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Operational Fact Sheet  - Philippines PRRO 200296
“Support for Returnees and other Conflict-Affected Households in Central Mindanao, and National Capacity Development in Disaster Preparedness and Response”

Table 1: Operational Factsheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>The operation was approved by the Executive Board in February 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Two years (01 May 2012 to 30 April 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments</td>
<td>There have been two amendments to the initial project document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BR1: to replicate the pilot Disaster and Preparedness Response capacity-building activities in additional 12 municipalities, including Climate Change Adaptation activities as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BR2: to expand geographical coverage of the PRRO, by providing emergency food assistance and cash and vouchers transfers to 400,000 people affected by the typhoon Bopha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A third budget revision is currently being processed but falls outside the timeframe of the evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned beneficiaries</td>
<td>Initial: 977,112 Revised: 1,480,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned food requirements</td>
<td>Initial: 38,947 mt of food commodities Cash and vouchers: US$2 million Revised: 56,072 mt of food commodities Cash and vouchers: US$4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Partners</td>
<td>Government: The Department of Social Welfare and Development, Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UN: FAO, UNDP, UNFPA, UN HABITAT, UNHCR, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs: International: 3 (Community and Family Services International, Helen Keller International, Save the Children) National: 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US$ requirements</td>
<td>Initial: US$49.01 million Revised: US$72.94 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution level (by March 2014)</td>
<td>The operation received US$65,593,713; i.e. 86.8% of the total US$ requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top five donors (by March 2014)</td>
<td>USA (22% of total donations); Philippines (12%); European Commission (13%); Australia (5%), and Multilateral (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Objective</td>
<td>Operation specific objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Strategic Objective 1** | Assisting the most vulnerable individuals whose nutrition security has been reduced by the escalation of conflict | - Prevention and treatment of moderate acute malnutrition (MAM) among children aged 6–59 months  
- Prevention of acute malnutrition among pregnant and lactating women (PLW) |
| **Strategic Objective 2** | Investing in disaster preparedness and mitigation measures by strengthening national, provincial and local Government capacities through targeted DPR activities | - providing technical support for local Governments implementing small-scale disaster-mitigation projects;  
- enhancing planning for national and local preparedness and response capacities through training and the sharing of best practices;  
- strengthening the food security cluster;  
- enhancing the preparedness capacity of the country office with a contingency food stock of 1,500 mt of rice and the pre-positioning of 200 mt of high-energy biscuits (HEBs) for immediate disaster response |
| **Strategic Objective 3** | Consolidating livelihood recovery in food-insecure communities in Central Mindanao through food transfers and, on a smaller scale, cash transfers | - Creating or rehabilitating productive and communal assets through food for assets (FFA) or cash for assets (CFA);  
- supporting skills training and diversification of livelihoods through FFA and CFA  
- supporting the enrolment and continued attendance of schoolchildren in remote areas through on-site school feeding |

---

1 WFP Strategic Plan (2008-2013).
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Executive Summary

Introduction
1. The Republic of the Philippines is an island nation in Southeast Asia, situated in the western Pacific Ocean and consisting of 7,107 islands. The country is highly vulnerable to earthquakes, floods, landslides, typhoons and volcanic eruptions. Within the last 18 months the southern and central islands have been seriously impacted by typhoons Bopha and Yolanda, as well as an earthquake in Bohol. Certain areas of the country have also been impacted by long running conflict situations.

2. The conflict on the southern island of Mindanao between the Government of the Philippines and a number of armed separatist groups peaked during the first decade of the century, displacing over 700,000 civilians, until peace negotiations allowed most of the affected communities to return to their homes within the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (ARMM) during the course of 2010. Relative calm has descended upon the region since then, and there have been positive signs for the future since the signing of the Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro (FAB) on 15 October 2012.

3. The scope of this evaluation is the Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO) 200296, “Support for Returnees and Other Conflict Affected Households in Central Mindanao, and National Capacity Development in Disaster Preparedness and Response” operation, but excluding the typhoon Bopha response activities. The period covered has been from the PRRO formulation (mid-2011) to February 2014, when the evaluation took place. The evaluation has been timed so that findings can feed into future decisions on programme design. The Country Office plans to prepare a new PRRO to commence in January 2015, which will be submitted to the November 2014 Executive Board session.

4. Currently extended to the end of 2014, PRRO 200296 was originally planned to be operational between May 2012 and April 2014 with the following specific objectives:

- To assist the most vulnerable individuals whose nutritional security has been reduced by the escalation of conflict;
- To invest in disaster preparedness and mitigation measures by strengthening national, provincial and local government capacities through targeted disaster preparedness and response (DPR) activities;
- To consolidate livelihood recovery in food-insecure communities in Central Mindanao through food transfers and, on a smaller scale, cash transfers.

