
#### **ANNEX II-E: OUTCOME ANALYSIS BY PROGRAMME AREA**

- 1. This annex presents the detailed outcome performance of WFP's work in its various programme areas. It complements summarized data provided in part II by giving specific information on each outcome indicator.
- 2. The following outcome analysis uses the methodology described in annex II-C for which the following definitions apply:
  - a) No. of countries reporting sufficient data: The number of country offices reporting sufficient data. Only country offices that have reported sufficient data are included in the performance analysis. "Sufficient data" is defined as a complete set of measurements that account for at least 50 percent of the country's operation size (measured as transfers, expenditures or beneficiaries depending on the indicator) in terms of the total transfers associated with the given outcome indicator. For example, if the complete set of measurements for "Food consumption score for its interventions proportion of households with acceptable food consumption score" in Cameroon accounts for only 40 percent of the total transfers associated with that indicator in Cameroon, then data from the Cameroon country office is not included in the analysis of the food consumption score and Cameroon is classified as a country that is not reporting sufficient data for that indicator.
  - b) *No. of complete measurements:* The number of measurements for which all three data points (annual follow-up, annual target and baseline) are reported by the country offices reporting sufficient data.
  - c) *Measurement reporting rate:* The number of complete measurements divided by the total number of measurements (the total number of measurements, complete and incomplete, against an indicator).
  - d) *No. of measurements showing improvement or stabilization compared with the baseline:* The number of measurements for which the annual follow-up value has improved or remained stable compared with the baseline.
  - e) No. of measurements achieving or exceeding the target: The number of measurements for which the annual follow-up value has reached or exceeded the annual target value.

Figure 1: Summary of 2022 performance by programme area



#### **Nutrition**

#### **Prevention of malnutrition**

Outcome indicators		No. of complete measurements	Measurement reporting rate	Performance rating <sup>1</sup>			Number of measurements showing improvement or	Number of measurements achieving or
				2022	2021	2020	stabilization compared with the baseline	exceeding the target
Minimum dietary diversity – women	10	10	83%				7	3
Proportion of children 6–23 months of age who receive a minimum acceptable diet	11	11	85%				10	5
Proportion of eligible population that participates in programme (coverage)	28	41	91%				26	16
Proportion of target population that participates in an adequate number of distributions (adherence)	27	52	93%				31	21

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Tables in this annex show the performance ratings (recalculated using the revised methodology for assessing outcome performance) for the years 2020, 2021 and 2022 in the "Performance rating" column. All other columns in the tables report 2022 figures.

-		_	
Iraa	tmont	ot ma	Inutrition
II Ca	LIIICIIL	OI IIIa	

Outcome indicators	No. of countries reporting sufficient	No. of complete measurements	Measurement reporting rate —	Perf	ormance ra	iting <sup>1</sup>	Number of Number of measurements showing measurement	
	data			2022	2021	2020	<ul> <li>improvement or stabilization compared with the baseline</li> </ul>	achieving or exceeding the target
ART default rate	4	6	100%				1	1
ART nutritional recovery rate	4	6	100%				4	4
MAM treatment default rate	32	75	99%				38	37
MAM treatment mortality rate	32	75	100%				51	51
MAM treatment non-response rate	32	75	100%				37	36
MAM treatment recovery rate	32	75	100%				42	39
Proportion of eligible population that participates in programme (coverage)	21	45	100%				38	27
TB nutritional recovery rate	3	4	100%				2	2
TB treatment default rate	4	6	100%				2	2

### **Nutrition-sensitive interventions**

Outcome indicators	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	No. of complete measurements		Perf	formance R	ating	measurements showing mea improvement or ac stabilization compared e	Number of measurements achieving or
				2020	2021	2020		exceeding the target
Food consumption score – nutrition	34	270	91%				177	130
Minimum dietary diversity – women	26	74	94%				40	28
Percentage increase in production of high-quality and nutrition-dense foods	3	3	100%				3	3

### **Nutrition-sensitive interventions**

Outcome indicators		No. of complete Measurement reporting rate	Performance Rating			measurements showing measur		
				2020	2021	2020	improvement or stabilization compared with the baseline	achieving or exceeding the target
Percentage of targeted smallholder farmers reporting increased production of nutritious crops, disaggregated by sex of smallholder farmer	11	11	92%				10	6
Proportion of children 6–23 months of age who receive a minimum acceptable diet	19	55	98%				36	19

# **School-based programmes**

Outcome indicators		No. of complete measurements	Measurement reporting rate	Perf	ormance ra	iting <sup>1</sup>	Number of Number of measurements showing measurement or achieving o	
				2022	2021	2020	stabilization compared with the baseline	exceeding the target
Attendance rate (new)	24	31	97%				19	16
Enrolment rate	31	42	100%				28	23
Graduation rate (new)	2	3	100%				2	0
Percentage of students who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate ability to read and understand grade level text (new)	2	2	100%	•	N/A	N/A	0	0
Retention rate/drop-out rate (new)	29	42	100%				28	22
SABER school feeding national capacity (new)	6	6	100%				6	5

## Smallholders, livelihoods, food systems and climate risk management

Outcome indicators	No. of countries reporting sufficient data	No. of complete measurements	Measurement reporting rate	Perf	formance ra	ating¹	Number of measurements showing	Number of measurements achieving or exceeding the target
	aata			2022	2021	2020	<ul> <li>improvement or stabilization compared with the baseline</li> </ul>	
Consumption-based coping strategy index (average)	30	42	93%				31	25
Default rate (as a percentage) of WFP pro-smallholder farmer procurement contracts	5	5	100%				5	4
Food consumption score	39	60	92%				45	34
Livelihood-based coping strategy index (percentage of households using coping strategies)	25	37	93%		•	•	10	8
Percentage of targeted smallholders selling through WFP-supported farmer aggregation systems	18	19	100%			0	26	15
Percentage of WFP food procured from smallholder farmer aggregation systems	9	10	100%				27	23
Proportion of targeted communities where there is evidence of improved capacity to manage climate shocks and risks	16	19	100%				41	29
Proportion of the population in targeted communities reporting benefits from an enhanced livelihood asset base	d 30	38	95%				10	5
Proportion of the population in targeted communities reporting environmental benefits	9	12	100%				9	3
Rate of smallholder post-harvest losses	11	12	86%				9	8

### Smallholders, livelihoods, food systems and climate risk management

Outcome indicators		No. of complete measurements	Measurement reporting rate	Performance rating <sup>1</sup>			Number of measurements showing	
				2022	2021	2020	improvement or stabilization compared with the baseline	achieving or exceeding the target
Value and volume of smallholder sales through WFP-supported aggregation systems – volume ( <i>mt</i>	) 27	33	97%				22	16
Value and volume of smallholder sales through WFP-supported aggregation systems – value ( <i>USD</i> )	27	33	97%				21	12

### **Unconditional resource transfers**

Outcome indicators		No. of complete measurements	Measurement reporting rate	Perf	ormance ra	ting <sup>1</sup>	showing improvement or meas — stabilization compared achi with the baseline exc	
				2022	2021	2020		exceeding the target
Consumption-based coping strategy index (average)	50	132	96%				81	49
Economic capacity to meet essential needs (new)	12	27	100%				14	9
Food consumption score	59	156	95%				79	39
Livelihood-based coping strategy index (percentage of households using coping strategies)	24	63	95%	•			27	12