



# Standard Project Report 2015

## World Food Programme in South Sudan, Republic of (SS)

### Food and Nutrition Assistance for Relief and Recovery, Supporting Transition and Enhancing Capabilities to Ensure Sustainable Hunger Solutions in South Sudan

Reporting period: 1 January - 31 December 2015

Project Information	
Project Number	200572
Project Category	Single Country PRRO
Overall Planned Beneficiaries	1,702,720
Planned Beneficiaries in 2015	1,702,720
Total Beneficiaries in 2015	1,385,221

Key Project Dates	
Project Approval Date	November 07, 2013
Planned Start Date	January 01, 2014
Actual Start Date	January 01, 2014
Project End Date	December 31, 2016
Financial Closure Date	N/A

Approved budget in USD	
Food and Related Costs	585,913,516
Capacity Dev.t and Augmentation	8,497,894
Direct Support Costs	105,385,404
Cash-Based Transfers and Related Costs	17,696,486
Indirect Support Costs	50,224,532
<b>Total</b>	<b>767,717,832</b>

Commodities	Metric Tonnes
Planned Commodities in 2015	133,176
Actual Commodities 2015	79,334
Total Approved Commodities	405,982

# Table Of Contents

## **COUNTRY OVERVIEW**

Country Background

Summary Of WFP Assistance

## **OPERATIONAL SPR**

Operational Objectives and Relevance

Results

Beneficiaries, Targeting and Distribution

Story Worth Telling

Progress Towards Gender Equality

Protection and Accountability to Affected Populations

Outputs

Outcomes

Sustainability, Capacity Development and Handover

Inputs

Resource Inputs

Food Purchases and In-Kind Receipts

Food Transport, Delivery and Handling

Post-Delivery Losses

Management

Partnerships

Lessons Learned

Endnotes

Operational Statistics

Annex: Participants by Activity and Modality

Annex: Resource Inputs from Donors

# COUNTRY OVERVIEW



## Country Background

The Republic of South Sudan, a land-locked country situated in eastern Africa, is sparsely populated, with an estimated population of 11.7 million people on 644,329 square km of land. In 2005, the Comprehensive Peace Agreement was signed between the Sudan People's Liberation Movement and the Republic of Sudan, ending one of the longest civil wars on record. In July 2011, the Republic of South Sudan gained independence and remains the world's youngest nation.

On 15 December 2013, armed conflict broke out in the capital Juba between forces loyal to President Salva Kiir and those loyal to ex-Vice President Riek Machar and quickly spread to Jonglei, Unity and Upper Nile States, a region known as Greater Upper Nile. By the end of 2015, approximately 1.66 million had been displaced in country (including 185,000 in UNMISS Protection of Civilian sites) and about 646,000 into neighbouring nations.

Basic services within the country have been severely limited by several decades of nearly continuous war. In August 2015, the parties to the conflict signed a peace deal after months of mediation from the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD). Infrastructure, institutional capacity and economic stability continue to suffer as implementation of the peace agreement has been slow.

During the rainy season, between May and October, access to already limited basic services is significantly decreased as huge swaths of the country become inaccessible. Each year, infrastructure assets, including roads and bridges, deteriorate further due to insufficient maintenance during the dry season, thus extending the effects of the rainy season.

Despite plentiful natural resources, including fertile soil and rich biodiversity, only 4 percent of arable land is cultivated. More than 80 percent of the population live in rural areas and survive on subsistence farming. The country's economy is 98 percent dependent on oil revenues. Although it retained the bulk of the oil fields with the independence split, South Sudan remains dependent on the Republic of Sudan for its oil pipeline. Disputes between the two countries over the pipeline as well as interruptions to investments have contributed to the volatile economic situation. By the end of 2015, the decline in oil production together with falling oil prices resulted in a devastating declining revenue and to a huge disparity between the official exchange rate of the South Sudanese Pounds (SSP) to the US Dollar. In December 2015, the government announced the adoption of a market regulated exchange rate, and the official rate leapt overnight from 3.16 SSP to 18.55 SSP per 1 USD, dramatically changing the way business is conducted in country.

South Sudan has some of the world's worst socio-economic indicators and is not on track to achieve any of the Millennium Development Goals. It ranks 169 out of 188 on the 2014 Human Development Index. More than 53 percent of the population lives below the poverty line and the average life expectancy at birth is only 55.7 years. According to the latest Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) report, the country's overall nutrition status remained Critical, with Global Acute Malnutrition rates above the World Health Organization's Emergency threshold (more than 15 percent of the population was classified as malnourished). Moreover, the last IPC of the year showed 3.9 million people classified as severely food insecure with 2.4 million people projected to be in Crisis and Emergency phases from October to December 2015.

## Summary Of WFP Assistance

WFP continued to implement its emergency operation (EMOP) 200659 from 01 January to 30 September 2015 to provide emergency food and nutrition assistance to vulnerable groups including internally displaced persons and conflict-affected residents. These population groups live in United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) Protection of Civilian sites (PoCs), in IDP settlement camps (such as Mingkaman in Lakes state), or shelter in hard-to-reach locations. Most interventions took place in the three conflict affected states of Jonglei, Unity and Upper Nile. From 01 October 2015 to the end of the year, assistance continued under EMOP 200859.

The continued efforts of the 'Integrated Rapid Response Mechanism' (IRRM) have been vital to the success in providing assistance to communities in hard-to-reach locations. The mobile teams were composed of WFP, other United Nations agencies and NGOs, deployed to remote locations to deliver an essential package of food, nutrition, emergency health, livelihood and protection services. WFP was able to reach nearly 80 remote and insecure sites with emergency food assistance at least once in the year, a significant increase from about 55 locations in 2014. However, frequent delays and mission cancellations related to security concerns and logistical challenges meant that several locations were served very infrequently.

Under the EMOP, WFP has continued its joint Nutrition Scale-Up Plan with UNICEF. The two organizations provided their specific nutrition expertise to address severe acute malnutrition (UNICEF) and moderate acute malnutrition (WFP). Cash-based transfers were successfully introduced in the largest single IDP population outside of UNMISS camps. However, the current market situation, including prices and consistent availability of goods, has become volatile and WFP will therefore continue to monitor the sustainability of cash-based transfers.

Before the start of the conflict in December 2013, WFP had developed its protracted relief and recovery operation (PRRO) 200572, to promote the country's shift from unconditional emergency food assistance to more recovery-based food transfers. The operation continued in 2015, in the seven states identified as non-conflict (Central, Western and Eastern Equatoria, Northern and Western Bahr el Ghazal, Lakes and Warrap). General food distributions were still provided to vulnerable populations, particularly refugees, but the main focus remained on Food/Cash Assistance for Assets, Food for Education and nutrition interventions, including the prevention of acute malnutrition, treatment of moderate acute malnutrition, and Institutional Feeding Programme. Purchase for Progress was integrated into the PRRO, to promote the work of smallholder farmers.

WFP's portfolio in South Sudan included five special operations (SOs) to support the two main food assistance operations and to provide services to the greater humanitarian community and the Government of South Sudan.

WFP and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) co-lead the Food Security and Livelihoods Cluster, which was operated in part through SO 200775. This cluster was dedicated to ensuring a coordinated and efficient response for food availability, production and access issues and aimed at reaching the most affected population in close coordination with food security and livelihood actors at both national and sub-national levels.

WFP led the Logistics Cluster under SO 200778. As a service cluster, the Logistics Cluster provided the humanitarian community in South Sudan with logistical expertise, coordination, warehousing and transport services.

The Emergency Telecommunications Cluster is also led by WFP, under SO 200791, and ensured the delivery of a reliable Internet connectivity network and information technology services to the entire humanitarian community.

SO 200786 is the United Nations Humanitarian Air Service (UNHAS), which facilitated the movement of humanitarian actors and relief items across the country. Most areas in the country cannot be reached by road due to difficult terrain, insecurity and the lengthy rainy season.

The construction of feeder roads under SO 200379 benefitted the people and Government of South Sudan as well as the humanitarian community by improving access to rural markets and essential social services.

Beneficiaries	Male	Female	Total
Children (under 5 years)	290,864	290,864	581,728
Children (5-18 years)	569,604	669,384	1,238,988
Adults (18 years plus)	531,438	556,483	1,087,921
<b>Total number of beneficiaries in 2015</b>	<b>1,391,906</b>	<b>1,516,731</b>	<b>2,908,637</b>

Distribution (mt)						
Project Type	Cereals	Oil	Pulses	Mix	Other	Total
Single Country EMOP	88,044	4,753	7,407	10,284	489	110,976
Single Country PRRO	64,969	3,979	5,472	4,563	350	79,334
<b>Total Food Distributed in 2015</b>	<b>153,013</b>	<b>8,732</b>	<b>12,879</b>	<b>14,847</b>	<b>839</b>	<b>190,311</b>

# OPERATIONAL SPR

## Operational Objectives and Relevance

The South Sudan protracted relief and recovery operation (PRRO) 200572 was approved in November 2013. Originally, the operation was to mark a shift away from unconditional food transfers, except for prioritized vulnerable populations, and towards more resilience-focused programming. However, with the start of widespread armed conflict in the three Greater Upper Nile region states in December 2013, the needs and priorities in South Sudan shifted dramatically. WFP nonetheless decided to move forward with the launch of the two-year operation in January 2014, but with significant adjustments made to adapt to the changed situation. The most significant adjustment was to shift focus from the entire country to the seven states in the Greater Bahr el Ghazal (Lakes, Northern Bahr el Ghazal, Warrap and Western Bahr el Ghazal) and Greater Equatoria (Central, Eastern and Western Equatoria) regions, deemed 'non-conflict affected'. An emergency operation was launched to serve the Greater Upper Nile directly affected by the conflict.

The PRRO was aligned with the South Sudan Development Plan (SSDP) 2011-2016 and the South Sudan United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) pillars 2, 3 and 4. In line with WFP's Strategic Plan (2014-2017), the operation aimed to:

- enable vulnerable groups including refugees, returnees and residents affected by shocks to meet minimum levels of food security (Strategic Objective 1);
- treat moderate acute malnutrition and prevent the deterioration of the nutritional status in children, pregnant and lactating women and other vulnerable groups with special nutritional needs including people living with HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and kala-azar (Strategic Objective 1);
- support the restoration of livelihoods and improve household and community resilience through the creation of community assets and the enhancement of social cohesion (Strategic Objective 2);
- promote and stabilize school enrolment of girls and boys in WFP-assisted schools and support skills training to establish and rebuild livelihoods (Strategic Objective 2); and
- enhance the ability of households, communities and the Government to employ sustainable hunger solutions through disaster mitigation, adaptation and management (Strategic Objective 3).

