

# **Evaluation of Zambia WFP Country Strategic Plan 2019-2023**

SAVING LIVES CHANGING LIVES

### WFP CSP IN ZAMBIA 2019-2023

#### Five strategic outcomes

(Allocated resources versus needs-based plan as of July 2022 Budget Revision 3)

44.1 %

Crisis-affected people in Zambia, incl. refugees, can meet their basic food and nutrition needs all year round 9.2%

Vulnerable people in Zambia have improved nutritional status in line with national targets by 2024 39.5%

Smallholder
farmers in Zambia,
have increased
access to markets,
enhanced
resilience to
climate shocks and
diversified
livelihoods by 2030

6.9%

Government institutions in Zambia have more efficient, effective and shock responsive social protection systems to contribute to SDG2.

0.2%

Service provision to the government, private sector, development partners and United Nations agencies (added in BR2).

**SO1** 

**SO2** 

**SO3** 

**SO4** 

**SO5** 

## **FINDINGS**

# Q1 TO WHAT EXTENT ARE WFP'S STRATEGIC POSITION, ROLE AND SPECIFIC CONTRIBUTION BASED ON COUNTRY PRIORITIES AND PEOPLE'S NEEDS, AS WELL AS WFP'S STRENGTHS?



Well aligned with national priorities to achieve SDGs 2 and 17



Highly relevant given high levels of undernutrition and food insecurity



Active engagement with government, UN Country team and private sector



Strong ability to adapt to context evidenced by response to drought and Covid 19

# Q2 WHAT IS THE EXTENT AND QUALITY OF WFP'S SPECIFIC CONTRIBUTION TO CSP STRATEGIC OUTCOMES?



**SO1** Crisis response was effective for Covid 19 - less so for drought and refugee ops



Some contribution to government capacity to improve nutrition and some improved nutritional practice at community level



Contribution to resilience and increased access to markets among smallholder farmers, particularly women



Successful transition to government of the Home Grown School Meal programme, and some contribution to social protection



Improved partners capacity through on demand logistics response

### **Q2 CONTRIBUTION TO CROSS CUTTING ISSUES**



WFP adhered to the **humanitarian principles**, including operational independence



Mitigation measures for **Protection against sexual exploitation and abuse** (**PSEA**) and **Gender Based Violence (GBV)** in place for Cash Based Transfers



Some contributions to **women's empowerment** (GAM 3), but no comprehensive addressing of gender transformative practices (GAM 4)



Accountability to affected populations (AAP) mechanisms in place



Interventions not always environmentally sustainable

# Q3 TO WHAT EXTENT DID WFP USE ITS RESOURCES EFFICIENTLY IN CONTRIBUTING TO CSP OUTPUTS AND STRATEGIC OUTCOMES?



Interventions mostly timely except during the pandemic – but delays in drought response



Coverage nearly 100% of targets for crisis response, but ration cuts reduced nutritional outcomes

Some highly food-insecure areas omitted under geographical targeting



Cost-efficiency benefited from shift in-kind - CBT

# Q4 WHAT ARE THE ENABLING FACTORS THAT EXPLAIN WFP PERFORMANCE AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH IT HAS MADE THE STRATEGIC SHIFT EXPECTED BY THE CSP?



#### **Enabling factors:**

- Strong partnerships
- Human Resources

#### **Constraining factors:**

- Funding delays and shortfalls
- Economic crisis public spending constraints
- Covid 19 delays and cancelations

### **CONCLUSIONS**



WFP able to position itself strategically- capacity to scale up. But constrained strategic shift



The CSP relevant and aligned with national strategies and policies, as well UN plans. Based on WFP comparative advantages



Strong partnerships with government institutions, UN partners and private sector = contribution to outcomes



Strong effectiveness of Covid 19 response but less in the drought and refugee operation. Some results in resilience of SHFs and support to social protection

## **CONCLUSIONS (CONT.)**



Targeting at community and household level appropriate, but geographical targeting excludes some highly food-insecure provinces



Medium- and long-term sustainability example = HGSM programme



Commitments on cross cutting issues mostly fulfilled except environmental sustainability

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Reconsider geographical targeting to include areas in crisis as per IPC

Expand the nutrition portfolio by strengthening the coordination structures at local levels and advocate for the use of the FNG analysis to inform the nutrition policy

Strengthen engagement in the social protection space in partnership with UNICEF and the World Bank

Increase attention to crosscutting issues to improve GAM score and reduce environmental impact of interventions

Increase advocacy and diversification of funding for the refugee operation in partnership with UNHCR

Continue to develop resilience for SHF through CCS and stimulation of business-tobusiness networks at local level