



World Food Programme
Programme Alimentaire Mondial
Programa Mundial de Alimentos
برنامج الأغذية العالمي

Executive Board

First regular session

Rome, 28 February–2 March 2022

Distribution: General

Agenda item 6

Date: 11 February 2022

WFP/EB.1/2022/6-D/Rev.1

Original: English

Evaluation reports

For consideration

Executive Board documents are available on WFP's website (<https://executiveboard.wfp.org>).

Summary report on the evaluation of the country strategic plan for Honduras (2018–2021)

Executive summary

An evaluation of the country strategic plan for Honduras for 2018–2021 was conducted between July 2020 and October 2021 and covered WFP's strategy, interventions and systems for the period between 2017 and April 2021. Taking a utilization-focused, consultative approach, the evaluation served the dual purpose of accountability and learning and will inform the preparation of the next country strategic plan for Honduras. The evaluation assessed WFP's strategic positioning, its contribution to outcomes, the efficiency with which the plan has been implemented and the factors explaining WFP's performance.

Honduras is a lower-middle-income country. Although food insecurity is decreasing, high poverty rates, especially in rural and indigenous areas, limit access to food. Honduras is severely affected by climate change and has regularly experienced natural disasters over the past two decades.

The country strategic plan is aimed at achieving a strategic shift in WFP's support by strengthening local and central government capacity to implement a national school meals programme and a comprehensive social protection and resilience strategy that prioritizes partnerships, capacity strengthening and improved food and nutrition security for vulnerable population groups.

The evaluation found the country strategic plan to be relevant to and aligned with national policies and local development plans and consistent with the United Nations development assistance framework for Honduras. WFP plays a leadership role in the United Nations humanitarian network and has demonstrated strengths in technical and logistical capacity, food and security information generation and engagement with local institutions. However, WFP has focused on its operational role without fully leveraging its strategic positioning in public policy advocacy.

In line with the Evaluation Policy (2016–2021) (WFP/EB.2/2015/4-A/Rev.1), to respect the integrity and independence of evaluation findings the editing of this report has been limited and as a result some of the language in it may not be fully consistent with the World Food Programme's standard terminology or editorial practices. Please direct any requests for clarification to the Director of Evaluation.

Focal points:

Ms A. Cook
Director of Evaluation
Tel.: 066513–2030

Ms V. Knips
Evaluation Officer
Tel.: 066513–3910

WFP successfully scaled up implementation of the nationwide school feeding programme, although food was not provided throughout the school year due to insufficient funding. WFP responded to natural disasters and the COVID-19 pandemic; however, the pandemic had a negative impact on output delivery and outcome achievement under other activities.

Targeting was found to have been relevant and the community-based targeting approaches applied have proved effective, but the needs of vulnerable young people were overlooked. Although the country strategic plan places clear emphasis on gender equality and the empowerment of women, WFP lacks a strategic approach and the resources dedicated to gender transformation are insufficient; consequently, results have been mixed.

Following a significant budget increase during the first year of implementation, overall funding has fallen short of needs, with particular impact on school feeding and resilience activities. The mobilization of complementary funds for the school feeding programme has remained limited.

The evaluation concludes that WFP is well aligned with national policies and United Nations plans. The country strategic plan has been implemented with a high degree of flexibility and in alignment with country needs. Despite positive results, the levels of assistance provided and number of people assisted has often fallen short of plans due to variable and insufficient funding. This has impeded the sustained achievement of planned outcomes and WFP's capacity to implement development activities and support lasting solutions. Weaknesses in monitoring have limited WFP's ability to track and analyse progress towards expected results and make evidence-based strategic decisions during implementation.

The evaluation puts forward four recommendations: strengthening WFP's advocacy in respect of public policy so that it contributes more effectively to creating an environment conducive to achieving Sustainable Development Goal 2; better integration across activities with a focus on taking a gender-transformative approach; prioritization of monitoring and evaluation in support of strategic management, accountability and advocacy; and the design and implementation of a resource mobilization strategy with a focus on the humanitarian-development-peace nexus and gender transformation.

Draft decision*

The Board takes note of the summary report on the evaluation of the country strategic plan for Honduras (2018–2021) (WFP/EB.1/2022/6-D/Rev.1) and management response (WFP/EB.1/2022/6-D/Add.1/Rev.1) and encourages further action on the recommendations set out in the report, taking into account the considerations raised by the Board during its discussion.

