

Speaking points: CPE Sudan EB2/13 RT & EB

INTRO

- The evaluation followed our standard approach for CPE's addressing: strategic alignment & positioning; factors and quality of strategic decision making; performance and results.
- It covered Sudan's portfolio from 2010 to 2012, and specifically excluded activities in what is now South Sudan.
- The context for WFP's work as you well know has long been, and continues to be, deeply challenging. In addition, the funding environment altered significantly - since 2009 overall international funding began to decline, and funding through the Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP) dropping by c. 50%.
- That said, WFP remains the largest humanitarian actor in Sudan with more than 40% of the CAP request each year.

FINDINGS - The evaluation findings present a **mixed picture...**

On Alignment

The portfolio was broadly **well-aligned** with government poverty reduction and agricultural strategies, and WFP also **contributed** to policy and national capacity in specific areas. However, WFP's one year EMOP cycles can limit its ability to contribute to longer term improvement.

The operational scope **was found broadly relevant to humanitarian needs** and the portfolio was **broadly aligned with core humanitarian principles**, albeit in a manner complicated by the role of the Government of Sudan as host government to the UN agencies, and party to the conflicts within WFP's operating areas.

WFP aligned with corporate policy and was active in **negotiating access to all affected populations; but** while acknowledging recent improvements, there remains significant space for further coordination within the UN Country Team and with other partners on this issue.

Regarding factors affecting strategic decision making:

The **SECURITY situation obviously** affected all aspects of WFP's work from strategy to partnerships and operations, with direct impacts on need & programming response, operations & logistics, and access to beneficiaries.

The demands on the country office have been enormous, and require considerable innovation and flexibility. In this context, the evaluation found **FUNDING** issues to be a significant factor influencing the direction of, and flexibility in, WFP's portfolio.

- While annual operations were relatively well funded...
- The significant **percentage of in-kind** contributions (60-70%), limited options to shift WFP's programming strategy away from general food distribution.

Together, the shifting humanitarian context and funding environment limited the extent and pace of the shift to recovery activities envisioned in the 2009 Country Strategy.

The evaluation confirmed **WFP's well-recognized TECHNICAL EXPERTISE** in logistics and food security assessment...

- **...but found less recognized capacity in other areas**, potentially mitigating engagement in transition policy dialogue.

The evaluation also found **considerable scope to improve MONITORING systems for programme planning, decision-making, and assessment of results esp. at outcome level.**

Q3: Regarding portfolio Performance & Results:

- **Operations were scaled down significantly** over the 3 year period, reflected in downward budget revisions (49%) supported by improved food security assessments in 2011, resulting in about a 40% reduction in actual beneficiaries from 6 – 3.5 million, with similar trend in distributed tonnage.
- There was **consistent delivery & reach of food assistance**, e.g. in Darfur - the majority of WFP's programmatic focus - WFP consistently maintained 80-100% of planned coverage through adjustments in targeting and seasonal support to displaced populations. Better targeting, and less frequent distribution cycles were reported as more efficient by partners.
- While logistics costs were unavoidably high, WFP's extensive logistics capacity served many partners, and there was strong use of pre-positioning. Partnerships with the private sector in transport have reportedly increased efficiency and reduced LTSH costs.
- Considering the high in-kind costs, efficiency gains were also made through the introduction of vouchers, which increased over the period from 1 -13% of total food distribution. However the evaluation noted the high burden of paper-based voucher systems for the scale of their use in Sudan.

In terms of EFFECTIVENESS... the evaluation found **mixed evidence:**

On nutrition programming:

- There **was evidence** that **Integrated-BSFP** showed a significant decrease in GAM prevalence, and that MAM treatment activities generated good recovery rates.
- There was little direct evidence of improvement in child nutritional status from **blanket supplementary feeding, although preventative supplementary feeding** appears to contribute to reductions in seasonal hunger peaks and GAM rate spikes.

On school-feeding:

- Available data indicated **relatively stable enrolment and retention rates** in WFP-assisted schools, but monitoring limitations prevented attribution of these trends to WFP interventions. While a **handover strategy** is in place, limited government funding has prevented successful hand over of the programme.

Food for Work/Recovery - were a minor portion but well-received part of the portfolio. **However**, there was no evidence of strategic guidance for implementation & asset selection, technical support and partnerships.

And there were **Mixed results** in terms of **GENDER**:

- Targeting of women was broadly successful;
- There was some evidence of positive impacts on women e.g. through their role in voucher committees; and gender-sensitive programming such as awareness-raising on mother-child health & nutrition, and training on food hygiene and nutrition (IBSFP).
- Similarly, female participants in the SAFE project reporting increased savings, reduced firewood wastage, and better protection.
- Also the evaluation positively noted the MoU with the General Directorate of Women's Affairs on gender mainstreaming in Darfur.

However, despite recent training staff and partners, the evaluation found limited awareness of corporate gender policies and strategies, and limited use of gender analysis in programme design.

CONCLUSION:

WFP is the largest humanitarian actor in Sudan, covering over 25% of assessed needs in the UN Humanitarian Workplan. The evaluation affirmed the life-saving value of WFP's work in Sudan in an extremely challenging context, and the efforts made to balance the imperative of immediate humanitarian response with recovery and longer term needs. The evaluation makes **4 main recommendations in this regard concerning:**

1. Improvements in partnership and coordination
2. Strategic shifts to longer-term planning
3. Improvements in monitoring, evaluation and assessments
4. [and, relatedly] Further refinement of targeting.