5. The programme, apart from the DPR element, has been focused in five provinces in Central Mindanao: Lanao del Norte, Lanao del Sur, North Cotabato, Maguindanao and Sultan Kudurat. The DPR programme commenced in Northern Luzon but has since expanded throughout the Philippines.

Overall Summary Findings
6. In general, the evaluation has concluded that the intervention has, to an acceptable extent, met the stated objectives, having supported the identified priority beneficiary
needs of vulnerable communities and individuals whose nutritional security had been affected, with activities designed and implemented in an appropriate fashion. This work has taken place via a mixture of interventions including nutritional support, training on livelihood skills, and improvements to community based assets addressing either a health, livelihood or disaster preparedness related need, that will improve individual and collective resilience in the long term.

**Programmatic areas: Nutrition**

7. Further nutritional support has been provided through on-site school feeding, which the education authorities strongly believe has provided benefits in terms of improved educational performance and the increased involvement of parents in the schooling of their children that go beyond the intended programmatic objective of merely encouraging school attendance. Additionally the provision of nutritional support to families with vulnerable infants and young children via rural health units (RHUs) has improved the health and nutritional status of undernourished children as well as increasing access to complementary medical support services.

8. The targeted Supplementary Feeding Programme is aligned with the Philippine Plan of Action for Nutrition (PPAN) 2011-2016 key strategy of “Adoption and implementation of appropriate guidelines for the community based management of acute malnutrition to reduce the prevalence of wasted under-five children from 6.9 percent in 2008 to less than five percent (not of public health significance) in 2016”.

9. According to the majority of stakeholders interviewed, the nutritional situation in the communities has improved significantly from 2008 onwards, and the high rates of acute malnutrition seen previously have diminished. In many communities visited, the evaluation team was informed that there is currently very little acute malnutrition. A 2013 WFP/Community and Family Services International (CFSI) assessment of children aged 6-23 months in Lanao del Sur supports this finding and suggests that adaptation of the programmatic approach and a move away from blanket supplementary feeding (BSF) programmes, as was initiated in Maguindanao and North Cotabato, was appropriate during the period of this response. It should probably also have been implemented in Lanao del Sur and Lanao del Norte.

10. Ongoing BSF programmes are no longer appropriate in the current context, though targeted supplementary feeding programmes (SFPs) will continue to have a role to play while issues affecting the underlying causes of acute malnutrition remain unaddressed, particularly in the absence of treatment for severe acute malnutrition (SAM).

11. WFP’s continued upstream work on the national nutritional policy framework is highly relevant to assist the Government to put in place appropriate and relevant national protocols for the prevention and treatment of acute malnutrition, which the organisation can then support on the ground. However, work remains to be done in terms of training implementing staff in targeted SFP management and improved monitoring systems. In

---

addition, mechanisms for programme outreach to enhance accessibility for underserved children have not been given adequate attention or support.

**School feeding**

12. The nutritional, livelihoods and security situation in Central Mindanao has improved considerably in recent years, and what was appropriate at the outset of the intervention is less applicable now. The Government is coordinating its own approach to school health and nutrition which aims to target acutely malnourished children with a breakfast ration at school. The Department of Education (DepEd) has recently received approval to feed all of the identified SAM children nationally in the coming school year, and is now preparing an expanded budget for support for all moderately acute malnourished (MAM) and SAM children which it hopes will be funded in 2015. WFP needs to decide if they wish to continue with the on-site school feeding programme or hand back the schools they currently support to the Government.

**Livelihoods support via Cash for Work and Food for Assets/Training**

13. With respect to ongoing food for assets/food for training (FFA/FFT) activities, there are certainly enough opportunities and needs in the communities for this work to continue. The Government’s initiatives will certainly be continuing and the authorities would be glad to continue working alongside WFP. However, the WFP approach needs to be more proactive, more inclusive of women’s opinions, and targeted towards those specific communities with the greatest needs and integrated alongside other nutritional interventions.

14. Programmatic impact has been seen at its most effective when an integrated approach has been utilised in a community. Good synergies are created when both FFT and FFA activities are undertaken in the same locations where school feeding is provided and where nutritional support via the rural health centres is available. This has encouraged communities to work together well to generate the maximum benefit. Across the programme implementation area, it has been reported that household income levels have increased over the programme period.

15. Cash for work (CFW) activities, indicated in the initial PRRO original project document, have not materialised during the programme period as the ramifications of possible legal liability are discussed. Once agreed, however, the option of being able to support communities with either cash or food for work, dependent on community needs and preferences, would be advantageous.