* This is a draft decision. For the final decision adopted by the Board, please refer to the decisions and recommendations document issued at the end of the session.

Introduction

Evaluation features

1. An evaluation of the country strategic plan (CSP) for Honduras was conducted between July 2020 and October 2021 with the aim of providing evidence and lessons that could inform the development of the next CSP for Honduras.
2. The evaluation assesses CSP implementation between January 2018 and April 2021 as well as operations conducted in 2017 prior to adoption of the CSP in order to gauge the strategic shift in focus envisaged under the CSP. The evaluation examines WFP's strategic positioning; effectiveness in contributing to strategic outcomes; the efficiency with which the CSP was implemented; and factors explaining performance. It also looks at the extent to which WFP was able to respond to emergencies, including the COVID-19 pandemic.
3. An independent external evaluation team conducted the evaluation using a theory-based, mixed-methods approach, drawing on monitoring data, document review, semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with over 133 stakeholders. Primary and secondary data were triangulated to ensure the validity of findings. Gender and social inclusion were fully integrated into the evaluation approach. Ethical standards were upheld to ensure the dignity and confidentiality of those involved in the evaluation. The findings, conclusions and recommendations were discussed with stakeholders during two online workshops in June 2021.
4. The evaluation was carried out remotely because of restrictions related to COVID-19; however, the team did not encounter any major constraints that compromised the credibility of the evaluation. The main challenge encountered related to assessing outcome achievement based on quantitative data because only a limited number of outcome indicators were consistently monitored and reported over time; as a consequence, outcome achievement was largely assessed based on qualitative data.

Context

5. Honduras is a lower-middle-income country and was ranked 132 of 189 countries in the 2019 Human Development Index. Economic growth over the last decade averaged 3 percent and per capita gross domestic product (GDP) increased from USD 2,343 in 2016 to USD 2,500 in 2018.¹ Although inequality fell slightly between 2005 (Gini index of 59.5) and 2019 (Gini index of 52), Honduras continues to have one of the highest levels of inequality in the region and in the world.

¹ World Bank. 2021. [Country overview: Honduras](#).

TABLE 1: SOCIOECONOMIC INDICATORS			
	Indicator	Value	Year
	Total population (1)	9 450 711	2021 estimated
	GDP per capita (current USD) (2)	2 533	2019
	Agriculture, forestry and fishing, value added (share of GDP) (4)	11.79	2018
	Percentage of population in urban areas (1)	55	2021 estimated
	Human Development Index (2)	0.634	2019
	Gini coefficient (2)	0.52	2019
	Population vulnerable to or approaching multidimensional poverty (percentage) (3)	22.3	2019
	Population in severe multidimensional poverty (percentage) (3)	6.5	2019
	Prevalence of HIV, total (share of population age 15–49) (4)	0.30	2018
	Gender Inequality Index (value) (3)	0.479	2019
	Population with at least secondary-level education (share of population age 25+) (3)	Female: 34.2 Male: 32.6	2019
	Labour-force participation rate (share of total population age 15+) (modelled estimate from the International Labour Organization) (4)	65.2	2019

Sources: (1) National Institute of Statistics of Honduras (2015); (2) National Institute of Statistics of Honduras (2019); (3) United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Report 2020; (4) World Bank.

6. Despite economic growth, poverty remains widespread, with 61.9 percent of Honduran households living in poverty in 2018. Poverty rates are higher in rural than in urban areas,² and rural women, young people and indigenous groups are among the poorest and most vulnerable in the country.
7. Although food insecurity has decreased over the past two decades, access to food remains inadequate. This is closely linked to poverty, especially in rural and indigenous areas such as the Dry Corridor, where extreme poverty is highest. The Honduran population faces a double burden of malnutrition as persistently high levels of stunting and micronutrient deficiencies coexist with rising levels of overweight and obesity in children, adolescents and adults.


² National Institute of Statistics. 2018. *Encuesta permanente de hogares de propósitos múltiples: Resumen ejecutivo* (Honduras permanent multi-purpose household survey: executive summary) (in Spanish).