Because of the declining number of people returning to South Sudan since the outbreak of the conflict, the returnee programme was discontinued and the beneficiaries were integrated into other interventions.

The Purchase for Progress (P4P) initiative was integrated into the PRRO after the end of its pilot period. It continued to focus on the three surplus-producing states in the Greater Equatoria region.

## Results

### *Beneficiaries, Targeting and Distribution*

Overall, the PRRO was relatively successful in reaching its targeted beneficiaries in 2015. The majority of those assisted were food insecure people in the seven non-conflict-affected states. In addition, refugees in Unity and Upper Nile (as well as Central and Western Equatoria) and people living in the Abyei contested area continue to receive general food distributions under the PRRO.

South Sudan is host to over 300,000 refugees, the majority of whom have been in the country for years. Most refugees are from Sudan and reside in the large northern camps of Maban, Yida and Ajong Thok. In addition, smaller refugee populations mainly from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Ethiopia reside in the southern parts of the country. Refugees in camps received general food distributions, and children as well as pregnant and lactating women also received nutrition assistance for the prevention and treatment of moderate acute malnutrition. In collaboration with government counterparts, UNHCR and the NGOs African Humanitarian Action and Samaritan's Purse, a full array of basic services was provided to refugees in the camps on a regular basis.

Because of underfunding, however, WFP reduced its general food distributions to refugees from August 2015. Instead of reducing the number of beneficiaries targeted, WFP decided to cut rations by approximately 30 percent. The rations were reduced from 500 grams of cereals to 350 grams; from 50 grams of pulses to 35 grams; from 30 grams of vegetable oil to 21 grams; and from 5 grams of salt to 4 grams. Extensive discussions with the affected groups in the months prior to the reduction helped facilitate the process, as the refugees understood the reasons for

the reductions. The change in the ration partly explains the lower amount of food distributed under the PRRO.

Thousands of people remained displaced by conflict and insecurity within and from the contested Abyei area on the border with Sudan, where general food distributions are the main vehicle for WFP's intervention. Preparations are, however, ongoing to shift assistance to this population from unconditional food transfers to conditional activities including food assistance for assets (FFA with food or cash-based transfers), food for education (FFE) and nutrition support.

General food distributions were also provided to the most severely food insecure residents who required temporary food support. Assessments, such as Food Security and Nutrition Monitoring System (FSNMS) reports, Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) results and Emergency Food Security Assessments (EFSAs), guided WFP's targeting of these groups throughout the year - usually based on seasonal food insecurity, floods, drought and conflict.

The PRRO also allowed the flexibility to both prevent and treat moderate acute malnutrition (MAM) outside of the refugee camps as required based on assessments and information from the nutrition cluster. Most of this assistance was provided in Warrap and Northern Bahr el Ghazal states, which had global acute malnutrition (GAM) rates above emergency thresholds (above 15 percent according to World Health Organization standards) in the May and September 2015 IPC reports. This year saw increased levels of malnutrition in these states, which partially explains the high numbers of nutrition beneficiaries reached.

Pregnant and lactating women receiving support for both prevention and treatment of moderate acute malnutrition were provided with 20 grams of sugar, 30 grams of vegetable oil and 250 grams of SuperCereal per day. Prevention rations for children under 5 years were composed of 200 grams of SuperCereal Plus per child per day, while the treatment rations consisted of 92 grams of Plumpy'Sup per day. Community nutrition volunteers (CNVs) received 267 grams of cereals, pulses, vegetable oil and salt per person per day in exchange for their help in identifying malnourished children and mothers in their communities, encouraging adherence to prevention and treatment programmes and passing on knowledge on best practices for good nutrition.

The over-achievement of treatment of moderate acute malnutrition among pregnant and lactating women (PLW) compared to the estimated beneficiaries was partly due to a broader reach of PLW than initially expected, and partly to non-harmonized admission criteria used by nutrition cooperating partners. The plan was calibrated with a <21 cm mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) cut-off, while many partners used a <23 cm cut-off. Both are commonly used, and in the absence of a unified global standard, national guidelines are usually followed - however, in South Sudan, national guidelines were under revision. WFP and UNICEF are working closely with the Ministry of Health on the revision of the community management of acute malnutrition (CMAM) guidelines, and will increase monitoring visits to ensure this issue is addressed in 2016.

An institutional feeding programme (IFP) was implemented to stabilize the nutrition status of people living with HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and kala-azar. The families of clients receiving treatment were provided with a safety net. In addition, caretakers during the stabilisation centre phase of severe acute malnutrition treatment (provided by UNICEF or other nutrition partners) were also reached. All beneficiaries under IFP received 450 grams of cereals, 50 grams of pulses, 30 grams of vegetable oil and 5 grams of salt per person per day. The clients receiving treatment for HIV, TB and kala-azar also received 30 grams of sugar and 50 grams of SuperCereal per day.

Assistance to HIV/TB clients and their caretakers was affected by inconsistent deliveries to sites due to logistical challenges and commodity shortfalls as well as by a lack of reliable data available to project beneficiary numbers. To correct the data gap and support programmatic adjustments, WFP began conducting assessments to determine the food security and nutrition status of people living with HIV/AIDS.

The Ministry of Education, Science and Technology and WFP maintained their annual agreement to jointly implement school feeding, operational since 2008. The programme reduced short-term hunger among primary school children and encouraged enrolment, attendance and completion of basic education. The intervention was carried out through on-site midday school meals under FFE and take-home rations under the Girls' Incentive (mostly in all-girls schools). These activities were implemented in counties with high levels of food insecurity and functioning schools meeting WFP's education standards. Overall, the school feeding activities were successful in reaching targeted beneficiaries in 2015. During the year, additional girls' schools became eligible for WFP assistance, resulting in more beneficiaries than planned receiving take-home rations. The on-site school meals consisted of 120 grams of cereals, 30 grams of pulses, 10 grams of vegetable oil and 4 grams of salt per student per school day, while the Girls' Incentive comprised a monthly take-home ration of 9.9 kilograms of cereals and 3.6 litres of vegetable oil per student.

FFA was a centerpiece to increase community resilience to shocks in all seven of the non-conflict states. The main objectives were to meet the short-term food needs of food insecure households through a conditional food or cash-based transfer; to restore and create community assets which would help targeted communities enhance their livelihoods and build resilience against future shocks; and to improve skills and knowledge as well as the project



management capacity of farmers and agricultural market actors. Actors at all levels – state, county and boma (lowest administration level in South Sudan) – were involved in the targeting process and throughout FFA project implementation. Committees were formed to represent the interests of different villages and households, with consideration to gender and age variations. In line with WFP's community based participatory planning approach, boma project management committees played an active role in activity selection, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

Beneficiaries in food-based FFA activities (participants and their families), received 300 grams of cereals, 50 grams of pulses, 30 grams of vegetable oil and 5 grams of salt per person per day, while cash-based FFA provided a transfer value of USD 0.93 per person per day (covering corresponding quantities of commodities as WFP's food basket), which was also transferred to the food beneficiaries when food deliveries were not possible. However, as a result of funding constraints, WFP was forced to reduce its assistance through FFA, resulting in underachievement in beneficiaries reached.

Overall, insecurity in Western Equatoria state caused significant delays in food transportation through the Western Corridor from May 2015 onwards. This is possibly the most important transport corridor used by WFP and is typically passable even for a part of the rainy season. Therefore, insecurity along this corridor seriously affected the amount of food that could be delivered to beneficiaries, resulting in a reduced tonnage of food distributed under the PRRO.

The P4P pilot ended in 2014. Recognizing its potential for longer-term solutions to hunger, WFP integrated the programme in its PRRO in 2015. Entitlements are not distributed under this activity; instead farmer's organizations are supported through capacity development to increase production, improve post-harvest handling and strengthen collective marketing. The ultimate aim is to improve the interaction between smallholder farmers and markets, including WFP's local purchases. P4P operated in the three surplus-producing states of Western, Eastern and Central Equatoria.

Table 1: Overview of Project Beneficiary Information									
Beneficiary Category	Planned			Actual			% Actual v. Planned		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Total Beneficiaries	827,523	875,197	1,702,720	651,054	734,167	1,385,221	78.7%	83.9%	81.4%
By Age-group:									
Children (under 5 years)	161,758	161,758	323,516	110,818	166,227	277,045	68.5%	102.8%	85.6%
Children (5-18 years)	279,246	326,922	606,168	249,340	263,192	512,532	89.3%	80.5%	84.6%
Adults (18 years plus)	386,519	386,517	773,036	290,896	304,748	595,644	75.3%	78.8%	77.1%
By Residence status:									
Refugees	182,055	192,544	374,599	110,444	125,044	235,488	60.7%	64.9%	62.9%
Internally displaced persons (IDPs)	70,339	74,392	144,731	70,397	81,977	152,374	100.1%	110.2%	105.3%
Residents	575,128	608,262	1,183,390	478,732	518,627	997,359	83.2%	85.3%	84.3%

Table 2: Beneficiaries by Activity and Modality									
Activity	Planned			Actual			% Actual v. Planned		
	Food	CBT	Total	Food	CBT	Total	Food	CBT	Total
General Distribution (GD)	491,437	-	491,437	504,066	-	504,066	102.6%	-	102.6%
School Feeding (on-site)	220,000	-	220,000	219,636	-	219,636	99.8%	-	99.8%
School Feeding (take-home rations)	21,300	-	21,300	22,943	-	22,943	107.7%	-	107.7%



**Table 2: Beneficiaries by Activity and Modality**

Activity	Planned			Actual			% Actual v. Planned		
	Food	CBT	Total	Food	CBT	Total	Food	CBT	Total
Food-Assistance-for-Assets	414,900	112,800	527,700	308,002	43,483	351,485	74.2%	38.5%	66.6%
Nutrition: Treatment of Moderate Acute Malnutrition	262,649	-	262,649	253,128	-	253,128	96.4%	-	96.4%
Nutrition: Prevention of Acute Malnutrition	154,064	-	154,064	159,204	-	159,204	103.3%	-	103.3%
HIV/TB: Care&Treatment	59,930	-	59,930	31,140	-	31,140	52.0%	-	52.0%

