protect and assist other groups of persons regarded as falling within the competence of UNHCR. For the purpose of this MOU, the following categories of persons are of concern to UNHCR:

• **Refugees**

UNHCR is mandated to provide international protection and humanitarian assistance to refugees as well as to promote durable solutions to their problems.



[3]

- **Asylum seekers**

The term *asylum seeker*, in the context of this MOU, refers to persons who are part of large-scale influxes of mixed groups, the nature of which makes individual refugee status determination impractical. UNHCR is mandated to promote the right of all persons, whether individually or as part of mass movements, to seek and to avail themselves of asylum, until a solution is found and in accordance with basic humanitarian standards of treatment.

- **Returnees**

UNHCR's mandate concerning returning refugees, based on its legitimate concern for the consequences of return, includes substantive involvement to ensure that return takes place in conditions of safety and dignity and to provide assistance to returnees in their country of origin with an aim towards their full reintegration. UNHCR's activities in favour of returnees are limited in time and aimed at ensuring the sustainability of returns, and vary according to each operation. UNHCR's involvement may be determined by specific tripartite or bilateral agreements with respective countries that outline the framework of voluntary repatriation operations.

- **Internally displaced persons (IDPs)**

UNHCR's involvement with IDPs is selective, applying to persons displaced internally for reasons that would make them of concern to UNHCR had they crossed an international boundary. In line with relevant General Assembly resolutions, UNHCR's involvement in any IDP situation is based on a specific request from the Secretary-General or a competent principal organ of the United Nations, the consent of the State or other entities concerned, and the availability of adequate resources.

1.4. WFP is mandated to feed the hungry poor, regardless of their status. As the food aid arm of the United Nations, WFP uses food to save lives, alleviate hunger and enable poor, food-insecure people to make investments that will help them in the longer term. This entails assessing the needs of targeted populations, planning and implementing appropriate activities, organizing and managing logistics, monitoring impact and working with a range of partners. Refugees, asylum seekers, returnees and IDPs, especially women and children, are important categories of food-insecure people of particular concern to WFP, given the impact of displacement on food security.

1.5 Under the framework of this MOU, UNHCR and WFP will work together, in partnership, where their mandates overlap, to address the food security and related needs of refugees and others of concern to UNHCR.

## 2. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

2.1 The ultimate goal of the partnership between UNHCR and WFP is to ensure that food security and related needs of the refugees and returnees that UNHCR is mandated to protect and assist are adequately addressed. Food security is defined as access by all people at all times to enough food needed for an active and healthy life. On the basis of the above principle, and through the timely provision of the right quantity of the right food and of non-food items relevant to the safe and effective use of the food ration provided, UNHCR and



[4]

WFP seek to contribute to:

- the restoration and/or maintenance of a sound nutritional status through a food basket that meets the assessed requirements of the different population groups, is nutritionally balanced and is culturally acceptable, as jointly agreed upon and specified in Joint Plans of Action (see article 3.2); and
- the promotion of the highest possible level of self-reliance among the beneficiaries, through the implementation of appropriate programmes to develop food production or income-generation, which will facilitate a progressive shift from general relief food distribution towards more targeted assistance and sustainable development-oriented activities.

2.2 UNHCR and WFP are committed to ensuring that food aid and non-food items affecting health and food security are targeted at the household level and reach the most vulnerable, with their delivery respecting the guiding principles of humanitarian action, especially accountability and transparency. WFP and UNHCR will take measures to ensure that, to the extent possible and taking into account the demographic profile of the beneficiary population, at least 80 per cent of food inputs are directly managed by the adult female in the household. They will also work together to implement strategies to involve the beneficiary community, and particularly women, in all aspects of the management of food aid. Women should be encouraged to participate in decision-making bodies and should represent at least 50 per cent of the members in refugee committees.

2.3 UNHCR and WFP have a legitimate interest in the creation of suitable conditions for durable solutions. The promotion of self-reliance, although not a durable solution on its own, is one of the essential elements for lasting solutions. The achievement of self-reliance implies a whole range of activities aimed at socio-economic empowerment of refugees and returnees, as part of a local community. Given the need for self-reliance to be featured within a larger context of local development, WFP and UNHCR will make efforts to link self-reliance and reintegration activities to the longer-term recovery and development plans of governments and other actors.

2.4 The MOU is a management tool that contributes to the achievement of these objectives by recognizing the mandates of each organization and defining clearly the responsibilities and arrangements for cooperation between UNHCR and WFP. It does so in a way that maximizes the strengths of each organization and builds on their comparative advantages in arrangements for cooperation that provide both added value for the beneficiaries and the discharge of these mandates and responsibilities.

2.5 The MOU covers cooperation in the provision of food aid and related non-food items to refugees (including asylum seekers), returnees and, in specific situations (as defined in article 1.3) to IDPs. It applies when the number of people in need of food assistance in a given country is at least 5,000, unless otherwise determined and agreed upon by WFP and UNHCR on a case-by-case basis. Where the beneficiaries are located in developed countries,<sup>1</sup> the provisions of the MOU will still apply, provided that the availability of the necessary donor

<sup>1</sup> Countries other than those listed in the OECD/DAC Annual Report as aid recipient countries that fall below the threshold for World Bank loan eligibility.



[5]

resources is not at the expense of WFP's relief operations in developing countries. This will be determined by WFP on a case-by-case basis.

2.6 UNHCR and WFP will separately meet the food needs of persons of their concern that lie outside the scope of the MOU as defined above, as well as the needs of any persons who, while falling within the MOU's scope, have been excluded by a situation-specific agreement.

### 3. PLANNING AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

#### Contingency planning

3.1 UNHCR and WFP will establish early-warning systems, undertake contingency planning and maintain contingency plans for countries where this is deemed appropriate. Each will seek to ensure joint participation of others concerned in the process, and share relevant contingency plans where these can not be developed jointly.