8. Honduras is one of the countries of the world most vulnerable to the effects of climate change and among the countries most affected by extreme climate events. Over the past two decades, it has experienced regular natural disasters such as droughts, floods, tropical storms, forest fires and widespread harvest losses caused by pests.
9. The COVID-19 pandemic and the measures introduced by the Government to contain it have significantly exacerbated poverty. GDP contracted by 8 percent in 2020 and unemployment increased, particularly in the informal sector and among young people.


Country strategic plan

10. Building on earlier operations (figure 1), the Honduras CSP for 2018–2021 focuses on six strategic outcomes (figure 2) and is aimed at effecting a strategic shift in WFP's support for Honduras, notably through the strengthening of local and central government capacity to implement a national school meals programme. School feeding is the largest component of the CSP both in terms of beneficiaries and budget and is mainly funded by the Government of Honduras. The CSP also aims to support the strengthening of national social protection systems, particularly through partnerships and capacity strengthening, and improved food and nutrition security for vulnerable population groups.

Figure 1: Country context and WFP operations in Honduras (2016–2021)




Abbreviations: CP = country programme; PRRO = protracted relief and recovery operation; El Niño PRO-ACT (2016–2018) = Pro-resilience action project El Niño response in the Dry Corridor of Central America (2016–2018); PyENSAN = national food and nutrition security policy and strategy; UNDAF = United Nations development assistance framework.

Figure 2: Line of sight – Honduras country strategic plan (2018–2021)

Abbreviations: SDG = Sustainable Development Goal; SMP = school meals programmes; CSI = institutional capacity strengthening activities; URT = unconditional resource transfers to support access to food; NPA = malnutrition prevention activities; ACL = asset creation and livelihood support activities; CPA = service provision.

11. The initial needs-based budget in 2018 was USD 115.7 million but was increased several times, rising to USD 191.2 million in 2020 and USD 265.2 million in 2021. The CSP was revised (and the budget accordingly increased) to ensure nationwide coverage of school feeding in 2018; to respond to the impact of drought-induced harvest losses in 2019; to provide for logistics support for the Government in response to the COVID-19 pandemic; and to deliver emergency response that addressed needs of the population affected by hurricanes Eta and Iota in 2020. In 2018, allocated contributions covered 54.5 percent of the annual needs-based plan; this share remained stable at 53.2 percent in 2019 and increased to 70 percent in 2020 (figure 3).

Figure 3: Needs-based plan, allocated resources and expenditures by strategic outcome (2018–2021)




* The needs-based plan budget percentages by strategic outcome include total transfer and implementation costs, direct support costs and indirect support costs.

** Percentages of allocated resources by strategic outcome do not add up to 100 percent because resources were also allocated to non-strategic outcome purposes as well as to direct support costs and indirect support costs.

Sources: Honduras country strategic plan, revision 4; System for Programme Approval PLUS; Integrated Roadmap Analytics Annual Country Report 1 – Cumulative Financial Overview as at 30 March 2021 (accessed 17/11/2021), needs-based plan figures are for the whole CSP cycle; expenditures and allocated resources are as of end of March 2021.

12. Funding levels varied widely between strategic outcomes. As of April 2021, funding shortfalls were most significant for strategic outcome 5 on capacity strengthening, followed by strategic outcome 1 on school feeding (see figure 4). Strategic outcomes 2 and 3 on nutrition and resilience were better funded, with the funding of resilience improving over time, and strategic outcomes 4 and 6 on emergency response and logistics support were fully funded.

Figure 4: Allocated resources by strategic outcome (2018–2021)

13. Between January 2018 and April 2021, WFP received 52.8 percent of the funding called for in the needs-based plan. The main funding sources were the Government of Honduras (22.1 percent), the United States of America (13.7 percent), unearmarked multilateral funding (11.6 percent), the European Commission (6.2 percent), Japan (5.4 percent) and private donors (5.3 percent).

Evaluation findings

To what extent are WFP's strategic position, role and specific contribution based on country priorities, people's needs and WFP's strengths?

Relevance to national policies, plans and strategies

14. The portfolio of CSP activities is relevant to and aligned with national policies, plans and programmes and the SDGs of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.
15. The ability of WFP to adapt the CSP to changing circumstances has been particularly important in view of the challenges that Honduras faced over the implementation period: drought in 2019; hurricanes Eta and Iota; and the COVID-19 health emergency in 2020.
16. The alignment of WFP interventions with local development objectives and municipal development plans has been achieved through participatory planning processes and is highly appreciated by local actors.