**Table 3: Participants and Beneficiaries by Activity (excluding nutrition)**

Beneficiary Category	Planned			Actual			% Actual v. Planned		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
<b>General Distribution (GD)</b>									
People participating in general distributions	32,295	37,911	70,206	33,124	38,885	72,009	102.6%	102.6%	102.6%
<b>Total participants</b>	<b>32,295</b>	<b>37,911</b>	<b>70,206</b>	<b>33,124</b>	<b>38,885</b>	<b>72,009</b>	<b>102.6%</b>	<b>102.6%</b>	<b>102.6%</b>
<b>Total beneficiaries</b>	<b>226,062</b>	<b>265,375</b>	<b>491,437</b>	<b>231,871</b>	<b>272,195</b>	<b>504,066</b>	<b>102.6%</b>	<b>102.6%</b>	<b>102.6%</b>
<b>School Feeding (on-site)</b>									
Children receiving school meals in primary schools	132,000	88,000	220,000	131,782	87,854	219,636	99.8%	99.8%	99.8%
<b>Total participants</b>	<b>132,000</b>	<b>88,000</b>	<b>220,000</b>	<b>131,782</b>	<b>87,854</b>	<b>219,636</b>	<b>99.8%</b>	<b>99.8%</b>	<b>99.8%</b>
<b>Total beneficiaries</b>	<b>132,000</b>	<b>88,000</b>	<b>220,000</b>	<b>131,782</b>	<b>87,854</b>	<b>219,636</b>	<b>99.8%</b>	<b>99.8%</b>	<b>99.8%</b>
<b>School Feeding (take-home rations)</b>									
Children receiving take-home rations in primary schools	-	21,300	21,300	-	22,943	22,943	-	107.7%	107.7%
<b>Total participants</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>21,300</b>	<b>21,300</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>22,943</b>	<b>22,943</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>107.7%</b>	<b>107.7%</b>
<b>Total beneficiaries</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>21,300</b>	<b>21,300</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>22,943</b>	<b>22,943</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>107.7%</b>	<b>107.7%</b>
<b>Food-Assistance-for-Assets</b>									
People participating in asset-creation activities	37,692	37,693	75,385	24,360	32,292	56,652	64.6%	85.7%	75.2%
<b>Total participants</b>	<b>37,692</b>	<b>37,693</b>	<b>75,385</b>	<b>24,360</b>	<b>32,292</b>	<b>56,652</b>	<b>64.6%</b>	<b>85.7%</b>	<b>75.2%</b>
<b>Total beneficiaries</b>	<b>242,742</b>	<b>284,958</b>	<b>527,700</b>	<b>161,684</b>	<b>189,801</b>	<b>351,485</b>	<b>66.6%</b>	<b>66.6%</b>	<b>66.6%</b>
<b>HIV/TB: Care&amp;Treatment</b>									
TB Clients receiving food assistance	5,813	6,173	11,986	3,020	3,208	6,228	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%
<b>Total participants</b>	<b>5,813</b>	<b>6,173</b>	<b>11,986</b>	<b>3,020</b>	<b>3,208</b>	<b>6,228</b>	<b>52.0%</b>	<b>52.0%</b>	<b>52.0%</b>
<b>Total beneficiaries</b>	<b>29,066</b>	<b>30,864</b>	<b>59,930</b>	<b>15,103</b>	<b>16,037</b>	<b>31,140</b>	<b>52.0%</b>	<b>52.0%</b>	<b>52.0%</b>

The total number of beneficiaries includes all targeted persons who were provided with WFP food/cash/vouchers during the reporting period - either as a recipient/participant or from a household food ration distributed to one of these recipients/participants.

**Table 4: Nutrition Beneficiaries**

Beneficiary Category	Planned			Actual			% Actual v. Planned		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
<b>Nutrition: Treatment of Moderate Acute Malnutrition</b>									
Activity supporters (18 plus)	4,576	4,577	9,153	4,361	4,362	8,723	95.3%	95.3%	95.3%
Children (6-23 months)	48,177	48,176	96,353	41,258	41,258	82,516	85.6%	85.6%	85.6%
Children (24-59 months)	48,176	48,176	96,352	41,258	41,258	82,516	85.6%	85.6%	85.6%
Pregnant and lactating women (18 plus)	-	60,791	60,791	-	79,373	79,373	-	130.6%	130.6%
<b>Total beneficiaries</b>	<b>100,929</b>	<b>161,720</b>	<b>262,649</b>	<b>86,877</b>	<b>166,251</b>	<b>253,128</b>	<b>86.1%</b>	<b>102.8%</b>	<b>96.4%</b>
<b>Nutrition: Prevention of Acute Malnutrition</b>									
Activity supporters (18 plus)	2,969	2,969	5,938	2,973	2,973	5,946	100.1%	100.1%	100.1%
Children (6-23 months)	31,830	31,832	63,662	33,229	33,228	66,457	104.4%	104.4%	104.4%
Children (24-59 months)	31,832	31,832	63,664	33,228	33,228	66,456	104.4%	104.4%	104.4%
Pregnant and lactating women (18 plus)	-	20,800	20,800	-	20,345	20,345	-	97.8%	97.8%
<b>Total beneficiaries</b>	<b>66,631</b>	<b>87,433</b>	<b>154,064</b>	<b>69,430</b>	<b>89,774</b>	<b>159,204</b>	<b>104.2%</b>	<b>102.7%</b>	<b>103.3%</b>

Commodity	Planned Distribution (mt)	Actual Distribution (mt)	% Actual v. Planned
Beans	11,015	3,027	27.5%
Corn Soya Blend	15,471	3,892	25.2%
Iodised Salt	1,140	317	27.8%
Lentils	-	127	-
Maize	-	690	-
Peas	-	1,075	-
Ready To Use Supplementary Food	1,571	671	42.7%
Sorghum/Millet	95,707	64,279	67.2%
Split Peas	-	1,243	-
Sugar	551	33	6.1%
Vegetable Oil	7,722	3,979	51.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>133,176</b>	<b>79,334</b>	<b>59.6%</b>

Cash-Based Transfer	Planned Distribution USD	Actual Distribution USD	% Actual v. Planned
Cash	3,596,048	2,680,640	74.5%
Voucher	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,596,048</b>	<b>2,680,640</b>	<b>74.5%</b>

## Story Worth Telling

Each morning on the outskirts of Aweil, the capital of Northern Bahr el Ghazal state, hundreds of men and women come to work carrying spades, pick-axes, hoes and buckets. They are building an 8-kilometre road that links the villages of Udhum and Kuacriac, and also serves as a 2-metre-high flood-control dike.

In 2014, floodwaters devastated the crops planted in the area between these two villages. With no harvest of their own, people had to rely on buying food from the markets, but the floodwaters also made it harder for traders to keep the market well-stocked, which drove up prices.

"We lost crops; people had to swim to get to the next village. Women in labour and the very ill couldn't get to the clinic unless they found a tall man to carry them on their shoulders and wade through the flood waters," said Garang Adoub Adoub, a resident of Marial hamlet. He leads a team of community members involved in the road construction activity.

Those communities agreed to work together to build a dike-road that would allow people to directly access markets, schools and health services, and at the same time protect villages from the negative effects of annual flooding, explained Adoub Adoub.

They raised the issue with Aweil Project for Agriculture Development (APAD), a community-based organisation, and approached WFP to obtain support. WFP's FFA activities provide conditional food assistance to help communities create assets to restore livelihoods and to strengthen resilience against future shocks.

WFP helps meet the immediate food needs of vulnerable people while they build or improve assets that will benefit the whole community. Together this helps make individuals and communities more resilient. Sustainability is embedded into projects because the communities themselves help identify the problems to be tackled, plan the projects and then implement them. The community in Aweil intended to complete the dike-road by the end of June before the onset of the heavy rains.

"It has been our dream to have this road to connect us to the market; that is why I am here to work," said Adir Ngor, a team leader at the construction site. "We don't want people drowning or bitten by snakes anymore because they tried to cross the swamps when the place is flooded."

By the end of 2015, it was reported that the dikes had worked and the community enjoyed a level of mobility during the rainy season never before experienced.

## Progress Towards Gender Equality

Of the 1.4 million people assisted under the PRRO in 2015, more than half were women and girls. WFP has made concerted efforts towards meeting the United Nations System Wide Action Plan (UNSWAP) standards to sustainably promote gender equality and the empowerment of women across programmes. From August 2015, WFP has participated in the Award for Excellence in Gender Equality (a joint initiative between WFP and UNDP). It also created a new unit on gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) and appointed a gender advisor in December 2015.

WFP, UN Women, UNFPA and numerous national and community-based organizations partnered on gender equality, women's empowerment and gender-based violence campaigns. The participating agencies met monthly to share ideas and implement activities such as technical advisory support and capacity development for host government and relevant partners.

Following the relatively low results achieved in 2014, WFP and its cooperating partners conducted sensitization and advocacy for joint decision-making over the use of food assistance. As a result, by the end of 2015, the proportion of households receiving unconditional food transfers where women and men made joint decisions over their entitlement had significantly improved from December 2014 and was close to meeting its target (40 percent).

Women beneficiaries' active engagement and expertise in food management committees can be a significant step towards their empowerment. A seemingly low score was achieved in training women under food management committees in general food distributions. However, 100 percent of women project committee members were trained in 2014, and the result reported for 2015 refers only to new trainings for new projects which were perceived as most important. In the future, smaller as well as refresher trainings will also be recorded to more fully reflect the scale of training activities offered to women.

Monitoring data on the decision-making of FFA recipient households was not available due to technical difficulties with data collection - an issue that the organization is seeking to address in 2016.

Under FFA, the training achievement was well above target and has increased steadily throughout project implementation. While the proportion of women in leadership positions of food management committees was not yet

at parity, its current level is much above the baseline for this project. However, it should be noted that the data source was not post-distribution monitoring reports, but reports prepared by cooperating partners which evaluated the activities they had carried out. While partner reports included information on the challenges experienced and suggestions on the way forward, they are less comprehensive than monitoring reports. In 2016, WFP will increase its monitoring efforts and support to sub-offices in gender equality and women's empowerment.