#### Plan of Action

3.2 At the field level, a Joint Plan of Action setting out the agreed-upon objectives and implementation arrangements for operations under this MOU shall be developed at the onset of each joint operation and updated regularly, at least annually.

#### Registration/verification

3.3 The host government is primarily responsible for determining the number of refugees. In the context of its protection mandate, UNHCR will fully support the government in processes relating to the determination of refugee status and the registration of and provision of identity cards to refugees. WFP and UNHCR will jointly assess the number of refugees/returnees eligible for food assistance, in consultation with the government concerned. An accurate identification of beneficiaries and a sound assessment of their needs are essential for the mobilization and efficient use of the resources made available to both organizations.

3.4 In normal circumstances registration will take place within three months of the start of a major influx. The size and nature of the influx will determine the type of registration mechanism to be used. UNHCR will work together with the government to put in place local arrangements to register, to the extent possible, any new arrivals, departures, births, changes in marital status and deaths. This will ensure that changes in the family size of the beneficiaries of food items are followed by a corresponding change in family rations. Where a satisfactory registration has not been possible within three months, UNHCR and WFP will jointly determine the number of beneficiaries in need of food assistance and estimate the demographic breakdown of the population, in consultation with the host government. Beneficiary numbers and the refugee food security situation will be jointly updated regularly, at least annually, unless otherwise agreed upon by the country offices. The timing of the registration, verification or revalidation exercise will be agreed upon at the country level in the Joint Plan of Action.

3.5 UNHCR will fully involve WFP in the planning and execution of refugee enumeration, registration and verification exercises for actual or potential



[6]

beneficiaries of food aid and related non-food items. Operational partners and representatives of donor governments should be closely associated with this and other aspects of enumeration and registration. Should there be any disagreement between the respective country offices on the number of beneficiaries to use in the absence of a satisfactory initial registration, the matter shall be referred to the respective regional bureaux for resolution. Pending such resolution, and in consultation with the host government, WFP will provide food to the number of beneficiaries it estimates to be in need of assistance.

#### **Needs assessment**

3.6 In consultation with the relevant government authorities, donor representatives, operational partners, beneficiaries, and experts as appropriate, UNHCR and WFP will jointly assess the overall food aid and related non-food requirements. Both agencies will agree on the modalities of food assistance, the composition of the food basket, ration size, duration of assistance, and related non-food inputs. Special consideration will be given to the needs and views of women, children and vulnerable groups. Needs in different settlements may be established individually, if so jointly agreed upon at country level. The proposed food and non-food assistance programmes will take into account all relevant factors, including the socio-economic and nutritional status of the beneficiaries, cultural practices, overall food availability, prospects for self-reliance, availability of cooking fuels and milling facilities, and environmental impact. Energy requirements for cooking and corresponding energy supply options and quantities should be carefully assessed in each situation.

3.7 In a major new emergency, the initial assessment to determine the number of beneficiaries and the most urgent food and non-food needs will normally be carried out within the framework of the emergency response being mobilized by both agencies. This would involve the participation of emergency response teams from UNHCR, WFP and prospective operational partners, as appropriate.

3.8 In ongoing operations, a jointly led review of food and other relief needs will normally take the form of a periodic joint assessment mission (JAM), undertaken by the country offices and involving outside staff, as appropriate. The composition of the mission will be mutually agreed upon. When a consultancy is required to assess the beneficiaries' socio-economic or health situation — such as their household food economy, self-reliance potential, health behaviours, underlying causes of malnutrition and gender aspects of distribution modalities — its cost will be shared by both organizations. The participation, as full mission members, of selected donor and operational partner representatives will be encouraged so as to promote donor support for the mission's findings. Jointly established assessment mission guidelines will be developed. The JAM report will be finalized within a month of the completion of the mission, and circulated immediately thereafter.

3.9 Should either the UNHCR or the WFP country office consider that developments since the last needs assessment warrant a change in the agreed-upon ration or number of beneficiaries, the other organization shall be informed of this immediately. The implications of these developments will be reviewed jointly and a course of action agreed upon. Should the country offices not agree on a course of action, the issue shall be referred to the respective regional bureaux for appropriate and immediate resolution.



[7]

3.10 UNHCR and WFP will also consider the food security situation of communities surrounding refugee camps and of individuals and families hosting refugees, and will address these needs as appropriate.

#### **Durable solutions**

3.11 In accordance with their respective mandates, UNHCR and WFP will promote the use of assistance to encourage and build the self-reliance of beneficiaries. This will include programming food and non-food aid to support asset-building, training, income-generation and other self-reliance activities. With the increase in self-reliance, UNHCR and WFP will carefully plan for the reduction of assistance in consultation with the government, non-governmental organization (NGO) partners and beneficiaries. Possibilities for allocating agricultural land for use by refugees will be pursued with host governments, whenever possible.

3.12 WFP will be closely associated with the planning and implementation of repatriation operations, particularly with regard to timing, security and other components that would affect food aid planning and implementation. Decisions on the use of WFP food will be taken jointly. If a repatriation commission is established by the governments concerned, UNHCR will request WFP's participation (as an observer or as otherwise agreed) in its meetings.

3.13 UNHCR, in consultation with WFP and other relevant partners, will develop reintegration strategies that help integrate refugees into their former or new communities, keeping in mind the broader food security situation of such communities as well as government policies and sensitivity. Normally, assistance provided to communities or areas is likely to be more appropriate than that provided to individuals. UNHCR and WFP will make efforts to link UNHCR's short-term reintegration programmes to longer-term development plans/programmes of the region, including those of WFP and other development actors.

