

# Standard Project Report 2015

Reporting Period: 1 January - 31 December 2015

## WEST AFRICA (DAKAR)

Providing life-saving support to households in Cameroon, Chad and Niger directly affected by insecurity in northern Nigeria

Project Number	200777
Project Category	Regional EMOP
Overall Planned Beneficiaries	555,000
Planned Beneficiaries in 2015	555,000
Total Beneficiaries in 2015	488,638

Project Approval Date	31 Dec 2014
Planned Start Date	01 Jan 2015
Actual Start Date	01 Jan 2015
Project End Date	31 Dec 2016
Financial Closure Date	n.a.

Approved budget as 31 December 2015 in USD	
Capacity Dev.t and Augmentation	4,439,591
Cash--based Transfer and Related Costs	22,418,685
Direct Support Costs	28,464,301
Food and Related Costs	128,397,236
Indirect Support Costs	12,860,387
<b>Total Approved Budget</b>	<b>196,580,200</b>

Commodities	Metric Tonnes
Total Approved Commodities	129,498
Planned Commodities in 2015	64,727
Actual Commodities in 2015	39,587

## 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 Population
- 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

#### OPERATIONAL STATISTICS (where applicable)

- Annex: Resource Inputs from Donors
- Annex: Food Transport, Delivery and Handling
- Annex: Commodity Transactions

- Contribution & Expenditure as a Proportion of Budget
- Project Overview
- Project Detail by Contribution
- Status of Contributions Receivable

# Operational SPR

## OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES AND RELEVANCE

Since early 2013, returnee and refugee populations have been fleeing northern Nigeria across land and water borders to Cameroon, Chad and Niger. In the beginning of 2014, numbers were relatively low and populations were supported under WFP or partner existing activities. However, growing insecurity in 2014 led to important peaks in arrivals, in particular in August, bringing the need to activate a regional response. The continuation of widespread violence in Northeastern Nigeria and neighboring countries has caused massive population movements in the four Lake Chad Basin Countries with destruction of livelihoods and assets.

As the tensions in northern Nigeria intensified through 2015, there was a sharp increase in population displacement which further deprived chronically poor areas. Border countries therefore continued to support refugees, returnees, vulnerable host populations and internally displaced persons (IDPs) affected by the crisis.

Insecurity, displacement, disrupted agricultural activities, and cross border trade, which further undermined communities' livelihoods and led to a limited access to and availability of food. The disruption of farming activities in Cameroon, of trade and local farming in Chad and of the export of fish and livestock in Niger all contributed to an increasing level of food insecurity in the region.

By mid-October 2015, more than 4.7 million people were in moderate and severe food insecurity in Cameroon, Chad and Niger as well as Nigeria, the heart of the crisis.

In this context, in which the crisis has exacerbated the food insecurity of IDPs, refugees, returnees, and has greatly affected the coping strategies of local populations, the regional EMOP seeks to address these critical food and nutrition needs in the three Lake Chad Basin Countries (LCBC) of Cameroon, Chad and Niger. In Nigeria, as of September 2015, WFP signed memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) to provide capacity strengthening to their response to the crisis in the North East.

Specifically, the EMOP aims to:

- (i) Ensure the food needs of crisis-affected populations through flexible and context-specific responses;
- (ii) Stabilize the nutrition situation of crisis-affected children through robust prevention programmes adapted to nutrition indicators of population groups;

In line with the WFP Strategic Plan, the project contributes to Strategic Objective 1, "Save lives and protect livelihoods in emergencies."

Launched in January 2015, the regional emergency operation for the Lac Chad Basin supports populations displaced by the insecurity in northern Nigeria by the Boko Haram crisis. WFP has scaled up its operations throughout the year in response to multiple population movements resulting from cross-border attacks.

Under this EMOP, in response to rising food insecurity, malnutrition risks and continued displacement in the Lake Chad Basin, WFP aims at providing equitable assistance to the women and men within the refugee, IDP and local communities. Special efforts were made to provide a dedicated attention to gender considerations, in particular raising awareness to reduce the risk of sexual and gender-based violence in border areas and camps.

In Nigeria, in line with the MoU and in order to enable a hands on support by experienced WFP staff, WFP set up a base in Borno and Yobe Northern Nigerian states. Technical workshops on emergency management capacities were delivered to participants from national and state emergency agencies and partners.

WFP also supported the roll-out of the Cadre Harmonise regional food security classification framework in Nigeria. At the request of the Humanitarian Coordinator, in mid-2015 WFP launched United Nations Humanitarian Air Services (UNHAS) connecting humanitarian responders to the capital and northern states.

## RESULTS

### Beneficiaries, Targeting and Distribution

The geographic targeting and emergency focus of this regional operation ensured no duplication with activities ongoing under parallel resilience-building and development operations. Rather, the project was designed to recognize the complementarity and linkages with other in-country WFP operations. Parallel operations played an important role in stabilizing tensions and in ensuring equal access to malnutrition treatment services, schooling, and safety net programmes for displaced and local populations alike.

Across the three receiving countries the situation was exacerbated by a highly volatile and insecure operating environment.

In Niger, the increasing influx of displaced populations exacerbated the consequences generated by the lean season while from June to September 2015, WFP carried out its country wide lean season response. WFP maintained the lean season part of the response under the Protracted Relief and Recovery Operations (PRRO). However, it continued to assist some 30,000 people under the EMOP, in and-out of the camps during the four-month lean season period, keeping a standby capacity in place to respond to new arrivals.

In Niger, recognizing the varied composition of migration flow into the region, WFP used the Household Economy Analysis (HEA) socio-economic targeting methodology to ensure that beneficiaries were targeted based on vulnerability and not on status. All outside camp populations were included in this exercise, including IDPs, refugees, returnees and host populations. This ensured that the most vulnerable households (without able bodies and female headed households) within different categories in need of food security, received assistance under the EMOP.

In the Diffa region, WFP supported 5,000 refugees in the refugee camps through monthly food distributions. Some 78,760 refugees, displaced populations (returnee and IDPs) and vulnerable host communities were assisted through general food distributions outside of the camp setting. The food security response was linked from the start to WFP's blanket feeding activity in an effort to ensure that the most vulnerable children aged 6-59 months and pregnant women and nursing mothers (PWNM) receive the micronutrient and caloric value to prevent an increase in malnutrition and mortality. As a result of the increased pressure on food stocks and competition for resources in the region due to the continued influx, host communities came under pressure and were included under the regional strategy to ensure that their most basic food needs were met. In Niger, WFP assisted 21,500 children from 6 to 59 months through the distribution of a blanket supplementary feeding (BSF) ration of 200g Super Cereal Plus and 6,371 pregnant women and nursing mothers through a distribution of blanket feeding ration of 250g Super Cereal and 25g of Oil. The nutritional package included active screening for malnutrition in children aged 6-59 months, nutrition and hygiene education and referrals.

Targeted supplementary feeding (TSF) treatment for moderate acute malnutrition in the Diffa region was maintained under the PRRO (Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation) response, with the exception of TSF activities in the Sayam Forage refugee camp funded by this EMOP. Great efforts were made to ensure the delivery of nutrition commodities to the camp enabling the treatment of moderately malnourished children and women to prevent an increase in malnutrition rates within camp settings.

In the beginning of January 2015, the Lac region in Chad received significant numbers of returnee and refugee populations fleeing northern Nigeria for whom a dedicated site was created. WFP provided food assistance to these refugees and returnees through monthly general food distributions. The entitlements consisted of cereals, pulses, vegetable oil and salt. This assistance was initially provided by WFP through its PRRO 200713.

From September 2015 onwards in Chad, food assistance was provided to these target groups through this regional EMOP. As per the conclusions of local market monitoring activities carried out by WFP in Chad, the economic disruption resulting from the insecurity and borders closure had a substantial impact on local markets, which pushed WFP to delay the launch of the cash and voucher component of this operation. As a result of this, commodity-based assistance was provided to refugees and out of camp populations. Due to the high levels of insecurity, distributions also became increasingly difficult.

The increase in the number of internally displaced populations that previously resided in the islands and lakeshore of the Lac Region, led to the relocation of these populations in 18 identified sites across this region. They were also provided with an emergency food entitlement made of cereals, pulses, vegetable oil and salt.

Due to pipeline breaks in specialized nutritional commodities, initially planned blanket supplementary feeding activities targeting refugee and displaced children under 5 in the Lac region, were carried out under the PRRO 200713 rather than under the regional EMOP.

