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Context

• Population 17.6 million
• High levels of inequality
• 23% of children < 5 suffer from chronic malnutrition
• Hosting large numbers of Venezuelan refugees and migrants
• Vulnerable to natural hazards and impact of climate change
WFP CSP in Ecuador 2017-2022

**Emphasis** on complementing national social protection and humanitarian response, strengthening climate change adaptation capacity and support smallholder farmers around 5 strategic outcomes

**SO1**
Refugees, displaced persons and vulnerable people in Ecuador are enabled to meet their basic food and nutrition requirements all year long

**SO2**
Smallholder farmers, especially women, in targeted areas, durably increase their incomes and improve their productivity by 2021

**SO3**
Food-insecure communities and individuals in areas that are highly vulnerable to climate change, and government institutions have strengthened capacity for adaptation to climate change by 2021

**SO4**
National institutions and programmes in Ecuador, including social protection programmes, are supported to reduce food insecurity and malnutrition by 2021

**SO5**
Humanitarian and development partners in Ecuador have access to reliable services throughout the crisis
Data collection methods

• **Theory based**

• **Mixed methods approach:** literature and data review, semi-structured interviews, focus groups and survey

• Mostly on-site data collection

• Attention to confidentiality, gender and ethical considerations
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?

- Relevant CSP responds to needs and is aligned with national policies and priorities, except for a somewhat narrow focus in terms of nutrition
- Successful adaption to emergencies: migrant crisis and COVID-19 pandemic
- Strong partnership within the UN during emergencies and addressing root causes
Q2 What is the extent and quality of WFP’s specific contribution to CSP strategic outcomes?

SO1 Response to emergencies, including to Covid 19, implied a very significant scale-up of assistance. Beneficiaries access to food improved, yet behavioral change in terms of feeding practices was not notably enhanced.

SO2 Increased smallholder farmers’ capacities and incomes, although obstacles to access public contracting schemes prevail.

SO2 Effective contributions to the consolidation of the national school feeding programme although various challenges remain (budget, decentralized management).

SO3 Climate change adaptation as a means to combat food insecurity was duly positioned in national plans and comprised innovative approaches. Yet, community level assistance was delayed and assets too little diversified.
Q2 What is the extent and quality of WFP’s specific contribution to CSP strategic outcomes?

**SO3** Effective emergency preparedness and response activities were delivered in synergy with national efforts.

**SO4** A broad range of evidence, capacity development and technical assistance activities informed public policies and social dialogue related to food security, and promoted equality and inclusion.

**SO5** Adaptive service provision to humanitarian partners has contributed to enhance efficiencies of the Covid-19 response.
Q2 What is the extent and quality of WFP’s specific contribution to CSP strategic outcomes?

- Substantial progress was achieved for the integration of gender across the CSP, yet risks specific to men were not attended to.

- WFP adhered to humanitarian principles and duly accounted to affected populations, but fell short to mitigate protection risks.

- Nutrition sensitive approaches duly cut across strategic outcomes, but lacked a strategy to achieve behavioral change.
Q2 What is the extent and quality of WFP’s specific contribution to CSP strategic outcomes?

More attention was paid to environmental do-no-harm approaches, but activities have not been fully mainstreamed yet.

Capacity strengthening, evidence building and new partnerships contributed to sustainability, but additional efforts are required to address weaknesses in institutionalization of local procurement schemes; asset building; and shortcomings in knowledge management.

Limited external coherence across humanitarian and development domains implied missed opportunities for the inclusion of migrant populations.
Q3 To what extent did WFP use its resources efficiently in contributing to CSP outputs and strategic outcomes?

Most activities were timely, including for the COVID 19 response, but delays occurred for the implementation of climate change adaptation activities.

Overall adequate targeting, however insufficiently fine-tuned regarding host populations and people most vulnerable to climate risks.

Additional benefits and transaction costs caused a net increase of the cost per beneficiary, but new arrangements with UN entities envisage cost savings.

The move to one sole CBT redemption provider reduced costs for WFP yet beneficiaries ended up paying higher prices.
Q4 What are the factors that explain WFP performance and the extent to which it has made the strategic shift expected by the CSP?

- Evidence-generation contributed to CSP design, but pragmatic considerations drove changes throughout implementation.
- Resources competently mobilized but with limited flexibility.
- Strengthened and innovative partnerships, that however were not fully enacted at the sub-office level.
- High levels of operational flexibility to adapt to contextual changes.
- Human resource profiles did not consistently align to programmatic requirements.
- Siloed management of the five strategic outcomes.
Conclusions

WFP has ably delivered on its dual mandate in alignment with national priorities, though with a limited focus on malnutrition.

Overall effective contributions to the 2030 Agenda, including for gender. There are opportunities to further strengthen protection, nutrition and work across the triple nexus.

WFP pioneered climate change adaptation approaches as a means to combat food insecurity. However, financial, design and implementation challenges prevail.

Leadership, high operational flexibility and optimal timeliness when attending emergencies (incl. Covid-19), despite high levels in earmarking of funding.

The CSP has constituted a pertinent adaptable framework, strengthening WFP’s position, yet its CSP components need enhanced integration.

Weaknesses were noted in terms of monitoring and knowledge management.
Recommendations

1. Strengthen the triple nexus and protection approach of WFP’s response in Ecuador, leveraging on existing protection systems and alliances.

2. Capitalize on WFP’s strategic position and learning to continue to support public policy design and implementation.

3. Review the CSP structure to include a clear definition of coordination mechanisms, in order to enhance synergies between strategic outcomes.

4. Nutrition to be addressed as a crosscutting topic for the new CSP, emphasizing chronic malnutrition, obesity prevention and promotion of breastfeeding.

5. Improve the integration of the performance monitoring system, financial tracking and programme management.

6. Strengthen staff capacities in crosscutting areas, particularly in gender, protection, nutrition, monitoring and climate change.