#### **Nutrition**

3.14 The indicative average energy and protein requirements for human beings established by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the World Health Organization (WHO) (2,100 kcal per person per day, with 10–12 per cent coming from protein) will be maintained as the initial planning figure to apply at the onset of any emergency situation. This figure will be adjusted as soon as possible to take into account the temperature in the area and the demographic composition, health, nutritional status and physical activity levels of the beneficiaries, as specified in the Joint WFP/UNHCR/UNICEF/WHO Guidelines for Estimating Food and Nutritional Needs in Emergencies. Other factors, such as the ability of the population to provide its own food and those factors specified in article 3.6, will also be taken into consideration when estimating the food aid needs of the beneficiaries. Agreed-upon nutritional guidelines will be used to assess the food needs for both the general and any selective feeding programmes that may be necessary.

3.15 UNHCR, through its implementing partners (health agencies), is responsible for monitoring the nutritional status of refugees and for the implementation of any selective feeding programmes that may be necessary. UNHCR will organize regular nutritional surveys and maintain an effective surveillance system for



[8]

monitoring the nutritional status of refugee populations. UNHCR will ensure the full involvement and the effective participation of WFP staff in both the planning and the execution of the nutritional surveys, and in the analysis or interpretation and dissemination of the results. The nutritional status of the refugees will also be reviewed as part of a joint assessment mission. The decision to implement selective feeding programmes will be taken jointly by UNHCR and WFP on the basis of agreed-upon guidelines (WFP/UNHCR Selective Feeding Guidelines). UNHCR will keep WFP informed regularly on the implementation of such programmes. WFP, on the basis of the evaluation of its technical staff at the country and regional levels, may recommend to UNHCR specific actions in the nutrition field.

#### **HIV/AIDS prevention**

3.16 The HIV/AIDS pandemic affects the socio-economic and security situation of the beneficiaries of this MOU. In its implementation, both agencies will seize every opportunity to address the impact of HIV/AIDS on the populations of mutual concern and to promote prevention and care activities.

#### **4. RESPONSIBILITIES FOR RESOURCE MOBILIZATION AND MILLING**

4.1 WFP is responsible for mobilizing the following commodities, whether for general or selective feeding programmes: cereals; edible oils and fats; pulses (or other sources of protein when appropriate and jointly agreed upon); blended foods; salt; sugar; and high-energy biscuits. Where beneficiaries are totally dependent on food aid, WFP will ensure the provision of blended foods or other fortified commodities in order to contribute to preventing or correcting micronutrient deficiencies.

4.2 UNHCR is responsible for mobilizing complementary food commodities when recommended by JAMs or on the basis of specific health/nutritional and/or social assessments, particularly when refugees have limited access to fresh food items. These complementary commodities include local fresh foods and therapeutic milk (to be used in selective feeding programmes). UNHCR may mobilize spices and tea, when recommended.

4.3 Within its assistance activities, UNHCR is responsible for ensuring adequate supplies of non-food items and services, in particular those relevant to the safe and effective use of food aid, such as cooking utensils, fuel, water and sanitation, medicines, soap and shelter. UNHCR and WFP should promote nutritionally and environmentally sound practices, and cooking techniques and technologies for saving fuel.

4.4 Furthermore, UNHCR and WFP will facilitate the mobilization of seeds, tools and fertilizers, in cooperation with relevant government bodies and competent United Nations and development cooperation agencies.

4.5 The joint assessment mission will determine the specific food commodities and quantities required. The assessment will also determine whether cereals are to be provided in whole grain or as flour. For practical, nutritional and environmental reasons, it is generally preferable to provide flour in the early





[9]

stages of an emergency, but such provision may be difficult to sustain in protracted operations. If whole grain is provided, local milling capacity must be available. The ration should include compensation for milling costs (normally between 10 and 20 per cent of the cereals provided), if these costs are borne by the beneficiaries. WFP is responsible for mobilizing the necessary resources for milling and will provide milling facilities for the beneficiaries where feasible. Women will be particularly encouraged to play a key role in the management of the milling services, when appropriate.

4.6 WFP and UNHCR will maintain effective systems for monitoring their commodity pipelines and will keep each other closely and regularly informed, at both the country office and regional bureau levels, of any significant developments. UNHCR and WFP will consult immediately should it become clear that either organization may not be able to ensure the timely arrival (including milling) of food and non-food commodities under their responsibility, whether because of unavailability of resources, delayed deliveries, logistical problems, or other constraints. Systems should be put in place to ensure that such information is available at least three months in advance. As a consequence, appropriate remedial action will be taken jointly, such as the issuing of joint donor appeals, press statements, temporary modifications of the food basket composition to maintain the agreed-upon energy (kcal) level and any other action agreed upon at the field and regional levels.

## 5. RESPONSIBILITIES FOR FOOD DELIVERY AND DISTRIBUTION

5.1 WFP is responsible for the timely transport to agreed-upon extended delivery points (EDPs) of sufficient quantities of those food commodities it is responsible for mobilizing (specified in article 4.1). WFP is also responsible for storing these commodities at the EDPs, and for managing the latter. WFP will keep UNHCR informed of the in-country logistic arrangements made to implement the agreed-upon programme.

5.2 UNHCR is responsible for the timely transport and for the storage of sufficient quantities of those food and non-food commodities it is responsible for mobilizing (specified in article 4.2). Unless otherwise agreed, UNHCR is also responsible for the transportation of WFP food commodities from the EDPs to the final delivery points (FDPs) and for their final distribution to beneficiaries. Responsibility is assumed ex-warehouse (i.e. EDP) or free-on-truck/free-on-rail, taking into consideration practice in the country. UNHCR will keep WFP informed of the logistical arrangements made to implement the agreed-upon programme.