Cross-cutting Indicators	Project End Target	Base Value	Previous Follow-up	Latest Follow-up
Proportion of households where females and males together make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food				
<i>SOUTH SUDAN, Food-Assistance-for-Assets , Project End Target: 2016.12 , Base value: 2014.06 , Previous Follow-up: 2014.11</i>	=40.00	13.00	8.00	
Proportion of households where females and males together make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food				
<i>SOUTH SUDAN, General Distribution (GD) , Project End Target: 2016.12 , Base value: 2014.06 , Previous Follow-up: 2014.11 , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11</i>	=40.00	9.00	11.00	38.00
Proportion of households where females make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food				
<i>SOUTH SUDAN, Food-Assistance-for-Assets , Project End Target: 2016.12 , Base value: 2014.06 , Previous Follow-up: 2014.12</i>	=50.00	54.00	51.00	
Proportion of households where females make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food				
<i>SOUTH SUDAN, General Distribution (GD) , Project End Target: 2016.12 , Base value: 2014.06 , Previous Follow-up: 2014.12 , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11</i>	=50.00	75.00	80.00	60.00
Proportion of households where males make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food				
<i>SOUTH SUDAN, Food-Assistance-for-Assets , Project End Target: 2016.12 , Base value: 2014.06 , Previous Follow-up: 2014.12</i>	=10.00	47.00	42.00	
Proportion of households where males make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food				
<i>SOUTH SUDAN, General Distribution (GD) , Project End Target: 2016.12 , Base value: 2014.06 , Previous Follow-up: 2014.12 , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11</i>	=10.00	16.00	9.00	3.00
Proportion of women beneficiaries in leadership positions of project management committees				
<i>SOUTH SUDAN, Food-Assistance-for-Assets , Project End Target: 2016.12 , Base value: 2014.06 , Previous Follow-up: 2014.12 , Latest Follow-up: 2015.12</i>	>50.00	28.00	42.00	40.00
Proportion of women beneficiaries in leadership positions of project management committees				
<i>SOUTH SUDAN, General Distribution (GD) , Project End Target: 2016.12 , Base value: 2014.06 , Previous Follow-up: 2014.12 , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11</i>	>50.00	31.00	31.00	68.00

Cross-cutting Indicators	Project End Target	Base Value	Previous Follow-up	Latest Follow-up
Proportion of women project management committee members trained on modalities of food, cash, or voucher distribution				
SOUTH SUDAN, Food-Assistance-for-Assets , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 , <b>Base value:</b> 2014.06 , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.12	>60.00	44.00	53.00	75.00
Proportion of women project management committee members trained on modalities of food, cash, or voucher distribution				
SOUTH SUDAN, General Distribution (GD) , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 , <b>Base value:</b> 2014.06 , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11	>60.00	100.00	100.00	36.00

## Protection and Accountability to Affected Populations

In order to ensure beneficiaries across different age, gender and ethnic backgrounds are better informed about the assistance provided, WFP used posters and radios in refugee settings, and megaphones and community mobilizers in remote locations to explain ration sizes, eligibility criteria and where to provide feedback and make complaints. Furthermore, FFA activities applied a participatory approach, where community members were consulted, provided feedback through the established community meetings and steering committees and also used informal channels to lodge complaints. Based on an accountability to affected populations mapping exercise, WFP will however continue to strengthen effective communication channels through new partnerships, standardized age and gender-sensitive messaging, and formal complaints and feedback mechanisms that are safe and accessible for all beneficiaries.

Of the targeted populations receiving GFD and FFA assistance, between 60 and 70 percent reported they knew their entitlements, the eligibility criteria and where to complain. Forty percent of refugees reported that they were not consulted on safe, accessible and appropriate channels of communication, whereas around thirty percent said they were consulted. Approximately 30 percent did not know if there were consultations. Additionally, 60 percent indicated they knew where to provide feedback or complaints, with the majority citing the food management committee, followed by the boma chief and WFP's cooperating partner. Other mechanisms available to beneficiaries to provide feedback included women representatives and community coordination meetings as well as state-level steering committees for FFA.

The monitoring teams experienced technical problems with data collection with regard to the three different questions probed under the indicator on beneficiary knowledge of the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain). It has therefore been difficult to establish why there is a decrease in this indicator for FFA beneficiaries. However, the technical issues (related to data collection tablet programming) have been addressed for the following round of monitoring data collection.

Of resident and long-term displaced populations in rural areas targeted through GFD, over 90 percent reported no safety concerns, while FFA participants raised no safety concerns at all. These results likely reflect the more stable situation in the non-conflict states which reduces the incidence of safety issues. However, it is also worth noting that even though only 8 percent of GFD beneficiaries reported safety concerns, there were very probably some issues considered too sensitive to report. For example, three refugees residing in the Doro refugee camp in Maban county (Upper Nile state) indicated experiencing coercion or insecurity while at the distribution site. They expressed their hesitation to report security incidents at the programme site.

WFP continued to strengthen protection in its programmes through capacity development of cooperating partners and government counterparts, as well as shared guidelines and good practices. WFP also worked with its partners, including UNHCR, to create a protective environment in refugee settings. Concrete measures to enable beneficiary access to food assistance in a safe and dignified manner included the timing of distributions, provision of water and shade, and specific measures for vulnerable groups; for example allowing a designated alternate to be sent to collect rations.

Cross-cutting Indicators	Project End Target	Base Value	Previous Follow-up	Latest Follow-up
Proportion of assisted people informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)				
SOUTH SUDAN, Food-Assistance-for-Assets , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 , <b>Base value:</b> 2014.06 , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11	>80.00	79.00	90.00	70.00
Proportion of assisted people informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)				
SOUTH SUDAN, General Distribution (GD) , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 , <b>Base value:</b> 2014.06 , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11	>80.00	92.00	87.00	61.00
Proportion of assisted people who do not experience safety problems travelling to, from and/or at WFP programme site				
SOUTH SUDAN, Food-Assistance-for-Assets , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 , <b>Base value:</b> 2014.06 , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11	>90.00	74.00	89.00	100.00
Proportion of assisted people who do not experience safety problems travelling to, from and/or at WFP programme site				
SOUTH SUDAN, General Distribution (GD) , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 , <b>Base value:</b> 2014.06 , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11	>90.00	100.00	100.00	92.00

## Outputs

While nutrition assistance largely reached the planned number of beneficiares, fewer than planned sites were assisted. This is primarily the result of higher than expected malnutrition rates in Warrap and Northern Bahr el Ghazal, leading to a higher number of beneficiaries receiving assistance at sites in these states. For the institutional feeding programme, WFP's partners reported that some of the sites targeted for assistance did not consistently provide HIV treatment. As a result, patients admitted themselves to other sites to receive treatment. As WFP assistance focused on the sites where medical treatment was provided, the total number of sites reached by WFP and its partners decreased.

While the majority of WFP's asset creation projects completed more than 70 percent of their planned activities, two main factors decreased WFP's achievements under FFA in 2015. Funding constraints for the PRRO forced WFP to reduce its targeted beneficiaries, which in turn affected the success of asset creation. Additionally, although FFA was implemented in the seven non-conflict states, the areas were not entirely stable. Each year there are skirmishes linked to traditional intra-communal issues (such as cattle raiding in Lakes, Northern Bahr el Ghazal and Warrap). These instances of violence disrupted participants' engagement in activities like building and maintaining feeder roads, building post-harvest structures (especially ones that would be safe from fighting-related looting), and constructing fish ponds and shallow wells.

Trainings were linked to asset creation activities. Cooperating partners consulted with communities and identified the participants in need of additional capacity development and the relevant training subject. However, the training participants did not receive any additional incentives for their attendance apart from the cash or food distributed for the asset creation activities. This may partly account for the underachievement in training provision.

The FFE and Girls' Incentive programmes distributed food and support items (for example bicycles, stoves and cups). Albendazole tablets for deworming were distributed to children both at on-site school feeding and Girls' Incentive schools to help maximize the benefits of the food provided. Technical support activities included trainings for Parent-Teacher Associations and school management committees.

P4P was implemented in Central, Eastern and Western Equatoria states, aiming to increase farmer's income from their produce, stimulate re-investment in the agriculture sector, and improve productivity and food security in the long run. WFP signed three field-level agreements to support 48 cooperative societies at the beginning of the year. The agreements were signed with one partner in each state: Mother and Child Development Aid for Central

Equatoria cooperatives; Ark for Humanity for Eastern Equatoria cooperatives; and Catholic Diocese for Tambura and Yambio for Western Equatoria cooperatives.

The number of societies supported, as well as the number of smallholder farmers assisted, significantly increase in the first half of the year – before violence in Western Equatoria state escalated. However, the unexpected insecurity in the Greater Equatoria region in the second half of 2015 caused many of the cooperatives to disperse by the end of the year.

Interest and momentum for the P4P programme was high, as farmers and the business-minded sought a return to economic growth. Unfortunately, the harvest period (June to December) suffered from a number of issues which affected crop outputs. By August, the P4P team was concerned that insecurity would lead to a decline in harvesting activities. Additionally, farmers explained that their harvest was not as good as expected in parts of the Greater Equatoria region due to early dry spells. P4P activities experienced major funding gaps towards the end of the year, thus limiting the amount of commodities that could be procured from smallholder farmers.

WFP worked with the USAID FARM project and the Cooperative Bank of South Sudan to develop a special line of credit for smallholder farmers called Crop Advance, piloted in Western Equatoria with the Yambio Agriculture Farmers' Association (YAFA) and the Nzara Farmers' Agriculture Association (NAFA). It aimed to give smallholder farmers access to financing during the harvest season, using their WFP contracts as collateral, while waiting for commodity sales and payment from buyers to occur. The financing acted as a bridge to prevent farmers from succumbing to early selling or unfavourable farm-gate prices offered by roving traders with ready cash.

Output	Unit	Planned	Actual	% Actual vs. Planned
<b>SO1: HIV/TB: Care&amp;Treatment;</b>				
Number of institutional sites assisted	site	48	41	85.4
<b>SO1: Nutrition: Prevention of Acute Malnutrition</b>				
Number of health centres/sites assisted	centre/site	239	205	85.8
<b>SO1: Nutrition: Treatment of Moderate Acute Malnutrition</b>				
Number of health centres/sites assisted	centre/site	292	239	81.8
<b>SO2: Food-Assistance-for-Assets</b>				
Hectares (ha) of land cleared	Ha	19,261	16,013	83.1
Hectares (ha) of vegetables planted	Ha	220	183	83.5
Kilometres (km) of feeder roads built and maintained	Km	605	444	73.4
Kilometres (km) of feeder roads raised above flooding levels	Km	17	15	87.6
Number of classrooms constructed	classroom	1	1	100.0
Number of community managed post-harvest structures built	site	189	7	3.7
Number of excavated community water ponds for domestic uses constructed (3000-15,000 cbmt)	water pond	15	12	80.0
Number of fish ponds constructed (FFA) and maintained (self-help)	fish pond	9	4	44.4
Number of literacy centres constructed/rehabilitated	literacy center	31	28	90.0
Number of people trained (Skills: Engineering)	individual	1,732	1,292	74.6
Number of people trained (Skills: Environmental protection)	individual	902	660	73.2



