

Executive Board Second Regular Session

Rome, 17 - 19 May 2000

INFORMATION NOTES

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSE— PRO KENYA 4961.04

This document should be read in conjunction with the document "Joint WFP/UNHCR Evaluation of PRO Kenya 4961.04" (WFP/EB.2/2000/3/2).



Distribution: GENERAL WFP/EB.2/2000/INF/10 11 May 2000 ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

This document is printed in a limited number of copies. Executive Board documents are available on WFP's WEB site (http://www.wfp.org/eb_public/EB_Home.html).





| RECOMMENDATION TO WFP (SEPTEMBER 1999) | ACTION BY | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN TO DATE (APRIL 2000) |
|--|---|---|
| General A full general food ration of 2,100 kcal/person/day should be maintained for all refugees in both settlements. Refugee registration • UNHCR and WFP, with the support of the Government, should jointly establish procedures for assessing the magnitude and consequences of registration abuses. | WFP/UNHCR UNHCR/ Government | This recommendation was endorsed by the Joint Food Needs Assessment Mission (JFAM) in November 1999 and is fully incorporated in the PRRO. UNHCR/Government, with the participation of WFP, adopted a new refugee registration system for the card revalidation exercise in Dadaab in February 2000. The system included the creation of a fingerprint databank for refugees 10 years of age and above. The National Registration Bureau, the Ministry of Home Affairs, UNHCR and WFP are awaiting the results of the |
| Food distribution | | Dadaab exercise to examine lessons learned and establish procedures for assessing the accuracy of the population figures. |
| In Kakuma in particular, UNHCR, WFP and implementing partners should revisit the whole issue of food distribution, bearing in mind security concerns. An inter-agency review should take into account the following variables: the return to a monthly distribution a concomitant effort to improve community security to ensure the safety of household food stocks | WFP/UNHCR / Refugees involved in food distribution | This recommendation was reviewed by the JFAM and was not considered feasible in view of the volatile security situation. It was concluded that monthly food distribution would contribute to food losses at the household level due to theft and pest infestation resulting from a prolonged storage period. In addition refugee women noted that monthly distribution entails a higher security risk for them because of the potential for violence |
| a cost/benefit analysis of having one EDP in each camp an assessment of relative costs/benefits of WFP versus implementing partner as the EDP manager In line with the requirements of the UNHCR/WFP MOU, a regular household food security surveillance system should be established on a sample basis in order to monitor consumption patterns, diet diversification, intra-family food distribution, etc. | UNHCR/WFP/ LWF/CARE | related to food thefts. This recommendation was reviewed by the JFAM and was endorsed in full. These activities will be undertaken through increased staff capacity, which has been accommodated in the PRRO. |

| RECOMMENDATION TO WFP (SEPTEMBER 1999) | ACTION BY | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN TO DATE (APRIL 2000) |
|--|---|--|
| Nutritional indicators Now that the majority of the refugee population is no longer in an acute emergency, it would be advisable to include additional parameters which will enable measurement of chronic malnutrition such as agefor-height, BMI of adults, and low birth weight in the annual surveys. More technical inputs are necessary to improve the health and nutrition surveillance system in Kakuma, far beyond the occasional consultancy advice currently provided. In Dadaab, recording, data collection analysis, interpretation and utilization by MSF(B) are very professional. The same standards should be required in Kakuma. | UNHCR/Health NGOs/MSF (Dadaab) IFRC (Kakuma) | This recommendation was reviewed by the JFAM and was endorsed in full. UNHCR and its Health NGO partners will continue to undertake nutritional surveys on an annual basis, taking into account additional parameters recommended by the 1999 evaluation mission and JFNAM. |
| Selective feeding UNHCR and WFP should require from the implementing partner an evaluation of the selective feeding programme (SFP) two years after the above changes are implemented. Consideration should then be given to moving away from selective feeding towards general ration distribution, while maintaining the therapeutic feeding programme and intensified nutrition education to mothers. In order to achieve this, a well-organized recording system of admissions, defaulters, re-admissions, length of stay, etc. is necessary, along with strict monthly compilation. | UNHCR/WFP/ MSF(B)/IFRC | The Nutritionist on the JFAM in November 1999 reviewed this recommendation and concluded that efforts needed to be made to move away from selective feeding towards general ration distribution. Based on the demographic profile, a limited number of 4,000 beneficiaries was recommended for the selective feeding programme. |
| UNHCR, WFP and implementing partners should review the objectives of the school feeding programme, measure, if possible, the impact of the original specific nutritional intervention, and, in the light of this evidence, assess options available for its continuance or otherwise. The link between vegetable production, consumption and nutritional education in the schools should be established so that Sudanese boys in particular become aware of the nutritional value of the limited resources available to them. | UNHCR/WFP/ LWF/IFRC | The Nutritionist on the JFAM in November 1999 reviewed the demographic profile of the refugee population at Kakuma camp. Based on her analysis, she recommended that the school feeding programme should be continued with the objective of meeting the additional energy requirements of children aged between 8 and 18 years not acquired through the general ration. Whenever feasible, nutrition education would be given to schoolchildren, including boys. |