In Cameroon, during the initial phase of the operation, resource constraints forced WFP to prioritize food support to refugees only. However, as new resources were secured, assistance was gradually expanded to IDPs from April and host populations as of June. WFP managed to scale up assistance reaching nearly 100 percent of the targeted beneficiaries towards the end of the year. Food support was provided on a continuous basis to all Nigerian refugees in the Minawao camp. Great efforts were made to provide complete food baskets while incorporating new arrivals at each round of food distributions.

WFP launched a Blanket Supplementary Feeding Programme (BSFP) in Minawao refugee camp to prevent a deterioration of an already precarious nutrition situation. From February to August, children 6-59 months and pregnant and lactating women (PLW) were targeted. As the nutrition situation improved in the camp, BSFP was revised to account for children 6-23 months only. Resource constraints prevented WFP's efforts to extend this programme to IDPs and host populations as planned.

The Targeted Supplementary Feeding Programme (TSFP) provided treatment for children under 5 and PLW suffering from Moderate Acute Malnutrition (MAM). The programme targeted Nigerian refugees, IDPs and local populations in the affected areas. WFP significantly augmented support through the year, expanding assistance from 47 to 186 health centers across the region. Intensifying insecurity and access restrictions hampered regular supply to remote areas and several health facilities were closed down due to insecurity.

Beneficiary Category	Planned			Actual			% Actual v. Planned		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
<b>Cameroon</b>									
Number of adults	21,440	23,794	45,234	14,757	23,441	38,198	68.8%	98.5%	84.4%
Number of children 5 to 18 years of age	38,521	42,748	81,269	39,768	44,132	83,900	103.2%	103.2%	103.2%
Number of children below 5 years of age	56,168	62,329	118,497	32,232	35,768	68,000	57.4%	57.4%	57.4%
Total number of beneficiaries in 2015	116,129	128,871	245,000	86,757	103,341	190,098	74.7%	80.2%	77.6%
The total number of beneficiaries includes all targeted persons who were provided with WFP food during the reporting period - either as a recipient/participant in one or more of the following groups, or from a household food ration distributed to one of these recipients/participants									
<b>Niger</b>									
Number of adults	16,848	29,952	46,800	36,615	35,358	71,973	217.3%	118.0%	153.8%
Number of children 5 to 18 years of age	21,216	20,384	41,600	19,578	18,908	38,486	92.3%	92.8%	92.5%
Number of children below 5 years of age	21,216	20,384	41,600	12,382	12,952	25,334	58.4%	63.5%	60.9%
Total number of beneficiaries in 2015	59,280	70,720	130,000	68,575	67,218	135,793	115.7%	95.0%	104.5%
The total number of beneficiaries includes all targeted persons who were provided with WFP food during the reporting period - either as a recipient/participant in one or more of the following groups, or from a household food ration distributed to one of these recipients/participants									
<b>Chad</b>									
Number of adults	40,400	41,381	81,781	36,527	37,415	73,942	90.4%	90.4%	90.4%
Number of children 5 to 18 years of age	30,541	31,283	61,824	27,614	28,284	55,898	90.4%	90.4%	90.4%
Number of children below 5 years of age	17,979	18,416	36,395	16,256	16,651	32,907	90.4%	90.4%	90.4%
Total number of beneficiaries in 2015	88,920	91,080	180,000	80,397	82,350	162,747	90.4%	90.4%	90.4%
The total number of beneficiaries includes all targeted persons who were provided with WFP food during the reporting period - either as a recipient/participant in one or more of the following groups, or from a household food ration distributed to one of these recipients/participants									

Beneficiary Category	Planned			Actual			% Actual v. Planned		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
<b>Cameroon</b>									
Internally Displaced Persons	37,920	42,080	80,000	39,328	40,526	79,854	103.7%	96.3%	99.8%
Children 24 to 59 months given food under blanket supplementary feeding (prevention of acute malnutrition)	17,189	17,716	34,905	3,581	3,691	7,272	20.8%	20.8%	20.8%
Pregnant and lactating women participating in blanket supplementary feeding (prevention of moderate acute malnutrition)		5,760	5,760		1,038	1,038		18.0%	18.0%
Beneficiaries of General food distribution (GFD)/ targeted food distribution/assistance (GFD-TFD/A)	71,412	73,588	145,000	73,787	76,035	149,822	103.3%	103.3%	103.3%
Refugees	21,285	23,715	45,000	24,609	25,359	49,968	115.6%	106.9%	111.0%
Children 24 to 59 months given food under supplementary feeding (treatment for moderate malnutrition)	13,756	13,349	27,105	16,341	16,839	33,180	118.8%	126.1%	122.4%
Children 6 to 23 months given food under blanket supplementary feeding (prevention of acute malnutrition)	9,256	9,539	18,795	1,929	1,988	3,917	20.8%	20.8%	20.8%
Children 6 to 23 months given food under supplementary feeding (treatment for moderate malnutrition)	7,188	7,407	14,595	8,799	9,067	17,866	122.4%	122.4%	122.4%
Pregnant and lactating women participating in targeted supplementary feeding (treatment for moderate acute malnutrition)		8,800	8,800		29,589	29,589		336.2%	336.2%
<b>Niger</b>									
Children 24 to 59 months given food under blanket supplementary feeding (prevention of acute malnutrition)	3,907	4,167	8,074	3,339	3,545	6,884	85.5%	85.1%	85.3%
Pregnant and lactating women participating in blanket supplementary feeding (prevention of moderate acute malnutrition)		0	0		6,371	6,371		-	-
Beneficiaries of General food distribution (GFD)/ targeted food distribution/assistance (GFD-TFD/A)	65,650	64,350	130,000	68,575	67,218	135,793	104.5%	104.5%	104.5%
Refugees	20,200	19,800	40,000	17,929	17,574	35,503	88.8%	88.8%	88.8%
Children 6 to 23 months given food under blanket supplementary feeding (prevention of acute malnutrition)	8,855	9,115	17,970	7,094	7,532	14,626	80.1%	82.6%	81.4%
Returnees	27,775	27,225	55,000	50,646	49,644	100,290	182.3%	182.3%	182.3%
<b>Chad</b>									
Internally Displaced Persons	12,500	12,500	25,000	35,787	36,657	72,444	286.3%	293.3%	289.8%
Beneficiaries of General food distribution (GFD)/ targeted food distribution/assistance (GFD-TFD/A)	69,123	70,877	140,000	80,396	82,351	162,747	116.3%	116.2%	116.2%
Refugees	7,410	7,590	15,000	2,571	2,634	5,205	34.7%	34.7%	34.7%
Children receiving school meals	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
Children 6 to 23 months given food under blanket supplementary feeding (prevention of acute malnutrition)	2,964	3,036	6,000	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cash-Based Transfer Beneficiaries	19,910	20,090	40,000	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

## Commodity Distribution

Commodity	Planned Distribution (mt)	Actual Distribution (mt)	% Actual v. Planned
<b>Cameroon</b>			
Beans	135	440	325.9%
Corn-soya Blend (csb)	3,060	1,612	52.7%
Iodised Salt	252	76	30.3%
Ready To Use Supplementary Food	761	183	24.0%
Rice	22,680	14,156	62.4%
Split Peas	3,645	1,470	40.3%
Sugar	137	36	26.3%
Vegetable Oil	1,314	782	59.5%
<b>Sum</b>	<b>31,984</b>	<b>18,755</b>	<b>58.6%</b>
<b>Niger</b>			
Beans	3,324	1,037	31.2%
Bulgur Wheat	0	586	-
Corn-soya Blend (csb)	2,384	1,432	60.1%
Iodised Salt	52	9	17.3%
Lentils	0	612	-
Ready To Use Supplementary Food	76	2	2.4%
Rice	2,356	2,025	86.0%
Sorghum/millet	13,595	8,830	65.0%
Split Peas	75	848	1,130.2%
Vegetable Oil	771	559	72.5%
<b>Sum</b>	<b>22,633</b>	<b>15,940</b>	<b>70.4%</b>
<b>Chad</b>			
Corn-soya Blend (csb)	721	48	6.7%
Lentils		325	
Maize	600	646	107.7%
Rice	5,452	1,937	35.5%
Sorghum/millet	2,111	1,294	61.3%
Split Peas	606	322	53.1%
Vegetable Oil	620	321	51.7%
<b>Sum</b>	<b>10,110</b>	<b>4,892</b>	<b>48.4%</b>
<b>Total for 2015</b>	<b>64,727</b>	<b>39,587</b>	<b>61.2%</b>

Cash-Based Transfer	Planned Distribution (USD)	Actual Distribution (USD)	% Actual v. Planned
Cash	1,046,195		
Vouchers	1,575,600		
<b>Total for 2015</b>	<b>2,621,795</b>		

## 'Story Worth Telling'

Falmata, mother of five, fled her home in Fotokol after the village turned into a war zone between Boko haram and the government. In a few days, the whole town was emptied of its population. Along with thousands of other families, they sought refuge in the town of Kousseri, located in Cameroon close to the Chadian border.