Output	Unit	Planned	Actual	% Actual vs. Planned
Number of people trained (Skills: Livelihood technologies)	individual	6,653	3,681	55.3
Number of shallow wells constructed	shallow well	219	170	77.6
Number of tree seedlings produced	tree seedling	1,590,400	1,315,936	82.7
Volume (m3) of earth dams and flood protection dikes constructed	m3	191,140	183,500	96.0
<b>SO2: School Feeding (on-site)</b>				
Number of Albendazole Tablets (400mg) distributed	item	388,630	369,604	95.1
Number of bicycles distributed	item	21	21	100.0
Number of cups distributed	item	2,960	2,960	100.0
Number of institution stoves distributed	item	9	9	100.0
Number of institutional sites assisted	site	344	339	98.5
Number of technical support activities provided on food security monitoring and food assistance	activity	840	772	91.9
<b>SO2: School Feeding (take-home rations)</b>				
Number of Albendazole Tablets (400mg) distributed	item	42,100	37,688	89.5
Number of institutional sites assisted	site	149	147	98.7
Number of technical support activities provided on food security monitoring and food assistance	activity	278	274	98.6
<b>SO3: Local Purchases</b>				
Number of cooperatives societies supported	farmer group	48	126	262.5
Number of farmer groups supported through local purchases	farmer group	63	3	4.8
Number of farmer individuals supported through local purchases	individual	2,050	1,548	75.5
Number of farmer organizations trained in market access and post-harvest handling skills	farmer organization	1,002	126	12.6
Number of farmers trained in marketing skills and post-harvest handling	individual	192	126	65.6
Number of individuals trained in business skills	individual	540	482	89.3
Number of individuals trained in lobby and advocacy	individual	20	30	150.0
Number of satellite collection centers supported	centre/site	6	6	100.0
Number of smallholder farmers supported by WFP	individual	1,750	8,039	459.4

## Outcomes

During 2015, the monitoring team thoroughly reviewed its system and toolkit, and revised and augmented its questionnaires in line with WFP's minimum monitoring requirements to inform programmatic decision-making. This process took several months; the first outcome monitoring data collection using the new tools was undertaken in the fourth quarter of 2015. While significant progress was made in terms of data quality (for example, providing representative results for different population groups which had not been possible under the old monitoring system), there were still improvements to be made. Future monitoring exercises will reflect the continuous review and strengthening of the system, and gaps in the reporting of 2015 results are being addressed in the first round of 2016 data collection. According to the new monitoring schedule, outcome results will be collected up to three times per year, exceeding the corporate minimum, using statistically representative sampling for three population groups, including FFA, general distribution to refugees, and general distributions to displaced populations and residents in rural areas.

While gathering statistically representative data related to aspects such as transfer modalities or sex of the household head remains the ultimate goal, the South Sudan context does not currently allow for this scale of data gathering. WFP will focus on meaningful types of data disaggregation and analysis, but statistical representativeness will be limited to the specified three groups in the immediate future. As a result of poor infrastructure and security issues, accessibility is a challenge even outside of the conflict-affected states. In addition, data collection for outcome monitoring often coincides with the need to conduct rapid and/or inter-agency assessments to address issues arising from localized violence such as cattle raids.

Under the PRRO, WFP's coverage for the treatment of moderate acute malnutrition exceeded targets, and was particularly high in the refugee camps. All four indicators for the effectiveness of the treatment activities – recovery, mortality, default and non-response rates – were well within the Sphere standards. However, while malnutrition prevention coverage met its target, distributions to targeted beneficiaries were much less regular than planned. Compared to treatment programmes which use a clinic-based approach (with a diagnosis and treatment plan recommended to mothers and children), under prevention activities it is more difficult to reach the same populations multiple times. In 2016, WFP will therefore reinforce the outreach component of its malnutrition prevention programme, to maximize the use of CNVs, whose primary role is to identify and mobilize eligible target groups.

Insecurity in the Maban refugee camp (Upper Nile state) in 2014 affected the collection of data on participation and coverage of malnutrition prevention and treatment. On the other hand, the implementation of malnutrition prevention in Yida refugee camp (Unity state) was not sufficient to provide strong data, and therefore 2015 data cannot be measured against previous results.

While tuberculosis (TB) default rates were quite low, an increase has been registered since the previous follow-up. The default rates from antiretroviral therapy (ART) were much higher. This is consistent with the irregular availability of HIV treatment at targeted clinics reported by WFP's partners.

School feeding exceeded or came close to meeting all of its targets in 2015. Enrolment rate changes were greatly improved in schools dispensing hot on-site meals. This is probably due to further stabilization in the seven non-conflict states in the second year of the conflict, which created an environment where parents felt comfortable enrolling their children.

Food consumption scores (FCS) amongst refugees did not reach the targets, possibly due to a host of reasons including ration cuts, rising food costs, and the lack of livelihood opportunities. However, the results were generally better than those for populations receiving general food distributions outside of the camps, including severely food insecure residents and those displaced by localized violence and flooding. Households headed by men fared better outside of camps. Nevertheless, none of the FCS results showed a substantial improvement when compared to baseline values. Diet diversity scores and the coping strategy index were also better among refugees compared to those in rural areas, regardless of the sex of the head of household.

The better FCS results in camp settings in comparison to beneficiaries in the rural areas can be attributed to more regular assistance and more regular access to other means of livelihoods. Those surveyed in the rural areas were predominately persons displaced from Abyei, who received half rations in 2015 due to food unavailability. Sixty-five percent of refugees have kitchen gardens to supplement their WFP baskets, whereas only 55 percent of the vulnerable rural population maintain a garden. Markets constitute a quarter of the food sources for rural GFD beneficiaries, but 38 percent of these beneficiaries indicated that high food prices was their worst shock. These factors may have contributed to their poorer food security.

Dietary diversity scores (DDS) and FCS amongst households engaged in FFA activities was similar to refugee populations and well above the other resident groups outside of the camps. In general, those receiving

unconditional assistance are people who are the most vulnerable and therefore less able to cope with shocks; better food security among FFA assistance recipients is therefore not surprising. Over 80 percent of FFA beneficiaries have kitchen gardens and more than half of their food is sourced through their own production, while vulnerable rural populations are able to fulfil only about a quarter of their food needs through their own production.

Data for FCS and DDS was not collected prior to 2015, which explains the lack of results prior to November 2015.

The coping strategy index (CSI), which measures the severity and frequency of negative food-based coping strategies used, was quite similar among FFA beneficiaries and other resident beneficiaries, and higher than the results found for refugees. Residents living outside of camp settings typically did not have the same measures in place to protect against the need for negative coping strategies as refugees did, leading them to resort to coping strategies like reduced food consumption. The use of crisis and emergency livelihood-based negative coping strategies, leading to asset depletion, was also high among FFA beneficiaries. This may reflect the delays experienced in FFA activities and their related cash and food transfers as a result of funding constraints and insecurity.

The data collected was not sufficient to allow for the disaggregation of community asset scores (CAS) between Strategic Objectives 2 and 3, which explains why both are recorded as 60 percent. The asset scores did not achieve targets as a result of lower levels of FFA implementation.

Although WFP purchased more than 10 percent of the food distributed in 2015 from regional, national and local suppliers, less than the targeted tonnage was purchased from smallholder farmers' cooperatives. This is attributable to the lower than anticipated harvest outputs, disrupted harvest activities due to insecurity and funding shortfalls.

Outcome	Project End Target	Base Value	Previous Follow-up	Latest Follow-up
<b>SO1 Save lives and protect livelihoods in emergencies</b>				
<b>Stabilized or reduced undernutrition among children aged 6–59 months and pregnant and lactating women</b>				
<b>Proportion of target population who participate in an adequate number of distributions</b>				
MAM-PREVENTION , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 PDM HH , <b>Base value:</b> 2014.01 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.12 WFP programme monitoring Monthly partner reports	>66.00	0.00	-	53.00
<b>Proportion of eligible population who participate in programme (coverage)</b>				
MAM-PREVENTION , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 Desk study , <b>Base value:</b> 2013.12 Secondary data Desk study , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 Secondary data Desk study	>70.00	0.00	-	70.00
<b>MAM treatment recovery rate (%)</b>				
MAM-TREATMENT , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 Health clinic registers , <b>Base value:</b> 2013.12 WFP programme monitoring Health clinic registers , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring Health clinic registers , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.12 Secondary data Nutrition cluster data	>75.00	85.00	74.00	91.00
<b>MAM treatment mortality rate (%)</b>				
MAM-TREATMENT , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 Health clinic registers , <b>Base value:</b> 2013.12 WFP programme monitoring Health clinic registers , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring Health clinic registers , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.12 Secondary data Nutrition cluster data	<3.00	0.10	0.30	0.00
<b>MAM treatment default rate (%)</b>				
MAM-TREATMENT , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 Health clinic registers , <b>Base value:</b> 2013.12 WFP programme monitoring Health clinic registers , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring Health clinic registers , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.12 Secondary data Nutrition cluster data	<15.00	12.00	22.00	5.00

Outcome	Project End Target	Base Value	Previous Follow-up	Latest Follow-up
<b>MAM treatment non-response rate (%)</b>				
MAM-TREATMENT , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 Health clinic registers , <b>Base value:</b> 2013.12 WFP programme monitoring Health clinic registers , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring Health clinic registers , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.12 Secondary data Nutrition cluster data	<15.00	3.20	3.20	4.00
<b>Proportion of eligible population who participate in programme (coverage)</b>				
MAM-TREATMENT-CAMPS , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 Desk study , <b>Base value:</b> 2013.12 Secondary data Desk study , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 Secondary data UNHCR data	>90.00	0.00	-	100.00
<b>Proportion of eligible population who participate in programme (coverage)</b>				
MAM-TREATMENT-RURAL , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 Desk study , <b>Base value:</b> 2013.12 Secondary data Desk study , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 Secondary data Desk study , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 Secondary data Desk study	>50.00	0.00	44.00	77.00
<b>Stabilized or improved food consumption over assistance period for targeted households and/or individuals</b>				
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score</b>				
GFD-REFUGEES , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 PDM HH , <b>Base value:</b> 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH	<6.00	28.00	29.00	32.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score</b>				
GFD-REFUGEES , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 PDM HH , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH	<5.20		-	26.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score</b>				
GFD-REFUGEES , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 PDM HH , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH	>89.00		-	43.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b>				
GFD-REFUGEES , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 PDM HH , <b>Base value:</b> 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH	<3.80	19.00	32.00	31.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b>				
GFD-REFUGEES , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 PDM HH , <b>Base value:</b> 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH	<7.40	37.00	25.00	33.00