5.3 The location of an EDP is proposed by the country offices, in accordance with agreed-upon Guidelines for Locating EDPs and Operating EDP Storage Facilities, and confirmed by UNHCR and WFP regional bureaux. The location selected should minimize overall costs and maximize management efficiency of the operation as a whole. EDPs should be located where sufficient warehousing space can be made available to ensure regular final distribution and the most efficient possible onward transportation, thus avoiding the need for further intermediate storage or trans-shipment between the EDP and the distribution location. Management and security considerations are particularly important.



[10]

The distribution site should also be as close as possible to households, to minimize the burdens and risks to women managing food distribution and/or collecting the food.

5.4 Arrangements for the final distribution of food commodities to beneficiaries are agreed-upon jointly by the government, UNHCR and WFP, in consultation with beneficiaries, particularly women's committees, and in conformity with the established commodity distribution guidelines. These arrangements will respect UNHCR and WFP's policy of ensuring the maximum possible appropriate involvement of the beneficiary community, and of women in particular, in all aspects of distribution. The final distribution of food commodities will be normally the responsibility of an implementing partner of UNHCR (except in those countries selected for the pilot activities mentioned in article 5.8), whose designation shall be jointly agreed upon by UNHCR and WFP. The distribution modalities and the responsibilities of the implementing partner for reporting on the distribution and use of food commodities are the subject of a tripartite agreement among UNHCR, WFP and the implementing partner. Tripartite agreements will be signed in every joint operation. UNHCR is responsible for ensuring, in collaboration with WFP, that implementing arrangements also provide appropriate guidance to beneficiaries on their entitlements, distribution schedules and how to prepare food in a manner that minimizes cooking time and safeguards the food's nutritional content.

5.5 Bearing in mind the broader context in which the food distribution process takes place, and its impact, in particular on the protection situation of the assisted population, the country office of either UNHCR or WFP may, at any moment, request modifications to the pattern of distribution, or stop distribution altogether, if deemed appropriate. Should the country office of either agency disagree with this request, the matter will be submitted to the corresponding regional bureaux of both organizations for final joint decision. Pending this final resolution, the process of food distribution will proceed as previously agreed.

5.6 In targeted feeding programmes such as school feeding and food for work, and in non-camp situations in the country of asylum or in situations where food assistance is targeted to both IDPs and refugees, UNHCR and WFP may agree to transfer the responsibility for distribution to WFP.

5.7 There is no automatic retroactive entitlement when full distribution of the agreed-upon ration has not been possible. The decision on any exceptional retroactive distribution will be made jointly by UNHCR and WFP and will be based on substantive evidence of any negative effects of the reduced ration on refugees' well-being.

5.8 On a pilot basis and for an initial duration of 12 months (per country), WFP will assume, at its own cost, responsibility for the final distribution of the basic food ration in five refugee programmes. The pilot country programmes will be selected jointly by UNHCR and WFP based upon jointly agreed criteria and in consultation with the concerned WFP/UNHCR country teams. For the countries in which WFP will take responsibility for food distribution, WFP and UNHCR will agree on transitional provisions so as to ensure a smooth hand-over of related responsibilities. The pilot activities will be jointly evaluated. The findings of that evaluation and their implications will be the subject of further discussions



[11]

between UNHCR and WFP.

5.9 UNHCR will maintain its responsibility for distribution of food in selective feeding programmes.

## 6. RESPONSIBILITIES FOR FUNDING AND APPROACHES TO DONORS

6.1 UNHCR and WFP will each mobilize the cash and other resources necessary for the discharge of their respective responsibilities.

6.2 UNHCR and WFP will ensure that the resource implications for each organization are set out in all approaches to donors and related documentation in a manner that makes these responsibilities and their complementarity clear. Details on country-specific landside transport, storage and handling (LTSH) and distribution costs will be provided. Approaches to donors will be coordinated, and UNHCR will share with WFP in advance the text covering food needs in any appeal to donors. Joint approaches will be made whenever appropriate, both at the start of a new operation and at any time should it appear that the response of donors will not ensure the timely delivery of the necessary relief items.

6.3 UNHCR and WFP will urge donors to pledge commodities and cash for all food requirements under this MOU through WFP. Sole exception will be for the few food items that UNHCR is responsible for mobilizing. WFP will manage all contributions channelled through it, and coordinate and monitor donor pledges and shipments, including bilateral and non-governmental donations, of all commodities, seeking to adjust delivery schedules as necessary. UNHCR will be kept informed accordingly.

6.4 WFP will seek to ensure that bilateral food resources for refugees (and asylum seekers), returnees and IDPs falling under this agreement, whether channelled through WFP or not, are accompanied by the full cash resources needed to cover LTSH and other related support costs.

6.5 UNHCR will support WFP's specific approaches to donors to provide cash for local, regional or international purchase, so as to ensure that the needs of beneficiaries are met in the most timely and cost-effective manner possible. UNHCR will also support WFP's general approaches to donors for cash contributions to bring the Immediate Response Account (IRA) up to, and maintain it at, the approved level, and for contributions to any similar fund, so that WFP can respond swiftly to new emergency food needs.

## 7. MONITORING, REPORTING AND EVALUATION

7.1 UNHCR and WFP are both responsible for operational reporting and ongoing monitoring. They will establish an effective monitoring and reporting system for each operation under this MOU, with special attention given to gender-specific quantitative and qualitative data on the socio-economic status of beneficiaries. The agreed-upon distribution of responsibilities for monitoring activities will be specified in the Joint Plan of Action developed in each operation under this MOU. The responsibilities of the government or any other



[12]

implementing partner entrusted with the distribution of WFP food will be set out in the tripartite agreement (referred to in article 5.5) in a manner that allows effective programme management and meets WFP's and UNHCR's responsibilities to donors. This agreement will require the partner entrusted with distribution to report directly to both WFP and UNHCR on the distribution and use of WFP food. UNHCR and WFP field staff will undertake periodic joint monitoring activities at the food distribution sites (which includes food basket monitoring activities) and at the household level (which includes post-distribution monitoring of the end use of the distributed commodities). The capacity of refugees and local communities to contribute to monitoring and evaluation of projects should be taken into account.

