



WFP EVALUATION

Evaluation of the corporate emergency evaluation of WFP's response in Ukraine

22 May 2025 – Round table on evaluation reports



World Food
Programme

SAVING
LIVES
CHANGING
LIVES

Main features of the evaluation

Purpose:

- Ensure accountability for results.
- Generate insights on WFP's performance during the emergency response.
- Contribute for broader learning on WFP's complex emergency responses.

Scope:

- Temporal scope – covered the contingency planning for the crisis until the end of June 2024.
- Programmatic scope – included the Limited Emergency Operation (LEO) framework and the Transitional Interim CSP (T-ICSP) along with their subsequent budget revisions.



Summary of key insights from the evaluation

Insight 1: Crisis preparedness, flexibility and scale-up

- WFP rapidly implemented a large-scale response, demonstrating a unique comparative advantage.
- However, Ukraine's moderate food insecurity raised questions about whether the scale of the response was proportionate.
- WFP's flexibility and capacity to scale-up remain critical to the humanitarian response in Ukraine.



Insight 2: Monitoring and reporting systems

- Monitoring and reporting systems struggled to present evidence of results.
- Corporate food security indicators made WFP's contribution hard to demonstrate.
- WFP highlighted broader benefits beyond food aid but set no clear targets or tracked progress.
- Nonetheless, evidence of results for food security and nutrition was starting to emerge.



Insight 3:

Cash transfer modality and alignment to needs

- The advantages of cash transfer across activities only partially realized.
- Although in-kind aid was justified in some cases, markets often recovered quickly, yet most WFP assistance remained in-kind.
- Reasons included logistical ease, like avoiding detailed registration to enable cash transfers and long setup times for cash top-ups.
- Underdeveloped potential of cash transfers beyond short-term consumption needs.



Insight 4: Principled humanitarian approach

- WFP aware of the importance of minimizing perceptions of the politicization of humanitarian assistance.
- WFP advocate of a principled humanitarian approach.
- Ukraine's sensitive context required WFP to balance competing principles. Earlier acknowledgment of the necessary trade-offs would have been helpful.
- Implications for global equity were not systematically monitored, and limited efforts were made to encourage a more balanced allocation of resources across global crises.



Insight 5: Coordination efforts

- WFP contributed to leading coordination efforts and forged important partnerships for an effective humanitarian response.
- WFP's support to UN strategy and services in Ukraine was commendable.
- The emergence of non-traditional actors, some of whom operated outside the coordination framework, presented a challenge.
- WFP maintained a degree of independence from collective coordination on the use of Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance.



Insight 6: Approaches to social inclusion & accountability

- WFP demonstrated a commitment to inclusion and protection.
- Merely insufficient attention paid to adapting programmes to the needs of women and men and mainstreaming approaches to social inclusion.
- Effective community feedback mechanism in place but limited beneficiary participation in core decisions.



Insight 7: Humanitarian funding, planning for transition

- WFP's funding profile, flexibility, and donor support for carrying over funds were key to its swift emergency response.
- Ukraine's evolving context is uncertain both in the course of the war, the level of needs and prospects for humanitarian funding.
- Implications for adjusting ongoing interventions, pursuing innovative opportunities and planning for transition and exit.

Recommendations

1

Draw on the lessons from Ukraine to strengthen preparedness for future corporate emergencies.

2

Utilize existing global platforms of engagement to strengthen coordinated approaches to the provision of food assistance globally.

3

Enhance the relevance and utility of its' assessment, targeting and measurement of results in Ukraine.

4

Explore and develop support to recovery in conjunction with a primary focus on emergency assistance.

5

Plan transition and exit from Ukraine.