Falmata's life was completely turned upside down. In Kousseri, the community provided the family with some food and a floor to sleep on, but as the lean season approached, the hosting community barely had enough food to provide for themselves. Falmata was forced to turn to begging to feed her children.

This is where WFP stepped in, providing monthly rations of rice, oil, pulses and salt as part of food assistance to over 10,000 IDPs in Kousseri. Some local families also received support to relieve the pressure of hosting additional members in their homes

"I am so grateful for the help we received," said Falmata, "I can now provide daily meals for my children without having to go begging for food".

Falmata and her family are amongst the 80,000 IDPs who received food support in the Far North region this year.

## Progress Towards Gender Equality

In the Diffa region, regular assessments were conducted using qualitative and quantitative tools. During group and individual interviews, problems and concerns were raised regarding gender, age, cultural background and legal status. Among these, post distribution monitoring (PDM) assessments focused on needs, ration size and utilization to adapt ongoing projects and inform future project design. The distribution monitoring (DM) noted that in Diffa, 3/4 of the 79 sites visited had a medium available to record the number of participants by gender. The Joint Assessment Mission (JAM) conducted by UNHCR, WFP and the Government of Niger was an opportunity to assess the Age, Gender and Diversity (AGD) approach compliance around food assistance. The assessment took into consideration cultural, religious and special needs in order to adapt on-going projects and complement future project design.

In Chad, almost half of refugee and recently arrived IDP households are headed by women, and over two thirds of the members of these households are children and elderly. This situation is quite different from that in the food insecure local populations, where the demographic composition is more in line with national and regional tendencies. As a result refugee and IDP women played a significant role as members and leaders of food distribution committees, reaching established corporate targets at this level. Within the host community, on the other hand, women were less well represented in distribution committees and were less likely to have been trained by cooperating partners.

In Cameroon, According to WFP monitoring results, 45 percent of women reported making decisions over the use of food in the household while 9 percent of men and women from the same household reported making joint decisions. Traditional power structures in the Far North remain a challenge for ensuring equal gender participation in decision making. However, WFP and partners made efforts to increase women's roles through community awareness-raising stressing the importance of equal participation. In order to improve women's control over food in the household, WFP ensured that women held a large proportion of decision-making seats in food distribution committees. The proportion of female headed households reported making decisions indicated a decrease from the baseline value. This could be related to the fact that a large number of new refugees arrived through the year, and thus the beneficiary groups surveyed were slightly different.

WFP also encouraged men to participate in nutrition and health education sessions and raised the awareness of traditional leaders on nutrition-sensitive issues.

Cross-cutting Indicators	Project end Target	Base Value	Previous Follow-up	Latest Follow-up
	Target Val	(at start of project or benchmark)	(penultimate follow-up)	(latest value measured)
<b>Cameroon</b>				
<b>Proportion of households where females and males together make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, WFP monitoring, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Apr-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	30	13	5	9.22
<b>Proportion of households where females make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, WFP monitoring, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Apr-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	30	53	45	45.85
<b>Proportion of households where males make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, WFP monitoring, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Apr-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	40	34	50	44.93

Cross-cutting Indicators	Project end Target	Base Value	Previous Follow-up	Latest Follow-up
	Target Val	(at start of project or benchmark)	(penultimate follow-up)	(latest value measured)
<b>Proportion of women beneficiaries in leadership positions of project management committees</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, WFP monitoring, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Apr-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	60	50	29	29
<b>Proportion of women project management committee members trained on modalities of food, cash, or voucher distribution</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, WFP monitoring, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Apr-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	50	50	71	71
<b>Niger</b>				
<b>Proportion of households where females and males together make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Base value: Jun-2015, PDM Diffa, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey.	14.8	15		21
<b>Proportion of households where females make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Base value: Jun-2015, PDM Diffa, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey.	29.7	30		13
<b>Proportion of households where males make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Base value: Jun-2015, PDM Diffa, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey.	55.5	55		66
<b>Proportion of women beneficiaries in leadership positions of project management committees</b>				
Base value: Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, Compilation checklists, Secondary data.	50	0		53
<b>Chad</b>				
<b>Proportion of households where females and males together make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	15			100
<b>Proportion of households where females and males together make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, WFP Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	15			33
<b>Proportion of households where females make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, Programme monitoring.	70			66
<b>Proportion of households where females make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, Programme monitoring.	15			3
<b>Proportion of households where females make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	70			0
<b>Proportion of households where females make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, WFP Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	70			67
<b>Proportion of households where males make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, Programme monitoring.	15			31
<b>Proportion of households where males make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, WFP Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	15			0
<b>Proportion of households where males make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, WFP survey.	15			0
<b>Proportion of women beneficiaries in leadership positions of project management committees</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 FGD Checklist, Programme monitoring.	50			67
<b>Proportion of women beneficiaries in leadership positions of project management committees</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 FGD Checklist, WFP survey.	50			44
<b>Proportion of women beneficiaries in leadership positions of project management committees</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 FGD Checklist, WFP survey.	50			53
<b>Proportion of women project management committee members trained on modalities of food, cash, or voucher distribution</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 FGD Checklist, WFP survey.	60			0
<b>Proportion of women project management committee members trained on modalities of food, cash, or voucher distribution</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 FGD Checklist, WFP survey.	60			33
<b>Proportion of women project management committee members trained on modalities of food, cash, or voucher distribution</b>				

Cross-cutting Indicators	Project end Target	Base Value	Previous Follow-up	Latest Follow-up
	Target Val	(at start of project or benchmark)	(penultimate follow-up)	(latest value measured)
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 FGD Checklist, WFP survey.	60			54

## Protection and Accountability to Affected Populations

The Age, Gender and Diversity (AGD) approach is incorporated in the project design and implementation for equality and protection measures. Throughout the Lac Chad Region, security measures were put into place during distributions that ensured beneficiaries' safe access to food assistance and emergency assistance.

Within the camp setting in the Diffa region, UNHCR set up refugee committees that addressed refugee concerns, contributed to the daily management of the camps and participated in coordination meetings with the camp manager ACTED and the UN agencies, including WFP. For populations outside of the camp settings, WFP strengthened the interagency coordination of field missions with implementing partners and the government. For out of camp populations WFP put in place security measures at the distribution sites to provide protection to the beneficiaries. In areas close to the Nigerian border, distribution sites were located further away to increase protection measures to the populations.

In Chad, despite the very tense security situation in the Lac region, where refugee and IDP beneficiary households are located, beneficiaries did not report any major safety problems going to, returning from, or in the actual distribution sites. On distribution sites, security area and crowd control and individual search measures were put into place with the support of police forces and beneficiaries security committees. Nevertheless, WFP and its partners need to increase their efforts to ensure that refugee and IDP households are better informed about the programme, in line with the positive results that have been obtained amongst local populations. In 2016, these efforts will focus in particular on recently displaced households, which are clearly less well informed about key elements such as ration composition, the reasons why their households receive assistance, and where and to whom complaints should be addressed.

In Cameroon, in order to secure distribution sites, WFP put in place special operating procedures to better manage large crowds and conducted systematic search of individuals entering the areas. The government ensured safety and security during food distributions and feedback mechanisms were established by implementing partners at distribution sites to ensure accountability towards beneficiaries. Community volunteers also participated in post distribution sessions where they had a chance to express their views of the assistance received.