Coherence and strategic positioning

17. The CSP is aligned and consistent with the United Nations development assistance framework for Honduras for 2017–2021. WFP is a leader and facilitator of the United Nations humanitarian network. This was particularly visible in 2020 in the face of natural disasters and the health emergency, when the United Nations demonstrated its capacity for joint response. In the nutrition sector, WFP led the United Nations support for Honduras in joining the Scaling Up Nutrition initiative and has been working with the Government on setting up a national nutrition monitoring network for children under 5.
18. However, formal agreements and joint programming to ensure the coherence of the United Nations response are not in place and collaboration has been opportunistic rather than based on a long-term strategy.
19. WFP is recognized for its technical and logistics capacity, its contributions to food and nutrition security information and its strong engagement with local institutions. So far WFP has focused on its operational role without fully leveraging its strategic positioning to advocate public policies in the framework of the 2030 Agenda.

Addressing the needs of the most vulnerable


20. The CSP was designed to address the needs of the most vulnerable population groups, including pregnant and lactating women and girls and children between 6 and 23 months of age; vulnerable preschool- and primary-school-age children; food-insecure small local producers (women and men) confronted with the effects of climate change, including indigenous and Afro-Honduran populations; and households affected by natural disasters and the COVID-19 health emergency. The targeting of WFP interventions was informed by national and subnational food and nutrition security analyses, including emergency needs assessments. This led to an expansion of the COVID-19 response into urban areas, which were identified as particularly affected.
21. Although overall targeting was relevant, the CSP did not respond to the needs of the sizeable group of vulnerable young people, in particular young women, who neither work nor study. This group is particularly vulnerable to adolescent pregnancy and recruitment by criminal groups.

What are the extent and quality of WFP's specific contributions to country strategic plan outcomes in Honduras?

Delivery of outputs and contribution to outcomes

22. WFP has made progress towards achieving its expected strategic outcomes, although some activities have advanced more than others (figure 5). Output target achievement was highest in 2019 and lowest in 2020 when the COVID-19 pandemic affected output delivery across all activities. Overall, an inconsistent monitoring framework makes it difficult to identify annual targets and assess progress towards their achievement.

Figure 5: Number of output indicators that reached or surpassed annual targets, by strategic outcome (2018–2020)



23. Under **strategic outcome 1 – school meals** WFP aimed to provide a daily nutritious meal to preschool and primary school children, linked to smallholder farmer production, as an incentive for school enrolment and retention while strengthening the capacity of national and local government institutions. Direct implementation by WFP was originally planned for 398,000 school children. However, in 2018, on request of the Government, this target was

increased to cover all 1.3 million preschool and primary school children, which required a massive scale-up in WFP direct implementation.

24. Despite the significantly bigger target, WFP managed to reach the planned number of children with assistance in 2018 and 2019. However, the number of school days on which food was distributed fell far behind plans due to insufficient government funding, which revealed limits to the integration of the national school feeding programme into the national social protection framework and WFP's ability to secure funding.³ While the school feeding programme had a positive impact on attendance when assistance was received, the period over which assistance was provided was too short to achieve sustained results in enrolment and retention.
25. In 2020, schools were closed because of the COVID-19 pandemic. In response, WFP switched assistance from school meals to take-home rations for families, ensuring that 1.2 million children received food for 55 days.
26. The local procurement of fresh products from smallholder farmers for the school feeding programme proved to be an effective mechanism for improving access to markets, incomes and food security, especially for women farmers. At the same time, the fresh rations were found to have positive effects on children's nutrition status; however, local procurement remained limited in scope and was not implemented at all in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.
27. **Under strategic outcome 2 – nutrition** WFP worked to reduce stunting and micronutrient deficiencies through the distribution of nutritional supplements to nursing mothers, pregnant women and children between 6 and 23 months of age, as well as through training on good dietary practices and anthropometric measurement. Output achievement was very high in 2018 and 2019, with a sharp drop in 2020 in the context of the pandemic. Outcome indicators showed an improvement in dietary diversity but did not cover health outcomes. WFP sought to address this shortcoming through national capacity strengthening in nutrition monitoring.
28. **Under strategic outcome 3 – resilience** WFP contributed to strengthening the capacity of smallholder farmers in agricultural production techniques and the creation and rehabilitation of assets based on participatory planning processes aimed at improving social cohesion. While food consumption was found to have improved for participating households, there was limited evidence as to the extent to which community livelihood assets had improved and it was therefore unclear whether community-level resilience had increased as a result of the activities. Due to funding constraints, the number of communities assisted fell from 213 in 2018 to 50 in 2020, limiting the possibility of achieving long-term results in the communities that dropped out of the activity.
29. **Under strategic outcome 4 – emergency response** WFP successfully complemented the emergency response of the Government of Honduras to the natural disasters that occurred in 2018, 2019 and 2020 and the COVID-19 health emergency in 2020 by providing food and cash-based transfers to affected populations, which increased the frequency of food consumption and reduced reliance on negative coping strategies. The response to the COVID-19 pandemic exemplified WFP's logistics capacity and its valuable coordination role. WFP expanded coverage to urban areas with a focus on vulnerable groups facing barriers to social protection programmes.