16. Day to day operational difficulties have been addressed appropriately, such as dealing with some barangay captains who had made it difficult to implement projects as anticipated or planned, by attempting to use their influence to bias the beneficiary selection process, or to adjust the payment modalities. Monthly feedback and ad hoc

---

4 Impact of food for asset projects survey conducted in Central Mindanao, December 2013 (WFP, KFI and KI).
5 Notably insurance for, or legal liability, with respect to damages or violence acted out upon the assets and staff of WFP staff or its cooperating partners.
6 A barangay is a sub-section of a town or village with its own elected leader and council members.
review sessions with the cooperating partners and WFP-contracted external monitoring agencies have contributed to controlling the implementation process.

17. Remote areas, although targeted, have not seen the full benefit of the programme implemented to date due to certain constraints identified, such as access in general, and in particular transport issues regarding the delivery of food supplies. The programme would provide an increased impact if it could improve its coverage in these remote areas where malnutrition levels are higher.

Disaster and Preparedness Response

18. The ongoing Disaster and Preparedness Response (DPR) project has succeeded in strengthening some provincial and local government capacities, but there is much more that needs to be done. The programme needs to be continued and expanded, working very closely with the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council (NDRRMC) to provide capacity building and training for municipal and barangay level disaster management staff. A greater focus on grass roots community based mitigation projects should be encouraged in preference to larger scale construction activities, and a lessons learnt event would be beneficial in terms of documenting and sharing best practices.

Coordination

19. Co-ordination with external partners has gone well, with the work done by WFP very much appreciated by Government ministries, local authorities, donors and beneficiary communities. The activities undertaken have been very much in coherence with the plans and objectives of Government partner stakeholders, both at a national and at barangay levels. Similarly, cooperating partners and monitoring agencies have worked well with the WFP field staff while liaising with the wide range of actors included within the programme boundaries.

Cross-cutting issues: Gender

20. Gender issues in the communities have been an ongoing challenge, especially in Lanao del Sur where traditionally the men decide what a community needs. It is no surprise therefore that the FFA projects selected tended to be physical or construction orientated in nature. To ensure a better focus on women’s needs in future programme design, external rural development organisations could be engaged to undertake a gender assessment to identify the rights and needs of women so appropriate programmes can be identified to better support them as well.

21. Within the WFP CO structure, the overall gender balance is good: there are more women than men at a field officer level, enabling good access to the communities and to the women in particular, although there are more men than women at a senior WFP level.

Internal systems

22. Internal systems have coped reasonably well with what has been a very demanding year for the Country Office in terms of the number and magnitude of the man-made and
natural disasters that have occurred. Agreements with the national Food and Drug Administration (FDA) need to be reviewed, however, to avoid any repetition of the supply chain gaps that have occurred previously. Similarly, the time taken to approve FFA projects, once submitted, has been longer than ideal, negating any attempts to enable work to coincide with seasonal calendar work commitments.

Monitoring, reporting and data collection

23. Improvements are also required in terms of the analysis of data and the provision of timely and accurate reporting. One constraint for the evaluation is that it has been difficult to obtain accurate data in a timely manner. For example, data for the nutrition programme has been at times questionable, and there has been no programmatic report for the DPR initiative since May 2013. Furthermore, it has proven difficult to break down data received: the evaluation team still has not received school feeding statistics broken down by area of intervention, and detailed participant information for the Food for Assets programme.

Future opportunities

24. Looking ahead, the possibility of supporting livelihood projects for the re-integration of former combatants should be considered. These would encourage both economic recovery and stability within the area, especially as these demobilized combatants tend to have resettled to the more inaccessible areas where undernutrition will be more of an issue.

25. The signature of the Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro may provide an opportunity for increased funding and access to previously closed operational areas in Central Mindanao. The new Bangsamoro authorities will contain a mix of new political appointees, the majority of whom will likely be unaware of ongoing programmes, and as such there will be a renewed need for liaison and capacity building within the Government ministries.

26. The boundaries of the Bangsomoro entity are yet to be determined, although the area will still remain one of the poorest and least developed parts of the Philippines. Agricultural practices and livelihood income need to be improved and increased, as most adults in the communities are very poor, working as seasonal day labourers or tenant farmers, with low rates of return. With respect to improving levels of undernutrition, the need will be to address the underlying causes, i.e. poor access to health services, inappropriate feeding practices, insufficient nutritional knowledge and large family sizes. A sizeable proportion of mothers with acutely malnourished children tend to be those with large numbers of children (reaching 10 or more) and teenage pregnancy is common.