7.2 UNHCR and WFP will seek to have multilateral donors accept the standard reports and documentation provided to their Executive Committee and Executive Board, respectively, as fulfilment of reporting requirements, instead of requiring donor-specific reporting.

7.3. The evaluation services of UNHCR and WFP will organize joint evaluations as appropriate, taking into account the scale and complexity of operations covered by the MOU. When an evaluation of a joint operation is organized by one organization, the other shall be informed and invited to participate.

## 8. COORDINATION

8.1 Close cooperation and regular exchange of information between UNHCR and WFP at the field level are essential. This should also enable the resolution of existing and potential problems without referring them to Headquarters or to the regional bureaux. Focal points or liaison officers will be appointed in both UNHCR and WFP field offices to deal with operational matters covered by the MOU.

8.2 The UNHCR and WFP country offices, in liaison with the relevant government authorities as appropriate, will establish and maintain food aid coordinating mechanisms that allow regular consultation and exchange of information with multilateral and bilateral donors, the diplomatic community, other relevant United Nations organizations and NGO partners. Moreover, for each operation, WFP will establish and chair a joint food security committee. The government and all interested partners will be invited to participate and exchange information on all issues pertaining to food aid, non-food related assistance, food security and nutrition relevant to that operation.

8.3 WFP and UNHCR will share with each other the project documents for assistance under the MOU before they are finalized. Letters of Understanding (LOUs) between WFP and the government will expressly provide for full access to and monitoring by both organizations of all aspects of the operation covered by the LOU. WFP will request UNHCR's association (as an observer or as otherwise agreed) with discussions pertinent to the LOU when it concerns people falling under UNHCR's mandate.

8.4 WFP and UNHCR will collaborate on public information activities to promote awareness of the food security and related non-food needs of beneficiaries, understanding of each organization's role, and support for the work of each.



[13]

organization in addressing these needs. In all joint operations, WFP and UNHCR will regularly acknowledge the role of the other to both the media and the general public in order to ensure the common goal of donor and host government support. At the field level, there should be adequate visibility for each organization.

8.5 At the Headquarters level, coordination on operation-specific matters is the responsibility of the respective operations managers or bureau directors. Joint field missions will be undertaken when warranted by specific situations. Coordination for commodity and resource mobilization issues is the responsibility of the respective resource mobilization services. Responsibility for coordinating overall policies and functional issues lies with the respective directors of UNHCR's Division of Operational Support and WFP's Operations Department, who will encourage direct contact among the technical, logistic and programme coordination staff concerned.

8.6 When either UNHCR or WFP is elaborating or developing emergency response capacities, systems and guidelines or taking any other action that could potentially benefit (or duplicate) the work of the other, the responsible unit in the other organization is to be informed. Furthermore, every effort should be made to maximize the benefits to both.

8.7 UNHCR and WFP will collaborate, as appropriate, on transport and logistics issues, at both the field and Headquarters level, to ensure coordination and best use of their assets and resources. Where possible, this will include regular information exchange, joint logistics planning, and use of common services and tools.

8.8 UNHCR and WFP will exchange information, collaborate and coordinate activities in regards to the safety and security of staff and beneficiaries. UNHCR and WFP will work together to enhance the United Nations Security Management System and, while doing so, promote an integrated approach to staff safety and security for the United Nations and NGO implementing partners.

8.9 UNHCR and WFP will collaborate, as appropriate, on telecommunications and information technology issues, at both the field and Headquarters level, to ensure coordination and best use of their assets and resources. Collaboration in the area of geographic information, such as Geographic Information Systems (GIS), Global Positioning System (GPS) and satellite imagery, will be strengthened to increase inter-agency collaboration and sharing of relevant data in standardized formats.

8.10 UNHCR and WFP will collaborate as appropriate in formulating and implementing joint policies and strategies aimed at promoting gender mainstreaming in all activities. The two agencies will make every attempt to implement joint operations in full respect of their common commitment to enhance the status and role of women. Task forces or gender theme groups at the field level would follow up on the strategies elaborated at Headquarters and would formulate joint action plans.

8.11 Each organization will develop and maintain its own training materials for discharging its responsibilities. Joint workshops will be organized, with priority



[14]

given to the field. These workshops will focus on enhancing the skills and knowledge required for joint support to operations falling under this MOU. In addition, each organization will invite the other to participate in courses of a more general nature, such as emergency management training, nutrition and vulnerability assessment.

8.12 Joint Headquarters-level meetings with governments and other parties concerned in specific country or regional operations will be organized as required. If either UNHCR or WFP organizes a meeting with external bodies on operations covered by the MOU, the other organization will be invited.

8.13 Both agencies are committed to ensuring adherence by their staff and those of the partner organizations to their respective codes of conduct and/or other internationally agreed-upon principles of accountability pertinent to humanitarian workers.

## 9. GENERAL PROVISIONS

9.1 This revised MOU shall come into effect on the date of its signing and supersedes the revised MOU dated March 1997.

9.2 It governs cooperation in all operations covered by its terms except those operations, or parts thereof, that may be specifically excluded by mutual agreement.

9.3 Should there be disagreement between the respective country offices on a course of action, the matter will be submitted to the corresponding regional bureaux of both organizations for resolution. If it is not possible to reach an agreement at the regional level, the matter will be referred to the Assistant Executive Director for Operations of WFP and to the Assistant High Commissioner of UNHCR for final resolution.