³ This was also a common weakness identified through the "Strategic evaluation of the contribution of school feeding activities to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals" (WFP/EB.A/2021/7-B).

30. The transfer modalities and logistics arrangements used for various activities were adjusted to allow the safe provision of assistance. WFP supported the Government through supply chain management, targeting, cash-based transfers, food procurement and distribution.
31. Under **strategic outcome 5 – government capacity strengthening to achieve SDG 2** WFP made significant contributions related to evidence generation and the strengthening of committees, local organizations and the Permanent Contingency Commission. Information provided to the Government proved critical to decision making on the response to the natural disasters that hit the country. Nevertheless, the initial plan to focus on shock-responsive social safety nets, public-private partnerships and the development of a platform for promoting the 2030 Agenda was not pursued due to limited funding.
32. **Strategic outcome 6 – logistics support** was added to the CSP in 2020 to provide support in response to hurricanes Eta and Iota and the COVID-19 emergency in 2020. The logistics support provided by WFP was instrumental in reaching remote populations with assistance.

Cross-cutting themes

33. While the CSP clearly emphasizes gender equality and the empowerment of women, WFP lacks a strategic approach and the resources dedicated to gender transformation are insufficient. While quantitative targets were set for the provision of assistance to women and girls, these were not accompanied by defined goals related to empowerment. Gender equality and the empowerment of women have been pursued under the CSP activities to varying degrees. The most notable successes have been an increased share of women taking household-level decisions on the use of assistance and being represented in the governing bodies of village savings and loan associations.
34. Protection concerns are considered throughout CSP implementation to ensure that beneficiaries and partners are not exposed to risks. WFP actively assessed potential risks and introduced mechanisms to mitigate them. Community-based planning approaches are used to identify the needs of communities and decide on community assets to be built or rehabilitated. A complaint and feedback mechanism is used to consult communities on their preferences related to transfer modalities.

Sustainability

35. The integration of capacity strengthening work across activities, alignment with national policies and strong community engagement had positive effects on the sustainability of processes and results achieved. Notable successes included the passing of a national law on school feeding, which WFP had supported since 2015, and the start of a gradual handover of local smallholder procurement to associations of municipalities. However, volatile funding and a lack of strategies for the handover of CSP activities have been limiting factors. A lack of follow-up on and documentation of results and lessons learned also limits WFP's ability to learn from experience and improve implementation in order to attain sustainable results.

Humanitarian-development-peace nexus

36. The CSP activities encompass issues related to the humanitarian-development-peace nexus, and WFP interventions address some of the underlying causes of migration, including high levels of poverty and violence, through the protection of livelihoods and the environment, participatory planning, food and nutrition assistance and the strengthening of local institutions.
37. WFP efforts to foster dialogue between the governments of Honduras and El Salvador concerning the contested Río Goascorán area contribute to creating conditions for peace and development for affected indigenous communities and give them a voice in the discussions.

38. The manner in which various activities contribute to the nexus is often not made explicit, and evidence that could be used to showcase results and highlight the contribution of WFP is not available. A better evidence base could prove useful in mobilizing funds for strengthening the nexus and preventing migration.

To what extent has WFP used its resources efficiently in contributing to the country strategic plan outputs and strategic outcomes?

