



WFP EVALUATION

Corporate Emergency Evaluation of WFP's Response in Myanmar 2017-2022

November 2023

EB.2 2023




WFP
World Food Programme

SAVING
LIVES
CHANGING
LIVES

WFP CSP 2018-2023


Beneficiaries
5.8 million targeted 2018-2023
2.76 million reached in 2021

Four strategic outcomes




67%^a
Emergency response

S01




21%
Country capacity strengthening,
School feeding &
Asset creation

S02



11%
Country capacity strengthening,
prevention and
treatment of
malnutrition

S03



2%
Humanitarian services

S04

^a) Percent of needs based plan as per Budget Revision 9

Contribution to strategic outcomes



SO1 – Emergency response: Sharp increase in actual beneficiary numbers in 2021, largely due to inclusion of peri-urban Yangon (1.7 million). Half the beneficiaries increased food expenditure: over 90% bought greater variety of food.



SO2 – Social protection, school feeding & resilience: Progress on social protection programme interrupted by military takeover. School meals helped bring children back to school. Asset creation improved food security for participants.



SO3 – Nutrition: Outcome target achievement high for Moderate Acute Malnutrition treatment, but beneficiary target achievement low across the years. CBTs to people living with HIV and TB patients have largely met beneficiary & outcome targets









SO4 – Humanitarian services: Reliable common services considered 'vital' by humanitarian community during COVID



Consistent efforts to implement **gender** sensitive programming. **Disability & chronic medical conditions** factored into assessments and activities where possible.

Factors affecting performance

-  Strong assessment capacity, but constrained by access challenges in conflict-affected areas
-  Full integration of WFP into the humanitarian assistance frameworks and coordination mechanisms. Close relationship with cooperating partners at Sub-Office level. Risks faced by cooperating partners require more attention.
-  Delivery modalities (in-kind, cash-in-envelopes, E-cash) flexibly adjusted over CSP period, to maximize coverage and efficiency while adjusting to context
-  Detailed and nuanced protection risk analyses and mitigation planning. Progressive expansion of Community Engagement Mechanism.
-  Adequate financial resources for emergency response; strong investment in donor relationships. School feeding and resilience activities underfunded.
-  Significant staff increase in main offices. Recruitment of specialized staff challenging. High pressure conditions: good attention for wellbeing

Conclusions (1/2)



C1: Adaptation and scaling up

- WFP achieved major scale-up in response to several overlapping crises, being flexible and responsive
- WFP's experience and ability recognized by donors; helped resource mobilization
- Decentralised decision-making + regular RBB guidance were critical



C2: Relations to partners and management of risks

- Amid simultaneous crises, WFP played growing role prudently and effectively
- Close coordination and complementarity with key UN partners
- Difficult ethical and practical choices around principles with limited formal guidance or support from HQ
- Careful protection risk management; cooperating partners lack support to manage risks transferred to them by WFP in some areas

Conclusions (2/2)



C3: Targeting, communication and accountability with affected populations

- High quality of needs assessments and engagement with affected populations in accessible areas
- Qualitative information gained at Sub-Office levels not easily shared across the whole CO structure
- Humanitarian needs in inaccessible areas likely underestimated → coverage gaps
- Blind spots in community feedback



C4: Integration of emergency response, resilience & sustainability

- Multiple shocks have diverted from original CSP goal of state-led development. WFP continued to support livelihoods, nutrition and school feeding, mostly in emergency response mode
- Resilience building insufficiently geared towards the way communities & systems absorb, adapt to, and transform themselves as a result of shocks and stressors

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1** **Adaptation and scaling up:** Maintain and enhance WFP capacity to work at scale, with special attention to financial resources, flexibility and staff wellbeing
- 2** **Inclusive, principled, and risk-sensitive approach:** Maintain consistency in decision-making processes around humanitarian principles and risk management, with adequate guidance and support from RBB and HQ, give fuller consideration to the role of local partners and widen efforts to communicate on WFP's humanitarian positioning
- 3** **Information and feedback systems:** Enhance collection, presentation and analysis of qualitative and community-based information for decision making
- 4** **Integrating resilience in the emergency response:** Test and gradually integrate a wider resilience perspective throughout the programme to address structural vulnerabilities focusing on communities and systems