Cross-cutting Indicators	Project end Target	Base Value	Previous Follow-up	Latest Follow-up
		(at start of project or benchmark)	(penultimate follow-up)	(latest value measured)
<b>Cameroon</b>				
<b>Proportion of assisted people (men) informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, WFP monitoring, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Apr-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	70	100	90	51.56
<b>Proportion of assisted people (men) who do not experience safety problems travelling to/from and at WFP programme sites</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, WFP monitoring, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Apr-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	80	100	88	100
<b>Proportion of assisted people (women) informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, WFP monitoring, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Apr-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	70	100	100	48.43
<b>Proportion of assisted people (women) who do not experience safety problems travelling to/from and at WFP programme sites</b>				
Base value: Dec-2015, WFP monitoring, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Apr-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	88	100	100	100
<b>Niger</b>				
<b>Proportion of assisted people (men) informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)</b>				
Base value: Jun-2015, PDM Diffa, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey.	70	0		77
<b>Proportion of assisted people (men) who do not experience safety problems travelling to/from and at WFP programme sites</b>				
Base value: Jun-2015, PDM Diffa, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey.	80	0		100

Cross-cutting Indicators	Project end Target	Base Value <i>(at start of project or benchmark)</i>	Previous Follow-up <i>(penultimate follow-up)</i>	Latest Follow-up <i>(latest value measured)</i>
<b>Proportion of assisted people (women) informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)</b>				
Base value: Jun-2015, PDM Diffa, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey.	70	0		73
<b>Proportion of assisted people (women) who do not experience safety problems travelling to/from and at WFP programme sites</b>				
Base value: Jun-2015, PDM Diffa, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey.	80	0		100
<b>Chad</b>				
<b>Proportion of assisted people informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	70			7
<b>Proportion of assisted people informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	70			32
<b>Proportion of assisted people informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, WFP Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	70			75
<b>Proportion of assisted people (men) informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	70			6
<b>Proportion of assisted people (men) informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	70			35
<b>Proportion of assisted people (men) informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, WFP Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	70			69
<b>Proportion of assisted people (men) who do not experience safety problems travelling to/from and at WFP programme sites</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, Programme monitoring.	80			99
<b>Proportion of assisted people (men) who do not experience safety problems travelling to/from and at WFP programme sites</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, Programme monitoring.	80			97
<b>Proportion of assisted people (men) who do not experience safety problems travelling to/from and at WFP programme sites</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, WFP Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, Programme monitoring.	80			100
<b>Proportion of assisted people who do not experience safety problems travelling to/from and at WFP programme sites</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, GD-Food Third Party Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	80			99
<b>Proportion of assisted people who do not experience safety problems travelling to/from and at WFP programme sites</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	80			98
<b>Proportion of assisted people who do not experience safety problems travelling to/from and at WFP programme sites</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, WFP Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	80			100
<b>Proportion of assisted people (women) informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	70			8
<b>Proportion of assisted people (women) informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	70			30
<b>Proportion of assisted people (women) informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, WFP Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	70			79
<b>Proportion of assisted people (women) who do not experience safety problems travelling to/from and at WFP programme sites</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	80			100
<b>Proportion of assisted people (women) who do not experience safety problems travelling to/from and at WFP programme sites</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third Party Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	80			100

Cross-cutting Indicators	Project end Target	Base Value <i>(at start of project or benchmark)</i>	Previous Follow-up <i>(penultimate follow-up)</i>	Latest Follow-up <i>(latest value measured)</i>
Proportion of assisted people (women) who do not experience safety problems travelling to/from and at WFP programme sites				
Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, WFP Monitoring November 2015 BCM Questionnaire, WFP survey.	80			100

## Outputs

Although no major incidents affecting WFP programmes were reported in 2015, insecurity in the region and constant attacks by Boko Haram within Niger caused some delays and for some operations to be put on hold or canceled, especially after major attacks in February. Further, all FFA activities that had started in February were cancelled and replaced by unconditional support. WFP conducted four food basket monitoring (FBM) and distribution monitoring (DM) exercises, to collect relevant operational information as well as to help monitor key indicators. Results showed improvements following each round of distributions, on participation in awareness sessions and cooking demonstrations, screening, complaints committees and management of distribution centers. It was noted in the DM that during the organization of distributions more women had participated in the organization than men and both WFP and donor visibility efforts were greatly enhanced. This is also due to the fact that, although the awareness sessions targeted all beneficiaries, they were of particular interest for women.

In Chad, as the market could not respond to increased demand due to insecurity and border closure, the assistance was thus provided in the form of commodities, leaving open the possibility of moving to voucher-based assistance once markets had stabilized. As a result of this, commodity-based assistance was provided to refugees and out of camp populations through 15 day and 30 day GFD ration, during 2015.

Though most Nigerian refugees have been reached since January 2015, a significant proportion of IDP beneficiaries have only been reached since November 2015. This is mainly due to the intensification of the conflict in the Lac and border area from July 2015 onwards, which led to a rapid increase in internal displacements of local populations in August through October. Other contributing factors included difficulties encountered in determining the actual number of IDPs and the sites where they were located, due to continued movements between the various spontaneous settlements, and the fact that IDPs were located in areas where access was previously restricted due to security concerns.

Local populations in neighboring regions affected by food insecurity resulting from the Nigeria crisis were supported over the October to December period, but assistance was slower than planned as a result of the above mentioned pipeline delays and due to the difficulties associated with finding operational partners in the targeted areas. Cooperating partners that were identified received financial and technical support from WFP as well as training on operational modalities. In Cameroon, WFP provided monthly food support to all refugees in Minawao camp through the year, scaling up over time to meet the needs as more refugees arrived.

Resourcing, insecurity, and access constraints remained important challenges for reaching out to the targeted IDPs and host populations. Nevertheless, WFP managed to scale up assistance to all targeted beneficiaries, gradually expanding to new areas as access was secured following government's massive counter-insurgency against Boko Haram. The BSFP provided all children between 6-59 months and PLW in the Minawao camp with monthly rations of nutrient-rich and fortified commodities. Regular screening procedures ensured early detection and referral of malnourished beneficiaries. Along with the improvement in the nutritional status of beneficiaries in the camp, BSFP was revised from initially targeting children 6-59 months and PLW to children 6-23 months only.

Under TSFP, WFP delivered food supplements to health centres working in partnership with regional health delegations and NGOs to treat MAM in children under 5 and PLW. MAM treatment programs were carried out in synergy with UNICEF SAM treatment activities. Despite major access challenges, WFP managed to reach 186 out of the 198 health facilities planned. Active community outreach activities ensured support to beneficiaries in remote locations, including areas where health facilities closed down due to insecurity. TSFP interventions were accompanied by behavioral change and educational activities on nutrition. Specific attention was given to promoting appropriate infant and young child feeding practices.

Output	Unit	Planned	Actual	% Actual vs. Planned
<b>Cameroon</b>				
<b>SO 1: Nutrition: Treatment of Acute Malnutrition</b>				
Number of health centres/sites assisted	centre/site	198	186	93.9%
Proportion of men exposed to nutrition messaging supported by WFP against proportion planned	%	100	25	25.0%
Proportion of men receiving nutrition counseling supported by WFP against proportion planned	%	100	5	5.0%
Proportion of women exposed to nutrition messaging supported by WFP against proportion planned	%	100	75	75.0%
Proportion of women receiving nutrition counseling supported by WFP against proportion planned	%	100	95	95.0%
<b>Niger</b>				
<b>SO 1: GFD</b>				
C&V: Total monetary value of cash vouchers distributed	US\$	1,205,545	0	0.0%
Energy content of food distributed (kcal/person/day)	kcal/person/day	2,190	2,212	101.0%
<b>SO 1: Nutrition: Prevention of Acute Malnutrition</b>				
Energy content of food distributed (kcal/person/day)	kcal/person/day	788	787	99.9%
<b>SO 1: Nutrition: Treatment of Acute Malnutrition</b>				
Energy content of food distributed (kcal/person/day)	kcal/person/day	500	500	100.0%
<b>Chad</b>				
<b>SO 1: Capacity Development: Strengthening National Capacities</b>				
GFD: Number of female government/national partner staff receiving technical assistance and training	individual	0	5	-
monitoring				
GFD: Number of male government/national partner staff receiving technical assistance and training	individual	0	27	-
monitoring				
<b>SO 1: GFD</b>				
C&V: Number of beneficiaries receiving a combination of cash transfers and food IDPs	Individual	25,000	72,444	289.8%
C&V: Number of beneficiaries receiving a combination of cash transfers and food Refugees	Individual	15,000	5,205	34.7%
C&V: Number of beneficiaries receiving a combination of cash transfers and food Seasonal Assistance	Individual	140,000	85,098	60.8%

## Outcomes

In Niger, WFP conducted two rounds of PDM assessments in July and September 2015 to evaluate the effect of WFP's response on beneficiaries in the Diffa region. The PDMs were conducted for in-and-out of camp populations under the lean season response of WFP's PRRO programme.

PDM results showed that the regularity of food assistance helped stabilize the level of food consumption and limit the use of negative coping strategies. Households receiving food assistance had very limited dietary diversity for two main reasons: the first baseline survey was held just before the start of military operations and the establishment of the state of emergency in the region greatly affected the markets in certain areas; and secondly, the ration sharing out of solidarity with the host populations. However, PDM results showed positive developments: the percentage of households not consuming more than three food groups reduced from 55% to 27%. Furthermore, the PDM showed that beneficiaries' participation, coverage and sensitisation sessions for BSFP were acceptable. MAM performance rates of the CRENAM in Sayam Forage camp are within the SPHERE standard, with 100% recovery rate.