Outcome	Project End Target	Base Value	Previous Follow-up	Latest Follow-up
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b>				
<i>GFD-REFUGEES , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	<4.60		-	23.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b>				
<i>GFD-REFUGEES , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	<5.80		-	29.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b>				
<i>GFD-REFUGEES , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	>92.00		-	46.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b>				
<i>GFD-REFUGEES , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	>87.00		-	39.00
<b>Diet Diversity Score</b>				
<i>GFD-REFUGEES , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Base value: 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Previous Follow-up: 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	>4.30	4.20	3.30	3.40
<b>Diet Diversity Score (female-headed households)</b>				
<i>GFD-REFUGEES , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Base value: 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Previous Follow-up: 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	>3.10	4.40	3.30	3.40
<b>Diet Diversity Score (male-headed households)</b>				
<i>GFD-REFUGEES , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Base value: 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Previous Follow-up: 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	>4.50	4.20	3.30	3.40
<b>CSI (Food): Coping Strategy Index (average)</b>				
<i>GFD-REFUGEES , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Base value: 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Previous Follow-up: 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	<18.00	19.00	20.00	6.80
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score</b>				
<i>GFD-RESIDENTS &amp; DISPLACED , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	<8.40		-	42.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score</b>				
<i>GFD-RESIDENTS &amp; DISPLACED , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	<4.20		-	21.00

Outcome	Project End Target	Base Value	Previous Follow-up	Latest Follow-up
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score</b>				
<i>GFD-RESIDENTS &amp; DISPLACED , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	>88.00		-	37.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b>				
<i>GFD-RESIDENTS &amp; DISPLACED , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	<9.20		-	46.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b>				
<i>GFD-RESIDENTS &amp; DISPLACED , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	<6.00		-	30.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b>				
<i>GFD-RESIDENTS &amp; DISPLACED , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	<4.80		-	24.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b>				
<i>GFD-RESIDENTS &amp; DISPLACED , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	<2.80		-	14.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b>				
<i>GFD-RESIDENTS &amp; DISPLACED , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	>86.00		-	30.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b>				
<i>GFD-RESIDENTS &amp; DISPLACED , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	>91.00		-	56.00
<b>Diet Diversity Score</b>				
<i>GFD-RESIDENTS &amp; DISPLACED , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	>4.00		-	2.70
<b>Diet Diversity Score (female-headed households)</b>				
<i>GFD-RESIDENTS &amp; DISPLACED , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	>4.00		-	2.60
<b>Diet Diversity Score (male-headed households)</b>				
<i>GFD-RESIDENTS &amp; DISPLACED , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	>4.00		-	3.04
<b>CSI (Food): Coping Strategy Index (average)</b>				
<i>GFD-RESIDENTS &amp; DISPLACED , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Previous Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	<10.00		13.50	13.50
<b>Restored or stabilized access to basic services and/or community assets</b>				

Outcome	Project End Target	Base Value	Previous Follow-up	Latest Follow-up
<b>ART Default Rate (%)</b>				
GFD-IFP , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 Health clinic registers , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring Health clinic registers , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.12 WFP programme monitoring Health clinic registers	<15.00		3.50	28.00
<b>TB Treatment Default Rate (%)</b>				
GFD-IFP , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 Health clinic registers , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring Health clinic registers , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.12 WFP programme monitoring Health clinic registers	<15.00		3.50	9.10
<b>SO2 Support or restore food security and nutrition and establish or rebuild livelihoods in fragile settings and following emergencies</b>				
<b>Improved access to assets and/or basic services, including community and market infrastructure</b>				
<b>CAS: percentage of communities with an increased Asset Score</b>				
F/CFA , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 PDM FGD , <b>Base value:</b> 2014.06 WFP survey PDM FGD , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM FGD	>80.00	0.00	-	60.00
<b>Retention rate (girls) in WFP-assisted primary schools</b>				
SCHOOL MEALS-GIRLS' INCENTIVE , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 School records , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring School records	>85.00		-	92.00
<b>Enrolment (girls): Average annual rate of change in number of girls enrolled in WFP-assisted primary schools</b>				
SCHOOL MEALS-GIRLS' INCENTIVE , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 School records , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring School records	>6.00		-	12.00
<b>Retention rate in WFP-assisted primary schools</b>				
SCHOOL MEALS-HOT MEALS , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 School records , <b>Base value:</b> 2013.12 WFP programme monitoring School records , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring School records , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring School records	>85.00	99.00	92.00	89.00
<b>Retention rate (girls) in WFP-assisted primary schools</b>				
SCHOOL MEALS-HOT MEALS , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 School records , <b>Base value:</b> 2013.12 WFP programme monitoring School records , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring School records , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring School records	>85.00	98.00	90.00	87.00
<b>Retention rate (boys) in WFP-assisted primary schools</b>				
SCHOOL MEALS-HOT MEALS , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 School records , <b>Base value:</b> 2013.12 WFP programme monitoring School records , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring School records , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring School records	>85.00	99.00	93.00	84.00
<b>Enrolment: Average annual rate of change in number of children enrolled in WFP-assisted primary schools</b>				
SCHOOL MEALS-HOT MEALS , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 School records , <b>Base value:</b> 2013.12 WFP programme monitoring School records , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring School records , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring School records	>6.00	-4.00	-18.00	23.00



Outcome	Project End Target	Base Value	Previous Follow-up	Latest Follow-up
<b>Enrolment (girls): Average annual rate of change in number of girls enrolled in WFP-assisted primary schools</b>				
SCHOOL MEALS-HOT MEALS , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 School records , <b>Base value:</b> 2013.12 WFP programme monitoring School records , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring School records , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring School records	>6.00	-4.00	-14.00	37.00
<b>Enrolment (boys): Average annual rate of change in number of boys enrolled in WFP-assisted primary schools</b>				
SCHOOL MEALS-HOT MEALS , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 School records , <b>Base value:</b> 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring School records , <b>Previous Follow-up:</b> 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring School records , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.12 WFP programme monitoring school records	>6.00	-4.00	-21.00	21.00
<b>SO3 Reduce risk and enable people, communities and countries to meet their own food and nutrition needs</b>				
<b>Improved access to livelihood assets has contributed to enhanced resilience and reduced risks from disaster and shocks faced by targeted food-insecure communities and households</b>				
<b>CAS: percentage of communities with an increased Asset Score</b>				
F/CFA , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 PDM FGD , <b>Base value:</b> 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM FGD , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM FGD	>80.00	0.00	-	60.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score</b>				
F/CFA , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 PDM HH , <b>Base value:</b> 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH	<7.00	35.00	-	33.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score</b>				
F/CFA , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 PDM HH , <b>Base value:</b> 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH	>5.20	26.00	-	25.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score</b>				
F/CFA , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 PDM HH , <b>Base value:</b> 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH	>86.20	39.00	-	42.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b>				
F/CFA , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 PDM HH , <b>Base value:</b> 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH	<8.60	43.00	-	44.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b>				
F/CFA , <b>Project End Target:</b> 2016.12 PDM HH , <b>Base value:</b> 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , <b>Latest Follow-up:</b> 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH	<5.20	26.00	-	24.00

Outcome	Project End Target	Base Value	Previous Follow-up	Latest Follow-up
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b>				
<i>F/CFA , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Base value: 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	>4.80	24.00	-	24.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b>				
<i>F/CFA , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Base value: 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	>5.40	27.00	-	27.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b>				
<i>F/CFA , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Base value: 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	>86.60	33.00	-	33.00
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b>				
<i>F/CFA , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Base value: 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	>89.40	47.00	-	49.00
<b>Diet Diversity Score</b>				
<i>F/CFA , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Base value: 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	>3.30	3.20	-	3.20
<b>Diet Diversity Score (female-headed households)</b>				
<i>F/CFA , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Base value: 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	>3.30	3.20	-	2.79
<b>Diet Diversity Score (male-headed households)</b>				
<i>F/CFA , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Base value: 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	>3.30	3.20	-	3.49
<b>CSI (Food): Coping Strategy Index (average)</b>				
<i>F/CFA , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Base value: 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring HH , Previous Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	<10.00	11.00	12.89	12.89
<b>CSI (Asset Depletion): Percentage of households implementing crisis and emergency coping strategies</b>				
<i>F/CFA , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Base value: 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	<78.00	78.00	-	83.00

Outcome	Project End Target	Base Value	Previous Follow-up	Latest Follow-up
<b>CSI (Asset Depletion): Percentage of male-headed households implementing crisis and emergency coping strategies</b>				
<i>F/CFA , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Base value: 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	<78.00	78.00	-	74.00
<b>CSI (Asset Depletion): Percentage of female-headed households implementing crisis and emergency coping strategies</b>				
<i>F/CFA , Project End Target: 2016.12 PDM HH , Base value: 2014.06 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring PDM HH</i>	<78.00	78.00	-	93.00
<b>Increased marketing opportunities for producers and traders of agricultural products and food at the regional, national and local levels</b>				
<b>Food purchased from regional, national and local suppliers, as % of food distributed by WFP in-country</b>				
<i>P4P , Project End Target: 2016.12 FPTS, WINGS , Base value: 2014.01 WFP programme monitoring FPTS, WINGS , Previous Follow-up: 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring FPTS, WINGS , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring FPTS, WINGS</i>	>10.00	0.00	4.00	14.00
<b>Food purchased from aggregation systems in which smallholders are participating, as % of regional, national and local purchases</b>				
<i>P4P , Project End Target: 2016.12 FPTS, WINGS , Base value: 2014.01 WFP programme monitoring FPTS, WINGS , Previous Follow-up: 2014.12 WFP programme monitoring FPTS, WINGS , Latest Follow-up: 2015.11 WFP programme monitoring FPTS, WINGS</i>	>15.00	0.00	12.00	7.00

## Sustainability, Capacity Development and Handover

As a result of its focus on more stable areas in South Sudan, the PRRO was in a much better position to integrate sustainability efforts into its activities than WFP's emergency operation. WFP became the United Nations partner of choice for resilience building in South Sudan in 2015. It took a leadership role in the development of the United Nations Interim Cooperating Framework (ICF) 2016 - 2017 as the co-chair of both the ICF Outcome Group on *More Resilient Communities* and the Outcome Group on *The Local Economy Reinvigorated*.

FFA and FFE most directly attempted to address these issues, by helping communities safeguard against shocks and enhancing individuals' abilities to improve their circumstances. FFA included natural resource management activities, infrastructure improvement and training initiatives. These contributed to developing the long-term capacities of communities. In 2016, WFP will go back to 50 percent of the locations targeted with FFA in 2015 to assess the contribution of assets to the communities' ability to withstand shocks and stressors. UNICEF's Back to School Initiative, launched in 2015, used a conflict-sensitive approach to deliver a comprehensive package of education, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), child protection, health and nutrition services. FFE was integrated into that package to encourage enrolment and attendance of schoolchildren. The Girls' Incentive continued to target girls' participation in the education sector in South Sudan. Historically overlooked for schooling in South Sudan, the growth and contribution potential of this segment of the population is highlighted by the Girls' Incentive programme.