---

7 Typhoon Yolanda, for example, in November 2013 triggered a corporate L3 emergency.
Recommendations:

Based on the findings of this evaluation the team offers the following summary recommendations, as already discussed with the WFP CO, to be considered during the design process of the forthcoming PRRO:

i. A more targeted approach to the treatment of acute malnutrition would now be more appropriate, moving away from blanket feeding to targeting children with MAM. At the same time, mechanisms should be found to improve outreach work and enhance access for remote communities to the programme; delivery of supplies needs to move beyond the RHU and reach the targeted barangay level.

ii. WFP should continue its high quality upstream work, advising and advocating with the Government at a national level and with local government units (LGUs) to improve the nutrition policy framework, including consideration of the underlying causes of undernutrition, and to ensure this work results in improved programming on the ground. With the Philippines recently joining the SUN movement, WFP should consider, through multisectoral engagement, enhancing its supportive collaboration with the Government and other agencies to focus on the prevention of stunting as well as acute malnutrition. Future engagement with Government bodies should include capacity building initiatives whenever possible or necessary, particularly at LGU level.

iii. Increase training and capacity development of local health unit staff, together with their counterparts at the local and provincial government levels, to ensure a complete understanding of nutritional support needs and practices, in terms of rationale for and modalities of WFP programming to address acute malnutrition, and to improve reporting systems for collection and analysis of performance data.

iv. FFA projects need to be more targeted to the most vulnerable communities and integrated with DPR activities, being based on local contingency plans and hazard profiling results. FFA projects in communities should not be limited to one, but should reflect community needs, while increasing women’s participation in the project identification and design. Delays in the project approval system need to be addressed and the finalisation of cash for work (CFW) programming procedures should be agreed as a matter of urgency as this will enable flexibility in beneficiary support and the revival of local markets.

v. Working with the education authorities WFP should help schools develop their resource mobilisation capacity, kitchen gardens and logistical practices to ensure the continuation of the benefits gained from the on site feeding programme, as WFP hands over the schools it currently support into the Government’s own school feeding initiative.

vi. WFP needs to increase follow up support within the DPR programme to ensure cooperating partners make community/barangay level contingency plans and hazard mapping available in the targeted communities, to enable better linkages with future FFA interventions in forthcoming PRROs. A greater emphasis on mitigation and
training activities should be incorporated into the programme, which needs to be integrated and mainstreamed into the overall operational response.

vii. Programmatic reporting and data management needs to improve in terms of its timeliness, accuracy and regularity, becoming more analytical, and with outcomes measured against identified impact-related objectives and indicators.
1. **Introduction**

1.1. **Evaluation Features**

27. As per the approved Terms of Reference (ToRs: please see Annex 1), the evaluation has been undertaken in line with the WFP organisational objectives of accountability and learning. To those ends, it has assessed the performance and results of the operation, determined why programmatic objectives have been achieved or not, identified some good practices that have been observed, and highlighted lessons learnt that can be carried forward to future operations, both in the Philippines and elsewhere. The evaluation has been timed so that findings can feed into future decisions on programme design. The current PRRO 200296 was due to end in April 2014 but has been extended until December 2014. The Country Office plans to prepare a new PRRO to commence in January 2015, which will be submitted to the November 2014 Executive Board session.

28. The scope of the evaluation was set to cover all of PRRO 200296, excluding the typhoon Bopha response activities, and as such, the period covered by this evaluation spans from the PRRO formulation (mid-2011) to February 2014, when the evaluation mission took place.

29. The evaluation set out to answer the following key questions:

i. How appropriate is the operation?

ii. What are the results of the operation?

iii. Why and how has the operation produced the observed results?

The evaluation considered a broad range of internal factors under WFP’s own control, and the external operating context in the Philippines.

1.2. **Evaluation Methodology**

30. Three external, independent consultants (Team Leader, Nutritionist and a Livelihoods specialist) undertook the evaluation, including a three-week mission to the Philippines during February and early March 2014. The mission incorporated a ten-day trip to Central Mindanao to assess the various operational activities implemented in North Cotabato, Maguindanao, Lanao del Sur and Lanao del Norte, operating out of WFP bases in Cotabato City and Iligan. Shorter site visits in Northern Luzon, Cagayan de Oro and Laguna (near Manila) were also made to assess Disaster Preparedness and Response programme initiatives. A schedule of the visits is included in Annex 2, with a list of people met in Annex 3.