Certainly, these factors positively influenced the real-time monitoring system during distributions, the monitoring strategy during coordination meetings and communication. Also, the emergency preparedness capacity index indicates an acceptable level on a scale of 4, reflecting government efforts as well as partners in supporting WFP's response to the crisis in the Diffa region.

In December 2015, the mVAM survey (data collection by mobile phone) interviewed over 300 beneficiaries. Results indicated that only 2 percent reported poor food consumption, 61 percent with limited food consumption, while 15 percent have an acceptable food consumption score. The proportion who resorted to negative coping strategies amounted to 36 percent (in June 2015, 76 percent reported a negative coping strategy). It is also worth mentioning that 90 percent of households are generally satisfied with services provided by WFP.

Since WFP and its governmental partners carried out an Emergency Food Security assessment in the Lac region and western Sahel, in March 2015, the food security situation of Nigerian refugees in Dar el Salam Camp in Chad has significantly improved. As per the results of the latest WFP monitoring exercise carried out in November 2015, the proportion of households with a poor food consumption score was reduced by a third, dietary diversity almost doubled and the recourse to negative coping strategies was reduced amongst beneficiary households of this target group. The reduction in food insecurity levels is not as impressive amongst recently displaced populations, which in most cases only received food assistance during the latter part of 2015. Despite significant improvements in food consumption levels and dietary diversity, internally-displaced households, and particularly female-headed households within this group, are increasingly using negative coping strategies.

According to the November 2015 National Food Security Assessment (NSA), the western part of the Sahel including Chad - Lac, Bahr el Gazal and Kanem regions -experienced a decline in agricultural production, unfavorable livestock-cereal terms of trade, and an extension of the lean season. These factors severely impacted the food and nutrition status of local populations in these areas. This situation also affected food insecure Chadian populations targeted under this operation and resulted in less than expected improvement in food consumption scores. However, WFP's intervention towards the end of the lean season has contributed to a significant reduction in the use of coping strategies such as borrowing food and reducing the number of meals consumed.

In Cameroon, monthly GFD ensured immediate food access and nutritious consumption of refugees, IDPs and host populations. The food security and nutrition situation in the region deteriorated significantly in 2015 following a prolonged lean season and persisting insecurity due to Boko Haram attacks. According to WFPs emergency food security assessment (EFSA), the number of food insecure people in the targeted areas went up from 23 percent in June to 38.9 percent in September. These generally deteriorating conditions explain the decrease in the number of persons with an acceptable Food Consumption Score (FCS), especially with regards to local populations as revealed by the PDM December 2015. Nutrition programmes implemented at scale and along other partner activities, succeeded in improving the nutrition situation in the Minawao camp. Monthly screening data indicated a decrease in the prevalence of Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) from 13.3 percent GAM reported in early 2015 to 7 percent GAM registered amongst beneficiaries in December 2015.

On the other hand, the nutrition situation outside the camp remains critical. The 2015 SMART survey revealed a further deterioration nutrition situation in the region with MAM rates registered at 13.9 percent and SAM at 2.2 percent. In this context, WFP will put special emphasis on prevention programmes for IDPs and host populations in 2016. Annual TSFP performance indicators reported slightly lower results compared to June 2015, though an overall improvement was noticed compared to rates registered in the beginning of the year. The mortality rate remained at 0. The default rate obtained in December 2015 was slightly higher compared to that of June and below the acceptable sphere standard. This is mainly related to occasional pipeline breaks registered in health centers as a result of the deteriorating security situation in the Far North, which significantly restrained access to basic health services. Likewise the recovery rate decreased from 77 percent in June to 73 percent in December 2015. The non-response rate remained at an acceptable level.

In Nigeria, WFP deployed specialized personnel to work with NEMA and SEMA to review nutrition concepts including food basket planning and nutritious foods. WFP worked with the agencies to improve commodity tracking, organization of distributions, warehouse storage and management, and delivery planning. Furthermore, WFP played a key role in raising the profile and understanding of the alarming food security situation in the North thanks to the roll out of the Cadre Harmonise (regional phase classification tool). WFP has also trained on food security analysis and assessment trainings and co-led a series of rapid assessments, providing an opportunity to collect data and train NEMA on-the-job. And lastly, in November 2015, WFP received Government authorization to launch mVAM (mobile Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping), which will begin in January 2016.

Outcome	Project end Target	Base Value <i>(at start of project or benchmark)</i>	Previous Follow-up <i>(penultimate follow-up)</i>	Latest Follow-up <i>(latest value measured)</i>
<b>Cameroon</b>				
<b>Strategic Objective 1: Save lives and protect livelihoods in emergencies</b>				
<b>Diet Diversity Score</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, WFP monitoring, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	7	5.99	5.7	5.36
<b>Diet Diversity Score</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, WFP monitoring, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	7	4.69	4.57	3.97
<b>Diet Diversity Score (female-headed households)</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, WFP monitoring, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	7	6.01	5.12	5.34
<b>Diet Diversity Score (female-headed households)</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, WFP monitoring, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	7	4.69	4.84	4
<b>Diet Diversity Score (male-headed households)</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	7	5.97	4.89	5.36
<b>Diet Diversity Score (male-headed households)</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, WFP monitoring, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	7	4.66	3.87	3.98
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	80	49	64	46.9
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	80	90.8	62	57.14
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	80	90.1	62.4	50

Outcome	Project end Target	Base Value <i>(at start of project or benchmark)</i>	Previous Follow-up <i>(penultimate follow-up)</i>	Latest Follow-up <i>(latest value measured)</i>
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b> Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	80	49.9	47.3	58.28
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b> Base value: Apr-2015, WFP monitoring, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	80	50	70.4	43.34
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b> Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	80	92.2	59.6	76.19
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score</b> Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	18	5.5	21	42.02
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score</b> Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	18	24	26	42.42
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b> Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	18	0.4	21.3	26.19
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b> Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	18	5.9	21.5	51.29
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b> Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	18	24.33	25.4	47.34
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b> Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	18	4.4	21.3	26.19
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b> Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	18	40	27.3	31.38
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score</b> Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	0.4	3.8	17	0.84
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score</b> Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	0.4	27	10	16.6
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b> Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	0.12	0	4.6	8.95
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b> Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	0.12	4	16.1	0.84
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b> Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	0.12	28.38	4.2	12
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b> Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	7	6.03	5.48	4.86
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b> Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, ERSA, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM, Programme monitoring.	0.68	30	25.5	17.25
<b>MAM treatment default rate (%)</b> Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, Programme monitoring.	15	34	21	25
<b>MAM treatment mortality rate (%)</b> Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, Partner reports, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, Partner reports, Programme monitoring.	3	0	0	0
<b>MAM treatment non-response rate (%)</b> Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, Partner reports, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, Partner reports, Programme monitoring.	15	1	1	1
<b>MAM treatment recovery rate (%)</b>				

Outcome	Project end Target	Base Value <i>(at start of project or benchmark)</i>	Previous Follow-up <i>(penultimate follow-up)</i>	Latest Follow-up <i>(latest value measured)</i>
Base value: Dec-2014, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, Partner reports, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, Partner reports, Programme monitoring.	75	66	77	73
<b>Niger</b>				
<b>Strategic Objective 1: Save lives and protect livelihoods in emergencies</b>				
<b>CSI: Percentage of female-headed households with reduced/stabilized Coping Strategy Index</b>				
Base value: Nov-2014, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey.	13.8	68.9		0.6
<b>CSI: Percentage of households with reduced/stabilized Coping Strategy Index</b>				
Base value: Nov-2014, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey.	12.2	61		8
<b>CSI: Percentage of male-headed households with reduced/stabilized Coping Strategy Index</b>				
Base value: Nov-2014, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey.	11.8	58.9		10
<b>Diet Diversity Score</b>				
Base value: Nov-2014, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM Renforce Diffa; Target > 6.1, WFP survey.	6.1	6.1		4.4
<b>Diet Diversity Score (female-headed households)</b>				
Base value: Nov-2014, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM Renforce Diffa; Target > 5.9, WFP survey.	5.9	5.9		4.3
<b>Diet Diversity Score (male-headed households)</b>				
Base value: Nov-2014, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM Renforce Diffa; Target > 6.2, WFP survey.	6.2	6.2		4.5
<b>EPCI: Emergency Preparedness and Response Capacity Index</b>				
Base value: Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Sub Office meeting, Secondary data.	6	0		3
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score</b>				
Base value: Nov-2014, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM Renforce Diffa ; Target > 86.6, WFP survey.	86.6	86.6		73
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score</b>				
Base value: Nov-2014, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey.	12.5	12.5		24
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score</b>				
Base value: Nov-2014, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey.	0.18	0.9		3
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b>				
Base value: Nov-2014, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey.	0.2	1		3.4
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b>				
Base value: Nov-2014, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey.	0.18	0.9		3.2
<b>Proportion of eligible population who participate in programme (coverage)</b>				
Base value: Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Sep-2015, PDM Renforce, Programme monitoring.	66	0		79
<b>Proportion of target population who participate in an adequate number of distributions</b>				
Base value: Nov-2014, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM Renforce Diffa, WFP survey.	76	76		99.4
<b>Chad</b>				
<b>Strategic Objective 1: Save lives and protect livelihoods in emergencies</b>				
<b>CSI: Coping Strategy Index (average)</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2015, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third party Monitoring November-December 2015, WFP survey.	4.7	4.9		3.3
<b>CSI: Coping Strategy Index (average)</b>				