| RECOMMENDATION TO WFP (SEPTEMBER 1999) | ACTION BY | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN TO DATE (APRIL 2000) |
|--|----------------------------------|--|
| Trade in food commodities | | |
| UNHCR/WFP should undertake a regular monitoring of trading relations between refugees, 'middlemen' and Kenyan suppliers/purchasers. This should include an analysis of: a) the relative importance of food aid as an exchange commodity; and b) whether the amount of food (and non-food) aid 'exported' from the camps is consistent with anecdotal evidence of acceptable levels of exchange (and if not, why not). | UNHCR/WFP | This recommendation was reviewed by the JFAM. The mission concluded that for UNHCR/WFP undertaking regular monitoring of trade relations as envisaged above would pose a tremendous security risk for the staff. Should security risks be minimized, there would be an additional risk of collecting highly unreliable information as the refugees, middlemen and Kenyan suppliers/purchasers are reticent about divulging such sensitive market intelligence. Therefore, it was not considered to be a feasible recommendation. |
| Food for work | | |
| A feasibility study should be undertaken for a pilot food-for-work scheme in Kakuma based on water catchment (from seasonal floods) and the extension of vegetable growing along the river bank. This should comprise a cost/benefit analysis, including an assessment of community participation in monitoring and management and resource implications for WFP and UNHCR. | UNHCR | The JFAM was informed that UNHCR had completed feasibility studies on the construction of water catchments in the Kakuma camp area and it was not considered acceptable because of the high costs involved. |
| Gender priorities | | |
| The findings and recommendations of the UNHCR/WFP Gender Study undertaken in 1997-98 should be revised, updated and made available to all partner agencies. | UNHCR/WFP/ LWF/CARE | The recommendation is accepted and UNHCR/WFP Country Offices have already made plans to update the study and to disseminate the information to partners. |
| Refugees and the local population | | |
| UNHCR, the Government, WFP and implementing partners should conduct a feasibility study on food-for-work projects that benefit the local Turkana population in Kakuma while addressing the negative impacts of long-term refugee settlement. | UNHCR/ Government/ WFP/LWF | The JFAM was informed that UNHCR had completed feasibility studies on the construction of water catchments in the Kakuma camp area and it was not considered acceptable because of the high costs involved. |
| | | WFP plans to incorporate additional assistance to populations in the refugee-affected areas through its Kenya Emergency Operation and through the Disaster Mitigation Basic Activity under the Kenya Country Programme. UNHCR will continue to |

| RECOMMENDATION TO WFP (SEPTEMBER 1999) | ACTION BY | MANAGEMENT RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN TO DATE (APRIL 2000) |
|---|---|---|
| | | support the host population through local works such as construction of schools, police posts and water supply systems as well as through support to health services. |
| Coordination, planning and staffing | | |
| A Joint Plan of Action should be prepared (or updated in the case of Dadaab) by UNHCR, WFP and implementing partners with specific deadlines, indicating, inter alia: | UNHCR/WFP/ LWF/CARE / MSF(B)/IFRC | This recommendation was accepted and will be effectively implemented after recruitment and placement of staff. |
| the delivery and distribution of food and non-food items for the forthcoming 12 months | | |
| a set of monitoring indicators, a division of labour for adherence to these, and a reporting format | | |
| 3) a matrix of agency activities within the camps | | |
| the setting of priorities for certain activities above others so that any financial cuts follow previously agreed patterns. | | |
| • A strategy in relation to several scenarios. These would include, inter alia: contingency planning in the event of major changes in refugee numbers, including large influxes; large-scale repatriation organized through UNHCR; the closure of camps for security reasons and/or government edict; the enforced reduction of resources by donors; a shift in food aid modalities towards greater self-sufficiency and a reduction in the general ration. | UNHCR/ Government/ WFP/LWF/ CARE/MSF(B)/ IFRC | |
| The Joint Plan of Action should be prepared with an emphasis on projected outcomes and mutually agreed agency roles. It should be re-negotiated and redrafted every 12 months. | UNHCR/WFP/ LWF/CARE/ MSF(B)/IFRC | This recommendation is accepted and plans are incorporated in the PRRO for approval of the Executive Board in May 2000. |
| WFP should review in particular its camp staffing capacity in terms of numbers, training and seniority so as to adequately meet the stipulations of the MOU. It is further recommended that UNHCR and WFP, through the Joint Plan of Action and on a bilateral basis, urgently review the respective responsibilities of each agency at the field level, and ensure that this review is reflected in areas such as job descriptions and vehicle allocations. | | |