31. A mixture of information gathering techniques was utilised:

- Briefings with relevant WFP staff both in the Manila Country Office and the sub-offices in Mindanao (Cotabato and Iligan);
- Key stakeholder interviews were identified and conducted, in close collaboration with WFP country staff, including:
  - Interviews with national and local government representatives and relevant government departments: the Department of Social Welfare and Development
(DSWD), National Nutrition Council, Department of Education, Department of Agrarian Reform, National and Provincial DRRMC.

- Interviews with relevant United Nations agencies, donors and other relevant international and local organisations;
- Interviews with cooperating partners and external monitoring agency staff and management.

- Field visits to affected communities incorporating Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) as well as individual discussions with members of affected households. Wherever possible separate discussions were held with female members of the community to hear their perspectives.

- Desk review of relevant documentation:
  - Individual and consolidated project proposals and progress reports;
  - Donor reports;
  - Assessment reports and baseline survey data;
  - Previous evaluation reports;
  - Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) department reports and associated data;
  - Strategic and Annual plans and reports;
  - Implementing partner reports;
  - Other literature related to the operation.

32. An evaluation matrix (see Annex 4) was developed to guide the evaluation team towards addressing the questions raised in the ToRs, expressing detailed questions to enable a thorough line of inquiry. These questions were then broken down into relevant sub-questions to be addressed to each stakeholder group, e.g. FFA beneficiaries, local authority staff, WFP staff etc.

33. Triangulation of the information gathered through these various sources was undertaken during evening and weekend discussion sessions amongst the evaluation team. Findings and conclusions for the team’s initial in-country feedback debriefs in Cotabato, Iligan and Manila (with the Aide Memoire) were formulated to be incorporated into this final evaluation report.

34. An evaluation manager has supported the evaluation team and provided quality assurance throughout the evaluation. Furthermore, an external research director at the Feinstein International Centre, Tufts University, has provided remote advice and technical support on food security related issues.

**Limitations of the evaluation:**

35. Tied inevitably to the inherently insecure nature of operations in Central Mindanao, the evaluation team was subject to United Nations Department of Safety and Security (UNDSS) travel restrictions whereby some project areas were inaccessible due to the presence of armed separatist groups. There had been a Philippines Army offensive in the project area two weeks prior to the start of the evaluation. As such, a number of revisions to the site visit plans needed to be submitted before security clearance matched with travel practicalities and the need to see a variety of projects. Similarly, it was necessary to
leaves field sites by 16h00 in the Cotabato City region, and by 15h00 in Lanao del Sur. It was not possible to visit the Zamboanga Peninsula.

36. Beyond this, time and the poor quality of rural roads did not allow access to the extremely remote communities. It was against security regulations to stay overnight in communities.

37. More importantly, the evaluation team found it difficult at times to access up to date detailed project reports and accurate statistical data, of both a baseline and operational performance nature, particularly with respect to the nutritional intervention, where the quantitative results seem to lack accuracy and appear unreliable, and the DPR element of the response, where no full programmatic report has produced since May 2013. Furthermore, it has proven difficult to break down data received. For example, the evaluation team was unable to obtain detailed participant information for the Food for Assets programme. This has made it difficult to assess the actual impact of the programmes and to be fully aware of what activities have taken place.

38. The field mission for this evaluation was initially scheduled to take place in November 2013, allowing sufficient lead time between the receipt of the report and the preparation of the new PRRO. However, the mission was postponed at the last minute when typhoon Yolanda struck the country and caused massive devastation across several islands, obviously stretching the resources and capacities of the CO to receive the evaluation team at that time.

1.3. Country Context

39. The Republic of the Philippines incorporates 7,107 islands stretching 1,900 kilometres from the Batanes Islands, north of the Luzon Peninsula, southwards to the Sulu Archipelago, situated in the western Pacific Ocean. The country has an increasingly urbanised and growing population (+1.84 percent per annum) now totalling approximately 106 million people,8 being the 13th most populated country in the world. The Philippines’ human development index for 2013 was 0.654, with a ranking of 114th out of the 186 countries assessed,9 a comparatively lower position than in previous years, and lower than the East Asia and Pacific regional average.