Timeliness of delivery, targeting and coverage

39. Overall, assistance has been provided within planned time frames and WFP has demonstrated a strong emergency response capacity based on efficient procurement and logistics processes that have been optimized over time to address delays.
40. The geographic targeting of interventions has been relevant, focusing on areas with high levels of vulnerability and poverty, risk of natural hazards and marginalized groups. Targeting of individual beneficiaries and households has relied on community-based targeting mechanisms that have mostly been effective. Inclusion and exclusion errors have been followed up whenever detected through monitoring.
41. Annual beneficiary numbers have increased throughout the CSP implementation period in line with needs and government requests for support.

Efficiency and cost-effectiveness

42. WFP sought to ensure the efficient implementation of activities by subcontracting implementing partners, cooperating with local networks, strengthening partner capacity, training trainers and optimizing supply chains. Efficiency was hampered, however, by internal capacity bottlenecks in producing information on vulnerability and needs, gender and climate change resilience programming.
43. Community participation in targeting and in decisions on transfer modalities and the prioritization of cash-based transfers supports social cohesion, adherence to the humanitarian principles and respect for the dignity of beneficiaries and thus had a positive impact on the effectiveness of interventions. However, no studies to quantify its impact on cost-saving were carried out.

What factors explain WFP's performance and the extent to which it has made the strategic shift expected under the country strategic plan?

Use of data

44. The CSP design and implementation were informed by available data and evaluation evidence, which also influenced strategic choices related to intervention modalities and targeting. However, WFP lacks an outcome monitoring and knowledge management system and was not able to demonstrate results or generate lessons systematically, which is of particular concern for pilot activities.

Resource mobilization

45. The initial CSP budget was more than doubled through the first revision of the CSP, in 2018. Overall, 60 percent of the cumulative needs-based plan was financed by the end of 2020, indicating that funding expectations were over-optimistic. Lack of funding limited the effectiveness of school feeding and resilience activities, while emergency response and logistics support received additional funds and could have been expanded.
46. WFP managed to complement government funding to a limited extent through contributions from private donors but overall the short-term nature of funding hampered the implementation of interventions focused on long-term development.

Partnerships

47. The strong focus of the CSP on partnerships fostered collaboration with the national, regional and local governments, communities and non-governmental organizations and positively influenced performance. In addition to traditional partners, WFP managed to mobilize private sector companies in support of the school feeding programme and collaborated with the academic community to raise awareness of good nutrition practices and the use of meteorological data in agriculture.

Flexibility of the country strategic plan

48. The CSP permitted WFP to adjust operations to changing circumstances, such as shifting to full implementation of the national school feeding programme and responding to emergencies, based on a strong field presence, partnerships and its logistical and operational strengths. It did not manage to break up silos inherited from the previous project structure, and opportunities for integration across strategic outcomes and a coherent approach to cross-cutting themes, in particular gender, were missed.

Internal capacity and alignment

49. The implementation of the CSP benefited from an organizational realignment, which included a reorganization of functions and tasks aligned with strategic outcomes and an influx of young professional team members, mostly women. The change in personnel and the increase in expertise have been very positively perceived by WFP partners and the Government. Nevertheless, field-based staff and staff working on cross-cutting themes are often overloaded. Heavy workloads have resulted in limited attention being paid to outcome monitoring, knowledge management, dialogue among country office staff and coordination across strategic outcomes.

Conclusions

50. Overall, the CSP was well aligned with national policies and United Nations plans. WFP showed a high degree of flexibility in aligning with country needs, demonstrated by the scale-up in the implementation of the national school feeding programme and its agile response to emergency needs, including the COVID-19 pandemic.
51. While WFP activities led to positive results and were highly appreciated by recipients, the level of assistance delivered and number of people assisted often fell short of plans, except for the emergency response, due to variable and insufficient funding. This limited the sustained achievement of CSP outcomes and particularly hampered WFP's capacity to implement development activities and support lasting solutions.
52. WFP worked within expected time frames and used cost-efficient implementation mechanisms. It demonstrated high emergency response capacity based on its network of suppliers, partners and alliances with other United Nations entities and its logistical and operational capacity, which was strengthened through the recruitment of new staff.
53. The integration across activities envisaged under the CSP was only partially achieved, leading to missed opportunities to improve synergies, flexibility and impact across the humanitarian–development–peace nexus.