Outcome	Project end Target	Base Value <i>(at start of project or benchmark)</i>	Previous Follow-up <i>(penultimate follow-up)</i>	Latest Follow-up <i>(latest value measured)</i>
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2015, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third party Monitoring November-December 2015, WFP survey.	4.24	4.24		3.93
<b>CSI: Coping Strategy Index (average)</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2015, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third party Monitoring November-December 2015, WFP survey.	1.7	1.8		3.21
<b>Diet Diversity Score</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2014, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, Third party Monitoring November-December 2015, WFP survey.	4.5	1.8		3.93
<b>Diet Diversity Score</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2014, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, Third party Monitoring November-December 2015, WFP survey.	4.5	1.8		3.21
<b>Diet Diversity Score</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2014, WFP survey. Previous Follow-up: Sep-2015, PDM carried out by CP in September 2015, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, GFD local population PDM, November 2015, WFP survey.	4.5	4.9	3.3	3.7
<b>Diet Diversity Score (female-headed households)</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2014, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, Third party Monitoring November-December 2015, WFP survey.	4.5	1		3.82
<b>Diet Diversity Score (female-headed households)</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2014, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, Third party Monitoring November-December 2015, WFP survey.	4.5	1		3.13
<b>Diet Diversity Score (female-headed households)</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2014, WFP survey. Previous Follow-up: Sep-2015, PDM carried out by CP in September 2015, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM carried out by CP in November 2015, WFP survey.	4.5	4.8	3.3	4
<b>Diet Diversity Score (male-headed households)</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2014, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, Third party Monitoring November-December 2015, WFP survey.	4.5	1.9		4.03
<b>Diet Diversity Score (male-headed households)</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2014, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, Third party Monitoring November-December 2015, WFP survey.	4.5	1.9		3.28
<b>Diet Diversity Score (male-headed households)</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2014, WFP survey. Previous Follow-up: Sep-2015, PDM carried out by CP in September 2015, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, PDM carried out by CP in November 2015, WFP survey.	4.5	4.9	3.4	3.1
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2014, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third party Monitoring November-December 2015, WFP survey.	80	13		44
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2014, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third party Monitoring November-December 2015, WFP survey.	80	19		13.5
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2014, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third party Monitoring November-December 2015, WFP survey.	80	93		59.9
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2014, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2012, Third party Monitoring November-December 2015, WFP survey.	80	25		16.2
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2014, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third party Monitoring November-December 2015, WFP survey.	80	13		33
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2014, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third party Monitoring November-December 2015, WFP survey.	80	100		65.7
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2014, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third party Monitoring November-December 2015, WFP survey.	80	15		67
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2014, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third party Monitoring November-December 2015, WFP survey.	80	92		54.8
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b>				
Base value: Mar-2015, EFSA March 2015, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Third party Monitoring November-December 2015, WFP survey.	80	18.9		10.7

## Sustainability, Capacity Development and Handover

Refugees and displaced populations (IDPs) affected by violence in northern Nigeria, were forced to leave their assets behind when fleeing across the border to the Lac Chad basin. Host communities took in many refugees and displaced populations putting additional pressure on the already scarce resources. The potential for agricultural production is limited in the region and as a result the refugees and displaced populations including vulnerable host households relied fully on WFP's assistance in order to meet their nutritional needs and prevent negative coping strategies.

As the political and security situation in northern Nigeria continues to deteriorate, it is premature to define a handover strategy. The influx into Niger is very likely to continue in 2016 and beyond. The recent Joint Assessment Mission (JAM) in December 2015, will identify key areas where assimilation is likely. As a result, WFP assistance in the Diffa region aims to shift from unconditional assistance (General Food Distributions-GFD) to conditional assistance (Food Assistance for Assets activities - FFA), for populations residing outside of the camps in 2016. Assistance activities for out-of-camp populations will be based on vulnerability and not status to ensure that the most vulnerable received assistance and facilitate the integration of these populations with the aim of making them more autonomous. The shift in the response under the EMOP is in line with the PRRO strategy in the country and WFP Niger will aim to integrate these communes under the PRRO project once the situation stabilizes.

The MoU signed by WFP with the Nigerian Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) in September 2015 will help to provide capacity strengthening to their response to the crisis in the North East. It will support in equipping emergency management agencies (and humanitarian partners) with the technical and operational capacity to implement effective, targeted humanitarian response at scale; strengthening effective food security monitoring and analysis alongside partners and counterparts; and ensuring safe and efficient access of humanitarian responders to the conflict-affected northern states.

The key role WFP played in raising the profile and understanding of the alarming food security situation in the North thanks to the roll out of the Cadre Harmonise (regional phase classification tool) will benefit the overall response to this regional crisis. WFP, by implementing food security analysis and assessment trainings and co-leading a series of rapid assessments, provided an opportunity to collect data and train NEMA on-the-job.

Furthermore, the Government authorization that WFP received in November 2015 to launch mVAM (mobile Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping), which will begin in January 2016 will provide tremendous support thanks to its innovative data collection method, which already proved to be an extremely useful tool in the Diffa region since it gathers information at a distance and within a difficult security context, and where missions to the field are not always an option.

## INPUTS

### Resource Inputs

The EMOP was experiencing limited resourcing levels at the onset of the project with only 20 percent received in the first quarter of 2015 and a funding level of only 35 percent by mid-year. The limited funding available during the first phase of the intervention delayed the effective implementation of some of the activities, including for the capacity building of the Government of Nigeria, which provided an innovative partnership through support for data collection, coordination and a more hands on operational approach. Confirmed donor support was vital to meet urgent needs at the most critical times and to strengthen the regional approach. The direst shortfalls were mitigated through the WFP internal finance mechanisms, providing advance financing against donor pledges as well as providing internal loans to help secure resources at the time when they were most needed until funding was secured, to be able to move forward. WFP also received flexible multilateral donations which allowed the allocation of resources based on priorities and the most urgent needs. Through these mechanisms, WFP secured readily-available food in the region which decreased the lead time for the food to arrive, particularly to the landlocked countries.

The Government of Niger, UNHCR, international and national NGOs provided technical assistance for the implementation of the various activities and provision of non-food items for the populations covered under the EMOP.

In Chad up to the end of August, commodity-based assistance was provided to refugees and out of camp populations using PRRO 200713 resources. From September 2015 onwards, assistance was provided to these target groups under the regional EMOP.

In Cameroon, tools such as UN CERF and WFP's internal loan mechanism helped secure resources at an early stage of the response. This enabled WFP to swiftly procure food commodities through the Global Commodity Management Facility in Douala, which contributed to reducing lead times and significantly addressing food assistance needs before donor pledges were confirmed.

Donor	Resourced in 2015 (mt)		Shipped/Purchased in 2015 (mt)
	In-Kind	Cash	
European Commission		11,302	9,268
Germany		1,089	1,089
MULTILATERAL		13,707	8,437
Switzerland		864	500
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies		4,702	2,938
United Kingdom		4,349	1,167
USA	15,100	2,842	13,637
<b>Total:</b>	<b>15,100</b>	<b>38,855</b>	<b>37,036</b>

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

## Food Purchases and in-kind Receipts

Food purchases made under this operation included local and international purchases from the Global Commodity Management Facility stocks (GCMF) as well as in kind contributions. This allowed WFP to reduce the long lead times of internationally procured food items.

In Niger, WFP purchased 7,133 mt of mixed commodities from local suppliers (5,820 mt of millet, 1,301 mt of beans and 12 mt of salt). Some 882 mt of millet were purchased from local small farmers.

In Chad, a total of 2,305 mt of various cereals worth USD 1,349,289 was procured locally from two traders and eighteen smallholder farmers' associations in the maize-producing areas of Logone and Mandoul.