40. National unemployment levels sat at 7.2 percent in January 2013, with more than one million Filipinos currently employed overseas. Employment within the country is difficult to find, and agricultural work remains the most frequent source of household income. Poverty levels remain high with a national average of 27.9 percent. According to UNICEF, available data shows large numbers of Filipino children are undernourished: 3.6 million children of 0-59 months of age are underweight; and four million are stunted. Children are affected not only because of the lack of food, but also because of poor feeding and care practices, poor health provision for pregnant and breastfeeding women, a lack of access to health services, weak knowledge and access to family planning services, and unsanitary conditions. Deaths among children below five years of age remain highest in

the poorest sectors of society, in rural areas, and among families with low educational status.10

41. Sitting on the northwest fringes of the South Pacific ‘Ring of Fire’, and lying on the
Western Pacific typhoon belt, the Philippines is highly vulnerable to natural disasters in
the form of earthquakes, floods, landslides, typhoons and volcanic eruptions. The
typhoon season in the Philippines traditionally hits its peak between July and October,
although in recent years weather patterns have become more unpredictable.11 Numerous
tropical storms form during these months, some of which grow into cyclones that cross
the islands damaging and destroying infrastructure, agricultural assets and property in
their wake. Prior to the devastating super typhoon Yolanda in November 2013, there had
been several major catastrophes in recent years,12 a situation predicted to be further
exacerbated by imminent climate change phenomena. A number of serious floods also
occurred in 2013, and the latest substantial earthquake to hit the Philippines being in
Bohol on 15 October 2013 with a magnitude of 7.2.

42. The on-going conflict on the southern island of Mindanao between the Government
and several separatist groups peaked during the first decade of the century, displacing
over 700,000 civilians. Peace negotiations allowed most of the affected communities to
return to their homes within the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (ARMM)
during the course of 2010. Comparative calm had descended upon the region, although
security conditions remain unstable highlighted by explosions of ordnance last year in
Cagayan de Oro and Cotabato City, and in September 2013 with an attack on Zamboanga
by marginalised members of one group. Kidnapping of local businessmen is still a
comparatively common occurrence.

43. The likelihood for a peaceful future took a positive turn when the Bangsamoro
Framework Agreement between the MILF and the Philippine Government was signed on
15 October 2012. Although there is a long way to go before the agreement is fully
implemented, the expectation is that peace will be accompanied by external investment
which will help reverse poverty levels in ARMM, currently the worst nationally, having
deteriorated to 46.9 percent (of families living below the poverty line) in 2012 from 43
percent in 2006.13

44. Central Mindanao, incorporating ARMM, lags behind the rest of the Philippines in
virtually all social indicators. Culturally and traditionally, men have a dominant role in
family matters, family sizes are large across all religious communities, and early teenage
marriages are common.

10 UNICEF Philippines: http://www.unicef.ph/
12 For example: typhoons Bopha in December 2012, Washi in December 2011, and Nesat and Nalgae in September 2011.
1.4. Operational Overview

45. PRRO 200296 targeted 997,112 beneficiaries, was planned to operate between May 2012 and April 2014 (although this has now been extended until 31 December 2014), and was originally budgeted to cost US$49 million. The total funding request has since been revised to US$73 million to include recovery activities for typhoon Bopha, as well as increased support for the Disaster Preparedness and Response (DPR) activities.

46. The following Table 2 shows the logical framework document included in the original PRRO 200296, as submitted for approval in January 2012. Performance against some of the statistical outputs have been difficult to measure as both baseline and project to date data has not been made available for all objectives. As such a comparative table of performance against planned indicators cannot be presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Logical Framework from PRRO 200296 Project Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1: Restore and rebuild lives and livelihoods in post-conflict, post-disaster or transition situations (WFP Strategic Objective 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate food consumption over the assistance period for targeted returnee and other food-insecure households participating in productive asset creation and skills training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and cash distributed under secure conditions in sufficient quantity and quality to targeted women and men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnee and other food-insecure communities have increased access to productive assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 2.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood assets developed, built or restored by targeted communities and individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1: Restore and rebuild lives and livelihoods in post-conflict, post-disaster or transition situations (WFP Strategic Objective 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnee and other food-insecure households have enhanced livelihood skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 3.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed skills for diversifying and strengthening livelihoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment of girls and boys in assisted schools stabilized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 4.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food distributed to girls and boys under secure conditions in sufficient quantity and quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2: Save lives of the most vulnerable individuals whose nutrition security has been adversely affected by the escalation in conflict of 2008/09 (WFP Strategic Objective 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced MAM in children aged 6–59 months and PLW in targeted communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 5.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food distributed to children aged 6–59 months and PLW in sufficient quantity and quality under secure conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 3: Invest in disaster preparedness and mitigation measures (WFP Strategic Objective 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased DPR capacity at the national and local levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 6.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed skills in DPR and early-warning systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
47. Food for Assets (FFA) activities fall under Objective 1 as livelihood assets have been repaired and farm to market roads have been constructed. Food for Training (FFT) activities have provided beneficiaries with new skills and expertise in growing new crops that will diversify their food intake and support nutrition interventions. Similarly, the school feeding programme falls within this objective (outcome 4) in that student attendance rates are supported by the provision of daily food to targeted schools and support to kitchen garden activities.