9.4 Whenever the timely supply of the agreed-upon food and related relief items and services to the jointly identified beneficiaries is delayed or totally disrupted, UNHCR and WFP will jointly investigate all possible remedial actions to be taken and the modalities for resourcing.

9.6 The MOU may be modified at any time by mutual written agreement.

James T. Morris  
Executive Director  
WFP

Ruud Lubbers  
High Commissioner  
UNHCR

Date: July 9, 2002.



## Annex 6

# Terms of Reference for the WFP- UNHCR Joint Evaluation of the Pilot Food Distribution Projects (10 March 2004)







## I. Background

During the course of 2001/2002, WFP and UNHCR revised their 1997 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The new MOU was thus signed on July 2002 and includes a provision for WFP to take over responsibility for food distribution on a pilot basis in five country operations.

Article number 5.8, of the MOU states: “On a pilot basis and for an initial duration of 12 months (per country), WFP will assume, at its own cost, responsibility for the final distribution of the basic food ration in five refugee programmes. The pilot country programmes will be selected jointly by UNHCR and WFP based upon jointly agreed criteria and in consultation with the concerned WFP/UNHCR country teams. For the countries in which WFP will take responsibility for food distribution, WFP and UNHCR will agree on transitional provisions so as to ensure a smooth hand-over of related responsibilities. The pilot activities will be jointly evaluated. The findings of that evaluation and their implications will be the subject of further discussions between UNHCR and WFP”.

The first pilot started in Pakistan in January 2003, followed by Uganda, Rwanda (which had not been chosen but went ahead anyways) and Sierra Leone. Both Zambia and Kenya initiated their activities in 2004.

## II. Objectives

The main objective of the evaluation is to assess the overall effectiveness of the new food distribution arrangement piloted in five country operations. The evaluation findings and recommendations will:

- i) inform policy makers of both organizations;
- ii) facilitate future decision making on whether or not the food distribution should be handed over to WFP; and
- iii) provide accountability to the Executive Boards of both agencies.

## III. Methodology

As stated in the 2002 MOU, “the (evaluation) findings and their implications will be the subject of further discussions between UNHCR and WFP”. A careful analysis of the critical factors which influence both the efficiency and effectiveness of the WFP managed food distributions and a comparison with the previously UNHCR managed distributions will ultimately inform policy decisions in both agencies.

The evaluation will comprise of five case studies in those pilot countries where WFP has already assumed responsibilities for food distribution. They are: **Pakistan, Uganda, Rwanda or Sierra Leone, Zambia and Kenya.**

A detailed draft methodology is to be established during Phase I and will be finalized prior to the visits to the case studies countries. The methodology will be tested in the first country and eventually modified/adjusted according to the experience gained during the first country case study.

The evaluation will be undertaken by a team of two consultants who will be joined by a national consultant in each of the five countries visited. One staff member each from the evaluation sections of WFP and UNHCR, respectively, will join the team during the first mission. This evaluation will be managed jointly by the two agencies and all decisions concerning the implementation shall be taken by consensus between the two.

The evaluation will be carried out as a three-phase exercise:

### Phase I. Documentation – The Desk

During this phase all relevant documents will be reviewed by the team and interviews held with stakeholders at both HQs level. This step will also serve to finalize the methodology for the second phase of the evaluation.

Duration: 15 days

Output: Methodology and detailed plan of action for Phase II



## Phase II. Pilot Country Case Studies – The Field

The evaluation will assess the pilot projects' experience in Pakistan, Uganda and Rwanda in 2004 and in Kenya and Zambia in 2005. The final timing of the field visits will be coordinated between HQ and Country Offices of the two agencies according to the following tentative schedule:

**Pakistan: June 2004**  
**Uganda: July 2004**  
**Rwanda: July-Aug 2004**  
**Zambia: February 2005**  
**Kenya: March 2005**

The evaluation will employ a very participatory approach and use structured and semi-structured interviews to solicit for assessments from refugee beneficiaries, staff members of the two agencies and other stakeholders including NGO staffers as well as donor and Government representatives. The evaluation team will also use quantitative methods (cost-benefit analysis) and use other methods of enquiry including process mapping and a broad 'before and after' comparison.

The evaluation team will need to ensure a consistent approach and method of enquiry amongst the five pilot countries to ensure the comparability of findings. A detailed work plan will be compiled prior to the commencement of the missions and offer further clarification on the proposed methodology.

Duration: 15 days in each country + 8 days for report writing (one report/country)

Outputs: Aide-memoire for the WFP and UNHCR Country Offices and case studies reports

## Phase III. The Reports

The evaluation will produce:

- five individual case studies reports with findings from the pilot countries;
- one summary report providing overall findings and conclusions, supported by analysis contained in the pilot studies.

Where appropriate, the summary report will draw from "best practices" observed during field visits and discuss their relevance in other operations. The final report is not expected to make a direct recommendation as to whether or not the pilot scheme should be rolled out further. It should, instead, offer all required information for the management of the two organizations, thus enabling them to take an **informed policy decision** on the future arrangements for food distribution to refugee beneficiaries.

The evaluation summary report will be presented by OEDE to the WFP Executive Board. As per UNHCR's established evaluation policy, UNHCR may opt to place the final report in the public domain but would seek WFP's agreement beforehand.

Duration: 15 days for the summary report

Outputs: Case studies reports and summary evaluation report

## IV. Key issues

The evaluation of the Pilots could be shaped around five key questions:

- What has been achieved?
- What was different from UNHCR-managed distribution?
- What went well?
- What could be enhanced and how?
- What have we learned?