In Cameroon, over 5,800 mt of rice and 440 mt of pulses were purchased locally. In total, some 23,000 mt of food were received, including some 4,500 mt of in-kind contributions.

Commodity	Local (mt)	Developing Country (mt)	Other International (mt)	GCMF (mt)
Beans	1,741	0	0	418
Bulgur Wheat	0	0	588	
Corn Soya Blend	0	0	1,438	3,310
Iodised Salt	12	202	0	
Lentils	0	0	460	
Maize	656	0	0	
Ready To Use Supplementary Food	0	0	0	321
Rice	5,195	2,848	5,477	7,392
Sorghum/Millet	7,300	0	1,070	4,078
Split Peas	0	0	1,293	2,189
Sugar	0	0	154	
Vegetable Oil	0	0	739	1,659
<b>Sum:</b>	<b>14,904</b>	<b>3,050</b>	<b>11,218</b>	<b>19,368</b>

## Food Transport, Delivery and Handling

In order to increase its transport capacity to and from the areas of intervention of this operation and augment its storage capacities in the Lac region, WFP logistics also reviewed the contractual arrangement it had with local private transporters and installed additional warehousing facilities for food prepositioning in this area.

Internationally and regionally procured commodities arrived in Niger through the ports of Cotonou and Lome; Chad and Cameroon received the vast majority of their food through a single corridor that originates in the Douala Port.

The challenges of pipeline corridors due to port congestion resulted in a substantial increase of food supply breaks under this operation, mostly met through local purchases and loans from other projects.

## Post-Delivery Losses

Cereals was the commodity that was the most affected by losses in 2015. Losses of 2.4 mt occurred during the transport of the commodity by commercial transporters. The value of the commodity was deducted from the invoice to avoid similar occurrences in the future.

## MANAGEMENT

### Partnerships

Within the operational constraints of the Nigerian crisis, key partnerships contributed to allow WFP to carry out its mandate.

In Niamey and Diffa, the government (Cellule Crises Alimentaires et Cellules de Coordination Humanitaire), United Nations agencies and NGOs contributed to the effective implementation of activities under the regional EMOP. WFP actively monitored the implementation and addressed issues to improve the quality of assistance for beneficiaries where needed.

A technical food security working group led by the regional representative of the Ministry of Agriculture and the Dispositif (Secretariat Permanent Regional du DNPGCCA) together with WFP met regularly to ensure proper coordination between actors and optimal usage of scarce resources. WFP carried out a mapping exercise of all planned interventions mediating between actors where needed to avoid duplications in assistance programmes.

WFP joined forces with ICRC to reach the most affected populations in remote and insecure areas. Distributions were also organised through ICRC nutrition commodities to areas where access was not possible for WFP and other partners. Several partnerships were developed in Diffa with international NGOs among others in order to deliver food to the most affected populations. Care International and Samaritan's Purse were key partners for the outside camp distributions, further reinforced by NGOs Karkara, VND NUR and APBE. A contract with ACTED was signed for distribution in the Sayam Forage and Kabelewa camp in coordination with UNHCR. Continuous capacity building and practical support to partners were provided, particularly with regard to analyses, monitoring and evaluation and coordination with partners on the ground, to ensure efficient ways of operating in a very challenging context. As a result of the insecurity in the region WFP was not able to begin Food Assistance for Asset/Food for Work (FFA) in coordination with FAO as well as Cash Transfer programmes in the Diffa region. Populations received unconditional assistance under the EMOP throughout 2015. Assistance in the Diffa region will shift from unconditional assistance to conditional assistance (FFA) for populations residing outside of the camps in 2016 under the EMOP.

In Cameroon, GFD in the Minawao camp was carried out in cooperation with UNHCR and the NGO Public Concern. Food distributions outside the camp, were conducted in cooperation with NGO IEDA. This partnership proved critical for ensuring assistance to IDPs and local communities in remote locations, in particular considering the hampered access to vulnerable groups (sites only accessible via NGOs).

An interagency collaboration framework established at central and field levels allowed for efficient coordination between humanitarian actors.

Nutrition interventions were implemented jointly with the Ministry of Health, UNICEF and NGOs. The NGOs involved in the implementation of nutrition interventions were: International Medical Corps, Plan Cameroon, Saïd and Sana Logone. A nutrition working group was established in the Far North of Cameroon to allow all nutrition stakeholders in the region to coordinate their responses and share experiences.

Despite insecurity and access challenges, experienced partners were able to reach out to remote areas and deliver nutritional services to a large number of beneficiaries. Regular coordination meetings between UNICEF, WFP and NGO partners contributed to overcoming challenges and ensure complementarity of activities.

In Chad, a concerted effort was made to identify national and international NGOs who could serve as cooperating partners in the three regions affected by the Boko Haram crisis in view of rapidly responding to the needs of recently identified target groups. However these areas were also affected by security and access constraints as well as a limited NGO presence and operational capacity. Support received for preparedness activities, supported the prepositioning of specialized food commodities and the purchase of equipment that was used to establish a new office in the Lac region. In the Lac region, WFP initially signed an agreement with the Chadian Red Cross to organize distributions for Nigerian refugees, returnees and IDP's. This agreement was amended over time to include additional sites and beneficiaries. In order to increase the coverage of this operation in the Lac region and cover the needs of other out-of-camp populations, an additional agreement was signed with ACTED. Other agreements were also signed with ACF and IRC to cover the needs of food-insecure local populations in Kanem and BEG respectively.

Strong partnerships were also established in the area of food security assessments and in support of programmatic monitoring efforts.

In Nigeria, WFP has provided operational support by deploying dedicated staff to work with national and state authorities (NEMA and SEMA) to review nutrition concepts, improve commodity tracking, organise distributions, warehouse facilities and management, as well as to plan deliveries.

WFP has played an instrumental role in supporting data collection by increasing the understanding of the food security situation in the North through a regional phase classification tool, the first Cadre Harmonise. In addition, WFP has also provided training of food security analysis and assessments and co-led a series of rapid assessments of sorts of an informal IDP settlement, providing an opportunity to collect data and provide on-the-job training of NEMA. Coordination has been reinforced through the activation of food security working groups, decentralized at state level, and WFP has played an essential role in the development of the global Humanitarian Needs Overview and Humanitarian Response Plan.

Access challenges for the humanitarian community have been addressed through the launching of an UNHAS operation in Nigeria in August 2015, which strengthened access to key areas and has seen an increase in the monthly use of the air service by 30 percent.

Partnerships	NGO		Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement	UN/IO
	National	International		
<b>Total</b>	7	6	1	5

Cross-cutting Indicators	Project end Target <i>Target Val</i>	Base Value <i>(at start of project or benchmark)</i>	Previous Follow-up <i>(penultimate follow-up)</i>	Latest Follow-up <i>(latest value measured)</i>
<b>Cameroon</b>				
<b>Amount of complementary funds provided to the project by partners (including NGOs, INGOs, Civil Society, Private Sector organizations, International Financial Institutions, Regional development banks)</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, Partner reports, Programme monitoring.	5			481,000
<b>Number of partner organizations that provide complementary inputs and services</b>				
Base value: Jan-2015, Partner reports, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, Partner reports, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, Partner reports, Programme monitoring.	4	4	4	4
<b>Proportion of project activities implemented with the engagement of complementary partners</b>				
Base value: Jan-2015, Partner reports, Programme monitoring. Previous Follow-up: Jun-2015, Partner reports, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, Partner reports, Programme monitoring.	100	100	100	100
<b>Niger</b>				
<b>Amount of complementary funds provided to the project by partners (including NGOs, INGOs, Civil Society, Private Sector organizations, International Financial Institutions, Regional development banks)</b>				
Base value: Jun-2015, Secondary data. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Monitoring, Secondary data.	5,053	5,053		50,053
<b>Number of partner organizations that provide complementary inputs and services</b>				
Base value: Jun-2015, Secondary data. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Monitoring, Programme monitoring.	5	5		6
<b>Proportion of project activities implemented with the engagement of complementary partners</b>				
Base value: Jun-2015, Monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Nov-2015, Monitoring, Secondary data.	100	100		100
<b>Chad</b>				
<b>Amount of complementary funds provided to the project by partners (including NGOs, INGOs, Civil Society, Private Sector organizations, International Financial Institutions, Regional development banks)</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, WFP complementary partnerships monitoring matrix 2015, Programme monitoring.				140,000
<b>Number of partner organizations that provide complementary inputs and services</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, WFP complementary partnerships monitoring matrix 2015, Programme monitoring.				4
<b>Proportion of project activities implemented with the engagement of complementary partners</b>				
Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, WFP complementary partnerships monitoring matrix 2015, Programme monitoring.	100			100

## Lessons Learned

In 2015, WFP has revised its nutritional response strategy for regions affected by the crisis in the Lake Chad Basin to move towards a more preventive approach involving nutritional supplements distributions of essential services that have an impact on reducing child malnutrition. In addition, the general food baskets have been harmonized across the three countries and include fortified blended food to optimize the nutrient profile. This new approach has been shared with all stakeholders in the nutrition response and will be implemented in 2016.