48. Nutritional activities in the PRRO fall under Objective 2. This was to be achieved through:

- prevention and treatment of moderate acute malnutrition (MAM) among children aged 6–59 months; and
- prevention of acute malnutrition among pregnant and lactating women (PLW) with the provision of ready-to-use supplementary foods (RUSF) for children, and nutritional support for PLWs in specific vulnerable communities. Prevention of acute malnutrition targeted children aged 6–23 months; while treatment of MAM targeted children aged 6–59 months was to be undertaken in collaboration with UNICEF.

49. In addition, under a joint programming approach concerning the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F) for children, nutrition and food security\(^\text{14}\) in the Zamboanga peninsula, WFP provided micronutrient powder for home-based food fortification to reduce and prevent anaemia in children aged 6–23 months.

50. However the programme has evolved slightly differently in the two sub-office regions of Mindanao: in Northern Cotabato and Maguindanao, WFP and partners are operating a targeted SFP for children aged 6–59 months. Children are admitted with a Mid-Upper Arm Circumference (MUAC) between 11.5 and 12.5 cms or with a weight-for-height (WFH) $<-2$ z-scores, and discharged on reaching both criteria of MUAC $>12.6$ and WFH $>-1.5$. Uncomplicated cases of SAM are also treated within the programme in the absence of any outpatient programme for the treatment of SAM. Complicated SAM cases are referred to hospital for treatment with F75 and F100. House to house screening using MUAC is ongoing in the communities.

51. The PLWs are also selectively screened for MAM treatment and admitted with a MUAC <23cm. At the time of the evaluation this activity was only just starting and 250 eligible PLWs had been admitted to the programme. They expected to receive 1kg of mung beans and 10kg rice per mother per month, depending on availability of resources. The activity only started in January 2014 following lengthy coordination and approval issues with local government partners and WFP’s cooperating partner, Save the Children. The planned ten municipalities in Maguindanao were eventually reduced to four as a result of these challenges.

---

\(^{14}\) MDG-F 2030, Ensuring Food Security and Nutrition for children 0-24 months old in the Philippines, is a three-year joint programme which contributes to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) target to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger (MDG 1) by halving the 1990 prevalence of underweight children under five years old by 2015, which will also contribute to reduction in child mortality (MDG 4).
52. WFP has partnered with Save the Children to implement Moderate Acute Malnutrition Management Partnerships for Implementation, Localization and Technology Transfer (MAMM PILOT) Project in two provinces (North Cotabato and Maguindanao), in four municipalities in each province. This included 66 barangays in Maguindanao and 115 in North Cotabato.

53. In Lanao del Sur and Lanao del Norte, blanket supplementary feeding of children aged 6-23 months is ongoing, while support to all PLWs was provided during 2012, but has been absent in 2013. In many communities RUSF is also provided to acutely malnourished children aged 24-59 months, but this is a programme adaptation that does not happen everywhere.

54. In all locations, mothers learn about family planning, improved infant and young child feeding practices, hygiene and good nutrition at the RHU from Barangay Health Workers (BHWs) in their community.

55. The DPR activities come under Objective 3. To date the programme has implemented a number of hardware projects, in co-ordination with local authorities utilising the local expertise of relevant cooperating partners, such as disaster management centres and evacuation centres, matched with local initiatives to improve the disaster response capacity of local emergency response teams. Some small scale mitigation activities have been organised which will be expanded upon as the intervention spreads and expands throughout the Philippines.

---

**Figure 1: Timeline of recent events in Mindanao**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Events</th>
<th>Timeline of Recent Key Events - Mindanao</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aug.2008</strong></td>
<td>Escalation of conflict between Gov't. and MILF after Supreme Court ruling blocking peace deal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dec.2009</strong></td>
<td>Peace talks resumed following PRA military offensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sep.2011</strong></td>
<td>Maguindanao floods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dec.2011</strong></td>
<td>Tropical storm / Washi / Sendong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oct.2012</strong></td>
<td>Peace deal signed (Gov't / MILF) to establish Bangsamoro by 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dec.2012</strong></td>
<td>Typhoon Bopha / Pablo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jul.2013</strong></td>
<td>Incendiary devices in Cagayan de Oro and Cotabata City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sep.2013</strong></td>
<td>MNLF attack on Zamboanga City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Security and Humanitarian Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700,000 displaced. Many returned but rate of return slower in Maguindanao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;200,000 displaced due to conflict. WFP implementing PRRO 200131 from July 2010 to Dec. 2011, supporting 900,000 beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearly one million people displaced between June and September 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,472 dead, 1,074 missing, 220,000 displaced. 11,431 houses badly damaged in Northern Mindanao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,067 dead, 844 missing, hundreds of thousands affected. WFP received budget extension for PRRO 200296 for response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six dead, 28 wounded in CDO; eight dead &amp; 40 wounded in Cotabato. Peace process under threat from terrorist splinter groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208 dead, 170,000 affected, 125,400 displaced into 47 evacuation centres. 10,160 houses burned. Access to regions affected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Evaluation Findings