Relevance and strategic positioning

54. The CSP was built on relevant national food security and nutrition evidence and incorporated lessons from evaluation evidence gathered from previous operations. It adequately targets and responds to the food, nutrition and emergency assistance needs of vulnerable populations. Additional needs triggered by natural disasters and the COVID-19 pandemic led to adjustments in targeting and the scale-up of assistance. While the strategic positioning of WFP has been strengthened under the CSP, there is space for WFP to strengthen its role in development and the promotion of sustainable solutions through better integration across activities and the fostering of an environment conducive to the achievement of SDG 2 through advocacy related to social protection, food security and gender.

Gender

55. Gender equality and the empowerment of women have been integrated into the activities of the CSP. However, the CSP does not reflect a gender-transformative approach grounded in an analysis of different needs and vulnerabilities, and WFP staff lacked a coherent vision regarding gender-transformative implementation. This hindered the achievement of gender-transformative outcomes, which were limited to specific activities.

Sustainability

56. The sustainability of results has been achieved to varying degrees. Capacity strengthening has been integrated across various activities as well as implemented under strategic outcome 5, and WFP managed to strengthen the capacity of actors and institutions at the national, local and community levels, including beneficiaries and local producers. While WFP contributed to the formulation of the regulatory framework and institutionalization of the national school feeding programme, it did not manage to induce sustained financing for the programme by the Government.
57. WFP monitors the implementation of activities as planned but does not analyse whether conditions for long-term sustainability are in place. The CSP lacks a handover strategy that includes knowledge transfer and reflects the capacity of national counterparts to continue financing and implementing activities autonomously.

Use of information

58. Weaknesses in the monitoring system hamper the ability of WFP to analyse implementation, make performance-informed programme adjustments and make strategic decisions. It also limits the scope for internal knowledge generation and dissemination and the demonstration of results achieved to external partners and donors.
59. During the implementation of the CSP, WFP did not systematically monitor the validity of the assumptions underlying the logic of its intervention, which in turn challenged its ability to effectively manage risks, maximize opportunities and demonstrate the results achieved.

Resource mobilization

60. The country portfolio budget for Honduras is WFP's second-highest budget in Latin America, owing to WFP's role in implementing the government-funded national school feeding programme. Despite efforts to broaden the donor base and mobilize private donor funding, funds received for the CSP have been below expected levels and insufficient in flexibility and duration to achieve long-term results.

Recommendations

61. The findings, lessons learned and conclusions of the evaluation highlight the many positive changes brought about by the CSP, while also revealing opportunities to shape the future strategic and operational direction of the next CSP and improve the implementation of the current CSP, which has been extended by one year to December 2022. The four recommendations should be considered systematically in the development of the next CSP and to improve the implementation of the current CSP.

No.	Recommendation	Type	Who	Priority	When
1	To strengthen the enabling environment for achieving Sustainable Development Goal 2, WFP should expand its role in public policy advocacy by developing an advocacy strategy.				
	1.1 Identify relevant public policy gaps, with special emphasis on gender equality and long-term sustainability.	Strategic	Country office (management and programme and monitoring and evaluation units) With support from the regional bureau (capacity strengthening)	High	December 2022
	1.2 Map the main government, civil society, private sector and international community actors and analyse their positioning on issues of interest and the potential for mobilizing resources and/or common positions in public policy advocacy in the framework of the 2030 Agenda.	Operational	Country office (management) With support from the regional bureau	High	December 2022
	1.3 Draw up a knowledge generation and management plan to underpin advocacy work, identifying specific knowledge products for different audiences.	Operational	Country office (programme unit with the support of monitoring and evaluation and vulnerability analysis and mapping units)	High	December 2022
	1.4 Ensure that the human, technical and financial resources necessary to implement the public policy advocacy strategy are in place.	Operational	Country office (management)	High	December 2022
	Rationale for recommendation 1: The country office has concentrated on implementing activities in areas of logistical and operational strength and has neglected high-level advocacy, which has limited its effectiveness in improving public policy.				