The following **3 general key issues** need to be addressed at field and also partly at HQ level:

1. Costs and logistics considerations
2. Management and coordination aspects
3. Beneficiaries' perspective and protection

### **1. Costs and Logistics Considerations**

The key assumption that has guided the pilot projects relates to the perceived cost effectiveness of having only one agency involved in the entire food pipeline management. The evaluation will assess whether or not this new arrangement has indeed resulted in a more efficient use of resources.

- a) To what extent has the unit cost for the delivery of food increased/decreased (ITSH, LTSH, storage, transport costs)?
- b) To what extent the pipeline management benefited from being handled by one agency?
- c) Is there a duplication of efforts in the NFIs distribution? To what extent has the pilot been coordinated with other relief delivery systems?
- d) To what extent have the management and number of EDPs/FDPs/milling (including food losses) changed?

### **2. Management and Co-ordination Aspects**

Non governmental organizations (NGOs) are usually responsible for handling the physical distribution of food to refugees, on behalf of UNHCR. Where WFP has assumed responsibility, it has in many cases retained the same partner organization for the distribution. The evaluation team will need to determine how effective the handover in responsibility has been accomplished and how the responsible NGO perceives the impact of those changes.

- e) To what extent guidance was provided for the hand over to the NGOs, other main stakeholders (including Government counterparts) and to both UNHCR and WFP staff members. How has it affected the overall coordination process? How did the agencies overcome problems during the handover period?
- f) Were specific selection criteria established to choose the implementing partner?
- g) Has a Tripartite agreement and a Joint Plan of Action been signed between WFP, UNHCR and the implementing partner(s)?
- h) To what extent the exclusion of food from UNHCR's assistance portfolio has altered perception of UNHCR as the agency responsible for all aspects of refugee protection and assistance.
- i) Other important management concerns relate to the compatibility of systems and procedures (e.g. registration, issuance of ration cards).
- j) To what extent the monitoring (food basket, post distribution monitoring) and reporting system has changed?
- k) Has there been any change in the cost structure presented by NGOs?

### **3. Beneficiaries' Perspective and Protection**

The refugee beneficiaries are the most critical constituency in this process and the evaluation needs to be informed exhaustively by the views of refugees, both as individuals and in their capacity as members of the community or semi-formal structures (e.g. refugee leaders, women leaders, members of the distribution committee). The evaluation team will also need to understand what changes, if any, have taken place in the protection environment of the refugees.

- l) Were the beneficiaries aware/informed of the change of distribution management? What are the beneficiaries' perceptions of this change?
- m) Is the division of responsibility between UNHCR and WFP clear in the perception of certain refugees (camp leaders)?
- n) Have there been any changes in the type or frequency of protection cases being reported in relation to food distribution (SGBV, abuse of power, protection of vulnerables)?
- o) Are refugee rights protected throughout the process and have adequate procedures been instituted or maintained?



## V. Timetable

In 2004 the evaluation will be carried out according to the following timeframe:

Circulate TOR for comments	05 Mar 2004
Finalize TOR	20 Mar 2004
Identification of possible firm/consultants	20 Mar 2004
Circulation of TOR among identified firm/consultants for comments and expression of interest	Apr 2004
Selection of firm/consultants	May 2004
Contract preparation	May 2004
<b>Phase I</b> of Evaluation (15 days)	Jun 2004
<b>Phase II</b> of Evaluation – PAK-UGA-RWA ZAM-KEN	Jun-Aug 2004 Feb-Mar 2005
<b>Phase III</b> of Evaluation (summary report)	May 2005

The evaluation in Zambia and Kenya will be carried out in February and March 2005 respectively.

## VI. Funding and Co-ordination

The costs for this evaluation will be shared equally between the two agencies (50/50). A detailed budget will be compiled in March. To simplify the procedures, it was suggested that one agency (WFP) assumes responsibility for hiring Consultants.

All documents will, however, indicate that the project is a joint venture between two agencies to avoid any ambiguity in reporting lines.

It was understood that the two organizations' evaluation units have different modes of operation. That means that compromises may have to be struck on some issues: UNHCR publishing the documents of their website versus WFP which must report to its Executive Board. The overall management of the evaluation will be responsibility of the UNHCR and WFP evaluation services which will also ensure a consultative process within the two organizations.

## VII. Reports

The following reports will be produced by the evaluation team:

- a) Methodology paper
- b) Pakistan case study - max 10 pages
- c) Uganda case study - max 10 pages
- d) Rwanda case study - max 10 pages
- e) Kenya case study - max 10 pages
- f) Zambia case study - max 10 pages
- g) Summary report (max 5,000 words) for the Executive Board

The evaluation reports should contain the following sections:

- I. Executive Summary
- II. Evaluation's objective and methodology
- III. Background of the pilot
- IV. Findings and recommendations for each of the three key issues:
  - i. Costs and logistics considerations
  - ii. Management and coordination aspects
  - iii. Beneficiaries' perspective and protection.



## Annex 7

# Methodology for the WFP-UNHCR Joint Evaluation of the Pilot Food Distribution Projects





## I. Introduction

An evaluation is a management tool used in decision making to determine efficiency and effectiveness, identify lessons learned, and improve future projects. The WFP-UNHCR Joint Evaluation of the Pilot Food Distribution Projects will look at the performance, impact and sustainability of the joint programme and its objectives. This will involve the review of the achievements, identification of problems and their solutions and documentation of lessons learned. The evaluation will be used to improve current implementation, provide input for planning for the future delivery of assistance. The evaluation will use a participatory approach involving key actors and interested parties in each country.

The methodology of the evaluation will be to collect information from as many sources as possible and at several levels. This will include agency headquarters, the country and/or field offices, and the stakeholders directly involved in the implementation of Pilot Food Distribution Projects, including the beneficiaries.