Due to funding constraints, WFP was not able to implement some of its planned activities and programme changes in refugee camps, including milling vouchers for the duration of 2015 and cash-based transfers (value vouchers). However, in partnership with UNHCR and the Humanitarian Development Consortium, fuel-efficient stoves were distributed in the second half of the year. These not only reduced the negative environmental impact of populations receiving regular food assistance but also enhanced refugee households' resilience by contributing to their household assets.

WFP continued to work closely with the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Animal Resources and Fisheries (MoA) at national and state levels in the planning and implementation of FFA activities. Technical service agreements were

signed between WFP and the MoA in 2014 to address the FFA scale-up and sustainability challenges in a more coordinated manner, and the implementation of these agreements was further enhanced in 2015.

Overall FFA project management in the sub-offices implementing the activities was guided by two state level committees – State Level Steering Committees and State Level Technical Committees comprising staff from the MoA, cooperating partners, FAO and WFP. Both committees met quarterly to review progress.

As part of the technical service agreements, State Level Technical Committee members (including staff from the Ministry, cooperating partners, and United Nations agencies) conducted a series of field visits to investigate achievements, challenges, and future planning and reported back to the Steering Committee. WFP assigned a technical expert to fill capacity gaps during these field visits and increase members' knowledge of the programme.

The Nutrition strategy included close collaboration with the Ministry of Health, at both national and state levels, to manage nutrition gap analysis and appropriate programming. State Ministries of Health showed enthusiasm in increasing their ownership over malnutrition prevention, treatment of moderate acute malnutrition and IFP activities. WFP worked towards the integration of its IFP activities in South Sudan's national HIV policy, in partnership with the Ministry of Health, UNAIDS and the South Sudan Network of People Living with HIV.

The efforts of the P4P programme to provide trainings and capacity development for smallholder farmers and farmers' organizations continued in 2015. By providing them with better storage systems and linking them to markets for their surplus crops, P4P attempted to reach beyond food assistance to build the country's agricultural sector. P4P strengthened farmers organizations' marketing capacities; increasing storage capacities, providing basic equipment and materials for commodity handling, providing transport solutions to carry grains from farms to warehouses, and providing trainings in post-harvest and warehouse management. This allowed them to increase their aggregation capacity and to reduce warehouse handling losses.

WFP's early warning systems and disaster risk management advisor works within the Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs and Disaster Management and closely with the Government's Relief and Rehabilitation Commission (RRC). Their joint efforts led to five state-level early warning plans and protocols being prepared and put in place in 2015. These were informed by the broader hazard analysis and disaster preparedness.

Furthermore, the advisor provided technical support and institutional capacity development for the Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs and the RRC, particularly through an ongoing strategic activity coordinated with UNDP (through their capacity development project which includes a component on early warning flood systems and flood emergency capacity assessments) and WFP's vulnerability analysis and mapping (VAM) activities. The advisor coordinated with FAO, which provides rain gauges to support South Sudan's agrometrological system.

## Inputs

### Resource Inputs

The number of donors and the amount they contributed to the PRRO increased in 2015 from the previous year. As the emergency entered its second year, the focus of assistance in South Sudan broadened to acknowledge the need for and provide support to recovery activities. It was important for those donors to ensure that vulnerable populations in the non-conflict states (refugees and seasonally food-insecure host populations) and groups with the potential to improve their livelihoods were supported.

The bulk of contributions were provided flexibly to the whole operation, allowing WFP to prioritize activities as the situation required.

The contribution from the Government of South Sudan included 2,000 mt of maize originally donated to the government by Tanzania.

Donor	2015 Resourced (mt)		2015 Shipped/Purchased (mt)
	In-Kind	Cash	
Canada	0	1,927	100
Finland	0	840	17
Germany	0	3,572	0

Donor	2015 Resourced (mt)		2015 Shipped/Purchased (mt)
	In-Kind	Cash	
Japan	0	649	0
MULTILATERAL	0	10,908	6,260
Norway	0	1,112	0
Republic of Korea	0	625	0
South Sudan	2,000	0	1,000
Switzerland	0	594	0
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	0	832	35
United Kingdom	0	912	355
USA	69,697	2,415	19,513
<b>Total</b>	<b>71,697</b>	<b>24,386</b>	<b>27,281</b>

See Annex: Resource Inputs from Donors for breakdown by commodity and contribution reference number

## Food Purchases and In-Kind Receipts

The majority of the food commodities WFP procured in 2015 were from the Global Commodity Management Facility (formerly known as the Forward Purchasing Facility), totalling more than 23,300 mt. The GCMF has a number of regional storage facilities that allow WFP to stock food commodities purchased in bulk in anticipation of requests from country offices. This allowed WFP in South Sudan to avoid a lengthy procurement process, thus reducing delivery lead times. Globally, the GCMF also provided WFP the opportunity to maximize its cost-efficiency – purchasing commodities that are in demand at different times of the year when prices are favourable. The second largest proportion of commodities was sourced internationally (about 22,400 mt), including in-kind contributions received. A remarkable 1,300 mt of maize was procured locally from smallholder farmers through the P4P programme. Finally, approximately 300 mt of salt was procured from Kenya.

Commodities	Local (mt)	Developing Country (mt)	Other International (mt)	GCMF (mt)
Corn Soya Blend	0	0	2,335	6,286
Iodised Salt	0	300	0	0
Maize	1,286	0	0	415
Ready To Use Supplementary Food	0	0	187	0
Sorghum/Millet	0	0	12,780	15,437
Split Peas	0	0	4,600	964
Sugar	0	0	0	103
Vegetable Oil	0	0	2,450	182
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,286</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>22,353</b>	<b>23,386</b>

## Food Transport, Delivery and Handling

The logistical problems faced by WFP, other humanitarian actors and commercial entities in South Sudan are well-documented. It has been estimated that 60 percent of the country becomes inaccessible for approximately half

of the year during the rainy season. During the past two years, as the conflict has made maintenance of already limited infrastructure either impossible or deprioritized, this figure has no doubt grown. Roads that were previously considered all-year have begun to deteriorate. Furthermore, insecurity in the Greater Equatoria region – typically a non-violent area – put the safety of transporters and WFP commodities at risk. This led to a decrease in the amount of food that could be transported along the critical Western Corridor, the series of roads leading from Juba (the country's capital in Central Equatoria state) to Wau (capital of Western Bahr el Ghazal state) and Bentiu (in the north, capital of Unity state).

Prepositioning continued to be critical to the continuation of WFP's PRRO during the rainy season. Food commodities were transported to and stored in locations during the dry season closer to populations that would become inaccessible once the rains began. Furthermore, renewed transport corridor agreements from neighboring governments (Kenya, Uganda, Ethiopia and Sudan), remained vital to the successful transportation of food assistance into South Sudan.

## Post-Delivery Losses

WFP built on its experiences from 2014, leading to a significant reduction in the amount of food lost in 2015. Still, there were looting incidents recorded between May and October 2015, particularly in Western Equatoria, when fighting began in Mundri and escalated in the region. This unfortunately converged with WFP's last push to preposition food before the rains started (the South Sudan rainy season typically lasts from about May to December).

To further mitigate losses, commodity management training workshops have been extended to cooperating partners. Moving forward in 2016, WFP will enhance the supervision of warehouses; further improve warehouse infrastructure; and use stringent selection criteria for new warehouse locations take into account the volatile security situation.

Detailed post-delivery loss information will be provided in the Report on Post-Delivery Losses for the Period 1 January - 31 December 2015, presented to the WFP Executive Board in June 2016.

## Management

### Partnerships

In order to foster coherence among different programme modalities, leverage economies of scale and enhance internal systems and processes, in 2015 WFP launched an open call for proposals to optimize field-level agreements based on partner's footprint and capacity to deliver quality programmes and build complementarities with other ongoing activities. To enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of nutrition activities, WFP aligned its activities for prevention of acute malnutrition and treatment of moderate acute malnutrition with UNICEF's services for treatment of severe acute malnutrition as part of the CMAM model wherever possible. These activities are also integrated into the broader nutrition cluster coordination efforts, to ensure that WFP contributes to the broader national strategy to create the necessary synergies for long-term impact. Similarly, FFE partners worked in schools where UNICEF and other education partners were also present. In 2015 WFP signed a MOU on education with UNICEF to ensure convergence in schools supported by both agencies under the Back to Learning initiative. Related to this, WFP deployed a strategy to select education partners in the implementation of FFE, seeking complementarity activities around WFP supported schools and an education package as comprehensive as possible.

Linkages were established between FFA and P4P activities with other FAO agricultural production interventions in the same geographical areas. Efforts were also made to rationalize the number of partners by county or by activity in order to reduce the burden of managing invoicing and reporting processes, for example through the development of merged field-level agreements. Until 2015, each partner had an FLA per state, and at times per implementation modality, resulting in multiple FLAs per partner. After internal consultation and sharing of experiences with other WFP country offices (such as WFP Uganda), WFP decided to merge all the FLAs under one partner into one, regardless of geography and/or implementation modality.

These efforts built on a wider Quality Implementation Partnership Strategy, working with key partners including national NGOs and community-based organizations (CBOs) to identify and address capacity gaps, enhance coherence and improve impact and outcomes. The foundations of this strategy were laid through the development of a Resilience Context Analysis, conducted in partnership with the Government of South Sudan (Ministry of



Agriculture and the National Bureau of Statistics), United Nations agencies (FAO, UNICEF, UNDP, OCHA, and UN Women), and other international institutions (World Bank and FEWS NET). This analysis provided the basis for a framework for the design of more cohesive, systematic and strategic resilience-enhancing operations, based on strong evidence-based programming and a multi-stakeholder approach.

WFP strived to strengthen the policy dialogue around national resilience plans and strategies and to engage with country coordination mechanisms to ensure that WFP's full spectrum of interventions and tools is leveraged, complementing and creating synergies with partner activities. This effort was articulated in different stages: in the short and medium term, coordination focused on operational coordination with partners. Over the long term, WFP's approach will focus on state-level institutional strengthening, for example through upgrading the existing FFA Steering Committees into broader resilience platforms with inputs from partners in other sectors, and national and international NGO capacity development to ensure sustainable outcomes. Thus, a dedicated roving consultant was recruited to travel to the different sub-offices and conduct training as needed in WFP processes (such as reporting and invoicing), as well as identify gaps to be addressed through a comprehensive capacity development strategy in 2016.