WFP faced several challenges in the implementation and realization of its response and is progressively drawing lessons to strengthen its response on the ground. Initially the main challenges were insecurity and access constraints which rendered it difficult for humanitarian actors to operate, in particular to carry out mVAM (the collection of data through the use of a mobile phone).

Notwithstanding, the mobile mVAM project has now been extended in Niger to Diffa. This data collection method is very appropriate for Diffa as it gathers information at a distance and within a difficult security context, and where missions to the field are not always an option. Through the use of these new tools, the government will enhance its data collection systems and widen its coverage to facilitate data analysis. WFP provided technical support trainings to national staff and additional resources to cover the cost of data collection especially during lean season to facilitate quick and timely decision making.

In Niger, strong coordination between all the different actors was key to ensuring activities were implemented efficiently and effectively. Although the number of international actors with a presence in Diffa has increased over the last year, WFP remains one of the few key food security actors with a pipeline in place that allows to respond at large scale and in timely manner. The major access challenges and risks experienced in 2015 led WFP to reflect on the importance of introducing cash based assistance, particularly in remote areas impossible to reach with large trucks.

In Cameroon, the changing security context in the Far North region called for a more advanced and adjusted response. WFP managed to adapt rapidly to the changing context through the introduction of a series of new security procedures and standards. The humanitarian community determined the humanitarian space through almost daily risk analysis assessments while safeguarding the security and safety of its staff. Despite major challenges, WFP was able to go into the most remote areas reaching a large number of beneficiaries. This was made possible through strong collaboration and coordination with experienced transport and cooperating partners and with government counterparts ensuring safe access.

In Cameroon, WFP's nutrition response saw good outcomes, especially with regards to reducing malnutrition levels in the Minawao camp. However, augmented efforts are needed in 2016 to continue responding to the alarming food and nutrition situation, in particular amongst IDPs and local populations.

To apportion support closer to the four affected countries, the Regional Bureau in Dakar has decentralised the operational surge capacity for the Regional EMOP in critical functional areas (programme, VAM, cash-based transfers, nutrition, security), via a pop-up hub in N'Djamena, Chad. This enhanced operational support was initiated in December 2015 for a period of six months and aims to enable the smooth rollout and effective scale-up of the regional response into 2016. The team will travel regularly to EMOP operational areas, including Chad's Lake Region, Niger's Diffa region, Cameroon's Far North region and Nigeria's Borno state, providing hands-on operational support to WFP teams on the ground.

## OPERATIONAL STATISTICS

## Annex: Resource Inputs from Donors

Donor	Cont. Ref. No	Commodity	Resourced in 2015 (mt)		Shipped/ Purchased in 2015 (mt)
			In-Kind	Cash	
European Commission	EEC-C-00497-01	Iodised Salt		12	12
European Commission	EEC-C-00497-01	Sorghum/Millet		882	882
European Commission	EEC-C-00497-01	Vegetable Oil		153	0
European Commission	EEC-C-00513-01	Beans		136	136
European Commission	EEC-C-00513-01	Corn Soya Blend		156	0
European Commission	EEC-C-00513-01	Sorghum/Millet		1,079	1,079
European Commission	EEC-C-00513-01	Vegetable Oil		38	0
European Commission	EEC-C-00530-01	Corn Soya Blend		100	0
European Commission	EEC-C-00530-01	Iodised Salt		75	75
European Commission	EEC-C-00530-01	Rice		1,357	600
European Commission	EEC-C-00530-01	Split Peas		487	216
European Commission	EEC-C-00540-01	Rice		2,099	2,099
European Commission	EEC-C-00542-01	Beans		661	661
European Commission	EEC-C-00542-01	Corn Soya Blend		192	0
European Commission	EEC-C-00542-01	Sorghum/Millet		1,487	1,487
European Commission	EEC-C-00542-01	Split Peas		287	0
European Commission	EEC-C-00542-01	Vegetable Oil		80	0
European Commission	EEC-C-00545-01	Rice		1,547	1,547
European Commission	EEC-C-00545-01	Split Peas		384	384
European Commission	EEC-C-00545-01	Vegetable Oil		91	91
Germany	GER-C-00408-01	Corn Soya Blend		964	964
Germany	GER-C-00408-01	Ready To Use Supplementary		17	17
Germany	GER-C-00408-01	Vegetable Oil		109	109
MULTILATERAL	MULTILATERAL	Beans		862	418
MULTILATERAL	MULTILATERAL	Corn Soya Blend		1,070	499
MULTILATERAL	MULTILATERAL	Maize		650	650
MULTILATERAL	MULTILATERAL	Ready To Use Supplementary		157	0
MULTILATERAL	MULTILATERAL	Rice		3,308	652
MULTILATERAL	MULTILATERAL	Sorghum/Millet		6,217	6,217
MULTILATERAL	MULTILATERAL	Split Peas		789	0
MULTILATERAL	MULTILATERAL	Vegetable Oil		652	0
Switzerland	SWI-C-00427-01	Rice		500	500
Switzerland	SWI-C-00489-01	Rice		364	
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01251-01	Ready To Use Supplementary		55	45
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01256-01	Beans		440	440
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01256-01	Corn Soya Blend		517	517
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01256-01	Iodised Salt		101	101
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01256-01	Ready To Use Supplementary		2	2
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01256-01	Rice		1,134	1,069
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01256-01	Sugar		154	154
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01256-01	Vegetable Oil		200	200
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01266-01	Maize		6	6
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01266-01	Rice		193	193
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01266-01	Sorghum/Millet		13	13

**Annex: Resource Inputs from Donors**

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-01266-01	Vegetable Oil		183	0
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01362-01	Corn Soya Blend		256	199
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01362-01	Rice		938	0
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01362-01	Split Peas		390	0
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01362-01	Vegetable Oil		121	0
United Kingdom	UK -C-00264-01	Corn Soya Blend		255	0
United Kingdom	UK -C-00264-01	Iodised Salt		26	26
United Kingdom	UK -C-00264-01	Ready To Use Supplementary		26	0
United Kingdom	UK -C-00264-01	Rice		819	225
United Kingdom	UK -C-00264-01	Split Peas		68	0
United Kingdom	UK -C-00264-01	Vegetable Oil		128	0
United Kingdom	UK -C-00264-04	Ready To Use Supplementary		64	0
United Kingdom	UK -C-00264-04	Rice		2,963	916
USA	USA-C-01090-01	Corn Soya Blend	240		239
USA	USA-C-01090-01	Rice	3,250		3,244
USA	USA-C-01090-01	Split Peas	780		777
USA	USA-C-01090-01	Vegetable Oil	250		250
USA	USA-C-01090-02	Bulgur Wheat	590		588
USA	USA-C-01090-02	Corn Soya Blend	510		509
USA	USA-C-01090-02	Lentils	460		460
USA	USA-C-01090-02	Rice	2,240		2,233
USA	USA-C-01090-02	Vegetable Oil	200		200
USA	USA-C-01090-03	Vegetable Oil	290		
USA	USA-C-01122-01	Rice		584	584
USA	USA-C-01122-01	Sorghum/Millet		125	125
USA	USA-C-01122-02	Beans		504	504
USA	USA-C-01122-02	Sorghum/Millet		1,575	1,575
USA	USA-C-01122-02	Vegetable Oil		54	0
USA	USA-C-01153-01	Corn Soya Blend	490		490
USA	USA-C-01153-03	Corn Soya Blend	200		200
USA	USA-C-01153-03	Sorghum/Millet	1,070		1,070
USA	USA-C-01153-03	Split Peas	300		300
USA	USA-C-01153-03	Vegetable Oil	100		100
USA	USA-C-01153-04	Vegetable Oil	240		
USA	USA-C-01188-01	Corn Soya Blend	430		
USA	USA-C-01188-01	Rice	2,690		
USA	USA-C-01188-01	Split Peas	580		
USA	USA-C-01188-01	Vegetable Oil	190		189
<b>Total:</b>			<b>15,100</b>	<b>38,855</b>	<b>37,036</b>