The evaluation will involve participants from the two key agencies WFP and UNHCR, Government, beneficiaries or stake holders, NGOs, donors and other agencies involved in the programme. Women and single head of households will be important sources of information in the evaluation process. The list participants may vary with each country depending on the implementing partners and the context in which the Food Distribution takes place.

## II. Evaluation Criteria

The general criteria for the evaluation will be to review the issues outlined below. These will serve as indicators in the overall evaluation of the Pilot Food Distribution Projects.

- Relevance of the project in each country's context
- Interim results: achievements, problems, constraints, proposed solutions
- Effectiveness: the food distribution projects as part of the humanitarian response to basic needs
- Operational Efficiency: project management, delivery of inputs (quality, quantity, timeliness,) existing monitoring system
- Financial Criteria (cost effectiveness and operating efficiency)
- Capacity Building of national counterparts
- Views of direct beneficiaries ("Consumer satisfaction") through a participatory, consultative process.

Based on the points above, the evaluation will focus on institutional issues, management and organization and socio-cultural factors as they related to or are impacted by the Pilot Food distribution Projects. This will include:

### Institutional Issues

- Relevance of the policy and mandate,
- Relevance of institutions/partners involved, and review of possible alternatives
- Relevance of Services provided
- Cost (to donor, community, region), source of funds, affordability and sustainability
- Intended vs. Actual beneficiaries (gender sensitive issues)
- Capacity to respond to changes, streamline activities
- Linkages to other organizations, stakeholders, relief to development, regional impact)
- Approach (participatory, consensus, bureaucratic, decentralized, top down, etc.)

### Management and Organization

- Administration
- Human resources/Capacity building Training
- Logistics
- Operation and Maintenance
- Information and feedback
- Local Participation



#### Socio-cultural Factors

- Acceptability/participation by beneficiaries
- Participatory process involving local organizations
- Role of Women

### **III. Location of the Evaluation**

An important part of the methodology for the Joint Evaluation of the Pilot Food Distribution Projects will be to gather information from all levels. This will include the policy makers at each agency's headquarters, those implementing the project in each of the 5 countries, and the beneficiaries.

#### Headquarters (Rome, Geneva)

The initial meetings at the WFP and UNHCR the headquarters level will include a review of all relevant documentation, discussions on the policy issues with each agency, a review of the TOR for any possible last minute revision, and review of country specific information for the evaluation.

These meetings at Agency headquarters will take place with policy makers, logistics and programme staff, desk officers for each country under study and any other relevant staff. The Evaluation Team may also meet with representatives from any implementing partners who have offices in Rome/Geneva, other UN agencies, donors and anyone one else recommended by WFP and/or UNHCR.

#### Country Specific

At the country level information will be collected through field visits and interviews with staff and beneficiaries. A suggested list of contacts will be prepared by both the WFP and UNHCR country offices, and at a minimum will include the following:

- WFP and UNHCR Field Offices
- Recipient Government
- Project management and implementing partners
- Beneficiaries with a particular emphasis on women and female headed households, Vulnerable
- Donors, other UN agencies

### **IV. Sources of Information**

Information will be collected through a variety of sources. Existing documents as well as interviews will provide the basis for the majority of the information for the evaluation of the Pilot Food Distribution Projects. Sources may vary with each level but will include:

#### Headquarters

- Policy Guidelines
- MOU between WFP and UNHCR
- Specific country Reports
- Previous monitoring/evaluation reports

#### Country Specific

- National Policies and documents relevant to the Evaluation
- UN Country Programme
- WFP/UNHCR Country Programme
- Project documents including
- Agreements with Partners
- Project Budgets
- Monitoring Evaluation Reports
- Interviews with stakeholders (gender sensitive discussions with end users)





## **V. The Evaluation Report**

Once the information has been collected and analyzed a report for each country will be prepared. The report will follow the guidelines outlined in the TOR for the Evaluation Mission. A standard format will be used for all countries. As the evaluation progresses, minor revision/refinements may be made as required to fine tune the evaluation. Any refinements will be discussed and approved by WFP and UNHCR before the changes are made.

As part of the participatory process of the evaluation methodology, the collected information and initial findings of the evaluation team will be presented to stakeholders in each country for their information and input. This review with the stakeholders will include a summary of the situation in each country and include the following:

- Recommendations for future action
- Proposed solutions to immediate problems
- Lessons learned and conditions for successful replication

The final report will be submitted to the stakeholders in each country. Each party will be encouraged to submit written comments on the final report.

### Report Format

As outlined in the TOR the individual country report and the overall summary report will follow a standard format. A sample format is outlined below:

1. Executive summary: synopsis of the report
2. Country specific Review of Project
3. Analysis of Project Implementation
4. Results
5. Findings
6. Recommendations
7. Lessons Learned

## **VI. Action Plan**

Based on the above and as a preliminary work plan the following actions will need to be taken by the Evaluation Team with the support of the WFP and UNHCR offices both at headquarters and in the field.

### Headquarters

- Review/revise TOR
- Prepare Work plan
- Obtain clearance for each country including visas and travel permits for the evaluation team
- Briefing of Evaluation Team in Headquarters (Rome, Geneva)
- Prepare initial draft questionnaire to be used in each country

### For Each Country

- Initiate meeting schedule with stakeholders
- Establish parameters for data/information collection
- Logistics for field visits (access to computers, office space, vehicle and driver, communication equipment, designation of focal point or support staff, etc.)
- Field Visits and interviews with stakeholders
- Analysis of Findings
- Prepare Draft Report
- Set up review meeting with stakeholders to discuss initial findings and recommendations
- Wrap up meeting in each country
- Submissions of Final Report