In refugee settings, WFP worked closely with NGO partners to provide the needed food assistance, in coordination with UNHCR. Nutrition assistance in this setting was provided through tripartite agreements as per the WFP/UNHCR Global Memorandum of Understanding. In 2015, a joint assessment mission (JAM) was undertaken in partnership with UNHCR as well as FAO, and the findings covered the state of refugees in South Sudan and explored livelihood opportunities and durable solutions.

All cooperating partners committed significant resources to the projects, proportional to the level of activities implemented. International NGOs tended to have higher levels of resources contributed towards the projects, while small community-based NGOs provided lower levels as WFP invested its own resources to develop their capacity. While not monetary, the commitment and efforts made by the national NGOs over the long term are extremely valuable to the PRRO, as it is a direct contribution to the resilience of the communities.

Significant partners for food-based FFA activities included Norwegian People's Aid, Aweil Project for Agriculture Development, Wunnagap Agricultural Development Agency (a national NGO), and the Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development (ACTED). Under cash-based FFA, the main partners included Action Against Hunger (ACF), Women for Women International (WfWI) and World Vision International.

Overall, WFP worked closely with partners at national and sub-national levels on several initiatives. It continued to chair relevant Steering Committees and Technical Management Committees, organized at state level to ensure joint management and monitoring of activities. Members of these committees included state ministries, FAO and other relevant stakeholders, including national and international NGOs and CBOs. These committees provided ideal working platforms to coordinate a diverse range of activities at state level, spanning for example from WFP FFA to Safety Net Public Works implemented by the Government with support by the World Bank. WFP was also part of the Social Protection Working Group, led by the Ministry of Gender, aimed at coordinating social protection efforts around the National Policy Framework, as well as facilitating operational coordination through information sharing.

Partnership	NGO		Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement	UN/IO
	National	International		
Total	33	25		5

Cross-cutting Indicators	Project End Target	Latest Follow-up
<b>Amount of complementary funds provided to the project by partners (including NGOs, civil society, private sector organizations, international financial institutions and regional development banks)</b>		
<i>SOUTH SUDAN, General Distribution (GD) , Project End Target: 2016.12 , Latest Follow-up: 2015.12</i>	>4,200,000.00	9,000,000.00
<b>Number of partner organizations that provide complementary inputs and services</b>		
<i>SOUTH SUDAN, General Distribution (GD) , Project End Target: 2016.12 , Latest Follow-up: 2015.12</i>	=36.00	88.00
<b>Proportion of project activities implemented with the engagement of complementary partners</b>		
<i>SOUTH SUDAN, General Distribution (GD) , Project End Target: 2016.12 , Latest Follow-up: 2015.12</i>	=100.00	100.00



## Lessons Learned

WFP will continue to strengthen effective communication channels through new partnerships, standardized age- and gender-sensitive messaging, and formal complaints and feedback mechanisms that are safe and accessible for all beneficiaries. WFP, in cooperation with its partners, needs to continue its efforts to allow beneficiaries to report protection concerns or incidents as well as provide feedback in a safe, trusted and accessible manner.

Further gains are needed on the country's early warning and preparedness systems. Through the National Early Warning Technical Working Group and its VAM unit, WFP will continue to develop the Government's capacity in this area.

There are two significant groups facing protracted displacements in South Sudan – refugees in the Greater Equatoria states, Unity and Upper Nile, and the Abyei displaced. Under the global WFP-UNHCR programme of self-reliance for refugees, opportunities will be sought to transition those populations from general food assistance to livelihoods-based programming. This may include agreements to provide those groups with access to land for cultivation (which would otherwise keep them from inclusion in FFA activities). The South Sudan and Sudan Country Offices developed a “One WFP, One Programme” strategy to address needs in the Abyei area within a conflict-sensitive framework. The next steps of that strategy will be to transition that population from general food assistance to more nuanced programmes consisting of FFA, FFE and nutrition assistance.

The implementation of FFA activities was repeatedly constrained in 2015 due to funding shortfalls. While WFP will continue to prioritize life-saving interventions for the most vulnerable populations, it recognizes the need to ensure that FFA remains a strong link in the shift from unconditional food transfers to more diverse, longer-term programming that can provide communities with increased protection against the effects of shocks.

WFP will continue to expand its use of biometric registration to enhance accuracy in its targeting. Moreover, the use of cash-based transfers (CBT) should be expanded where possible in the coming years to avoid some of the logistical challenges faced by large-scale food deliveries in South Sudan, and increase beneficiaries' choice and dignity as well as overall local market activity. The main difficulties in the expansion are related to South Sudan's declining economic situation and an unstable market supply. Over the coming years, WFP will use a prudent but ambitious approach, based on solid market analysis, to move forward with shifting its assistance towards increase of cash-based transfers.

## Endnotes

Partnerships Cross-Cutting Indicators are reported for all PRRO activities.

## Operational Statistics

### Annex: Participants by Activity and Modality

Activity	Planned			Actual			% Actual v. Planned		
	Food	CBT	Total	Food	CBT	Total	Food	CBT	Total
General Distribution (GD)	70,206	-	70,206	72,009	-	72,009	102.6%	-	102.6%
School Feeding (on-site)	220,000	-	220,000	219,636	-	219,636	99.8%	-	99.8%
School Feeding (take-home rations)	21,300	-	21,300	22,943	-	22,943	107.7%	-	107.7%
Food-Assistance-for-Assets	59,271	16,114	75,385	44,000	12,652	56,652	74.2%	78.5%	75.2%
Nutrition: Treatment of Moderate Acute Malnutrition	262,649	-	262,649	253,128	-	253,128	96.4%	-	96.4%
Nutrition: Prevention of Acute Malnutrition	154,064	-	154,064	159,204	-	159,204	103.3%	-	103.3%

Activity	Planned			Actual			% Actual v. Planned		
	Food	CBT	Total	Food	CBT	Total	Food	CBT	Total
General Distribution (GD)	70,206	-	70,206	72,009	-	72,009	102.6%	-	102.6%
HIV/TB: Care&Treatment	11,986	-	11,986	6,228	-	6,228	52.0%	-	52.0%

## Annex: Resource Inputs from Donors

Donor	Cont. Ref. No.	Commodity	Resourced in 2015 (mt)		Shipped/Purchased in 2015 (mt)
			In-Kind	Cash	
Canada		Iodised Salt	0	0	100
Canada	CAN-C-00507-11	Corn Soya Blend	0	1,727	0
Canada	CAN-C-00507-11	Iodised Salt	0	100	0
Canada	CAN-C-00507-11	Sugar	0	100	0
Finland	FIN-C-00108-03	Corn Soya Blend	0	815	0
Finland	FIN-C-00108-03	Maize	0	25	17
Germany	GER-C-00426-01	Sorghum/Millet	0	3,272	0
Germany	GER-C-00426-01	Split Peas	0	300	0
Japan	JPN-C-00432-01	Sorghum/Millet	0	556	0
Japan	JPN-C-00432-01	Split Peas	0	94	0
MULTILATERAL	MULTILATERAL	Corn Soya Blend	0	2,797	354
MULTILATERAL	MULTILATERAL	Iodised Salt	0	213	108
MULTILATERAL	MULTILATERAL	Maize	0	304	684
MULTILATERAL	MULTILATERAL	Sorghum/Millet	0	7,412	4,652
MULTILATERAL	MULTILATERAL	Split Peas	0	105	385
MULTILATERAL	MULTILATERAL	Vegetable Oil	0	78	78
Norway	NOR-C-00312-04	Corn Soya Blend	0	141	0
Norway	NOR-C-00312-04	Maize	0	299	0
Norway	NOR-C-00312-04	Sorghum/Millet	0	378	0
Norway	NOR-C-00312-04	Split Peas	0	295	0
Republic of Korea	KOR-C-00104-01	Sorghum/Millet	0	625	0
South Sudan	SDS-C-00010-01	Maize	500	0	500
South Sudan	SDS-C-00012-01	Maize	1,025	0	500
South Sudan	SDS-C-00013-01	Maize	475	0	0
Switzerland	SWI-C-00485-01	Corn Soya Blend	0	594	0
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies		Iodised Salt	0	0	7

Donor	Cont. Ref. No.	Commodity	Resourced in 2015 (mt)		Shipped/Purchased in 2015 (mt)
			In-Kind	Cash	
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01189-02	Corn Soya Blend	0	251	0
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01278-01	Corn Soya Blend	0	48	0
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01278-01	Iodised Salt	0	7	0
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01278-01	Sorghum/Millet	0	450	0
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01278-01	Split Peas	0	45	0
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01278-01	Sugar	0	3	0
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01278-01	Vegetable Oil	0	29	29
United Kingdom	UK -C-00247-01	Sorghum/Millet	0	355	355
United Kingdom	UK -C-00247-01	Split Peas	0	60	0
United Kingdom	UK -C-00247-01	Vegetable Oil	0	36	0
United Kingdom	UK -C-00249-01	Iodised Salt	0	6	0
United Kingdom	UK -C-00249-01	Sorghum/Millet	0	390	0
United Kingdom	UK -C-00249-01	Split Peas	0	65	0
USA		Corn Soya Blend	0	0	2,035
USA		Ready To Use Supplementary Food	0	0	180
USA		Sorghum/Millet	0	0	12,780
USA		Split Peas	0	0	677
USA		Vegetable Oil	0	0	410
USA	USA-C-01047-03	Ready To Use Supplementary Food	0	0	7
USA	USA-C-01047-03	Split Peas	0	0	1,364
USA	USA-C-01047-03	Vegetable Oil	17	0	810
USA	USA-C-01047-04	Corn Soya Blend	840	0	301
USA	USA-C-01047-04	Ready To Use Supplementary Food	180	0	0
USA	USA-C-01047-05	Corn Soya Blend	1,500	0	0
USA	USA-C-01047-05	Sorghum/Millet	12,780	0	0
USA	USA-C-01047-05	Split Peas	250	0	950
USA	USA-C-01047-05	Vegetable Oil	400	0	0
USA	USA-C-01047-07	Maize	0	415	0

Donor	Cont. Ref. No.	Commodity	Resourced in 2015 (mt)		Shipped/Purchased in 2015 (mt)
			In-Kind	Cash	
USA	USA-C-01047-07	Sorghum/Millet	0	2,000	0
USA	USA-C-01047-08	Peas	2,310	0	0
USA	USA-C-01047-08	Sorghum/Millet	46,000	0	0
USA	USA-C-01047-08	Split Peas	1,630	0	0
USA	USA-C-01047-08	Vegetable Oil	3,790	0	0
Total			71,697	24,386	27,281