No.	Recommendation	Type	Who	Priority	When
2	Strengthen the integration of activities in the next country strategic plan through an underlying logic/theory of change for formulating humanitarian, development and peacebuilding activities (triple nexus) with a gender-transformative approach.				
	2.1 Define the objectives and outcomes of the country strategic plan with regard to the efficacy and the economic and institutional sustainability of public policies for reaching zero hunger (starting with the national school feeding programme), within the United Nations system priority framework of institutional strengthening and governance and following a triple nexus approach.	Strategic	Country office (management and programme unit) With support from the regional bureau (development)	High	December 2022
	2.2 In line with targets and WFP's global and regional gender strategies, define results and actions that promote the inclusion of women and the transformation of the traditional roles of women and their social, political and economic empowerment through community analysis and a redefinition of the roles of women and men in country strategic plan activities and the construction of new forms of masculinity.	Strategic	Country office (management and programme unit) With support from the regional bureau (development)	High	December 2022
	2.3 Enhance the already strong coordination with existing institutional and community actors by linking them to new actors to ensure the integration of peacebuilding (including in urban areas) in humanitarian and development assistance and in public policy advocacy (complementary to recommendation 1).	Operational	Country office (management and programme unit) With support from the regional bureau (gender)	High	December 2022
	Rationale for recommendation 2: (conclusions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6) The programmatic structure of the country strategic plan is a continuation of the previous country programme and lacks integration concerning the strategic goal of achieving zero hunger. WFP's incidence in working towards the triple nexus has been more evident in the areas of humanitarian and development assistance. The analysis of the underlying assumptions and risks in the value chain of the country strategic plan is weak and the country office lacks strategies that would allow WFP to fully reap the benefits when assumptions are met and for risk mitigation, which limits the achievement of objectives.				

No.	Recommendation	Type	Who	Priority	When
3	Prioritize and strengthen country strategic plan monitoring and evaluation as a tool for follow-up, strategic management, accountability and advocacy.				
	3.1 Use the theory of change of the new country strategic plan and its assumptions as the basis for an analysis of risks and opportunities and strategic decision making during the implementation of the country strategic plan.	Operational	Country office (management and programme and monitoring and evaluation units) With support from the regional bureau (monitoring and evaluation)	High	December 2022
	3.2 Revise output indicators and, when necessary, complement the corporate outcome indicators in order to better measure progress towards intended results, especially in school feeding, capacity strengthening in support of Sustainable Development Goal 2, gender and the triple nexus.	Operational	Country office (management and programme and monitoring and evaluation units) With support from the regional bureau (monitoring and evaluation)	High	December 2022
	3.3 Strengthen the monitoring and evaluation team and improve internal information flows within the country office in support of strategic management and evidence-based decision making.	Operational	Country office (management) With support from the regional bureau	High	December 2022
	Rationale for recommendation 3: (conclusions 7 and 8) There are evident weaknesses in the country strategic plan monitoring and evaluation system related to the measurement, reporting and analysis of output and outcome indicators. WFP's corporate indicator compendium offers a variety of options that could enrich the monitoring of country strategic plan outputs and outcomes, especially with regard to assessing impact on communities and capacity strengthening.				

No.	Recommendation	Type	Who	Priority	When
4	Design and implement a resource mobilization strategy with a focus on the triple nexus and gender transformation.				
	4.1 Document WFP's contribution to the triple nexus, gender equality and women's empowerment and climate change adaptation and mitigation, exploring the experiences of other country offices in the region and beyond, as an entry point for engaging with potential donors and demonstrating the comparative advantages of WFP.	Operational	Country office (management and monitoring and evaluation, programme and finance units) With support from the regional bureau (resource mobilization and partnerships)	Medium	December 2022
	4.2 Map potential sources of multi-year funding and design strategies specific to particular actors and funding sources (for example, Plan Biden; peace; multilateral banks; gender; the private sector; multi-year funds in the framework of the Comprehensive Development Plan for El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and south-southeast Mexico; and the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework).	Operational	Country office management With support from the regional bureau (resource mobilization and partnerships)	Medium	December 2022
	4.3 Strengthen the capacity of the country office team to engage with potential traditional and non-traditional donors and involve potential donors in the design of the next country strategic plan.	Operational	Country office (management) With support from the regional bureau	Medium	December 2022
	Rationale for recommendation 4: (conclusion 8) The country strategic plan is highly dependent on government funds and other sources of short-term funding earmarked for emergency response and school feeding. The country office is highly regarded as the implementing agency for the national school feeding programme and as a first responder in emergencies. Nevertheless, it is necessary to enhance WFP's strategic positioning in development and its contribution to peace and gender equality, and there are opportunities to do so.				