2.1. Appropriateness of the operation

56. The need to physically rebuild and socially restructure the food insecure and conflict affected communities can be seen in the day to day subsistence and survival activities of the men and women living in both the urban and rural environments of Central Mindanao. PRRO 200296 was designed to support the recovery of such communities, and to increase their resilience to future shocks, utilising a multi sectoral approach that would improve livelihood activities and support those most disadvantaged families with undernourished children.

Nutrition

57. The general health and well-being of the Central Mindanao population has clearly suffered in recent years when compared to the rest of the Philippines. For example, the general prevalence rates of under-nutrition have remained constant over the last 10 years in the Philippines (Figure 2 below). The 8th National Nutrition Survey (NNS) of 2011 found a stunting prevalence of 33.6 percent (<-2 HAZ WHO GS\(^5\)) and wasting of 7.3 percent in children aged 0-5 years. The respective rates of stunting and wasting were 44.6 percent and 6.7 percent in Maguindanao; 52.6 percent and 6.4 percent in Lanao del Sur; 45.4 percent and 9.2 percent in North Cotabato; 41.0 percent and 6.4 percent in Lanao del Norte. Stunting, reflecting longer-term under-nutrition, appears significantly higher than the national average in these areas. The exclusive breastfeeding rate for infants aged 0-5 months is low nationally at 48.9 percent, and just 44.6 percent in ARMM.

**Figure 2: Prevalence of malnourished children aged 0-5 yrs (0-60 months), Philippines, 2003-2011**

![Prevalence of malnourished children](source)

58. The PRRO nutrition activities are in line with WFP’s strategic approach of focusing on both prevention and treatment of MAM, with particular attention to the 6-23 month

---

\(^5\) Height-for-age, z-score, World Health Organisation Growth Standards.
age group, and clearly support WFP’s Strategic Objectives\(^{16}\) SO1 (save lives and protect livelihoods in emergencies), and SO5 (strengthen the capacities of countries to reduce hunger, including through hand-over strategies and local purchase). Additional support has been given to the Government of the Philippines in development of nutrition policies, strategies, implementation and capacity building.

59. It is important to note that a blanket supplementary feeding (BSF) programme is generally considered a short-term, emergency measure advisable in situations of high GAM rates (where GAM > 15 percent or 10-14 percent with aggravating factors). The suggested duration of a BSFP is 3-6 months.\(^{17}\) BSFP in this PRRO has stretched over a two year period. Modifications were made to the activities in Maguindanao and North Cotabato with a move away from BSFP to a targeted supplementary feeding programme (SFP) for acutely malnourished children only from May 2013. This was instigated by the local government in discussion with WFP and was an appropriate adaptation to the changing context. In Lanao del Sur and Lanao del Norte, BSFP has continued despite increasing stabilisation of the situation, which is not appropriate.

60. The targeted SFP is aligned with the Philippine Plan of Action for Nutrition (PPAN) 2011-2016\(^{18}\) key strategy of “Adoption and implementation of appropriate guidelines for the community based management of acute malnutrition to reduce the prevalence of wasted under-five children from 6.9 percent in 2008 to less than five percent (not of public health significance) in 2016”.

61. In Central Mindanao, nutrition activities were targeted to the same food insecure areas that were selected for the food for asset (FFA) activities, in order to offer a comprehensive package of support to the same communities, many of which also benefitted from school feeding. Specific sites within those areas were selected in discussion with local government authorities using the data on prevalence of undernutrition from Operation Timbang 2012, the national annual weighing assessment.

62. Support to PLWs through a supplementary take-home ration of rice and beans was planned in sites where clinics were operating well and providing post-natal and ante-natal services. The main objective of this activity was to offer an incentive to bring mothers to ante-natal and post-natal care and was described in one RHU as a ‘gift’ for mothers once they had submitted to vaccinations and appropriate care. It was not considered by implementers as a nutritional supplement to prevent or treat under-nutrition and no indicators were formulated to assess the nutritional status of the mothers enrolled in the programme. This activity was clearly responding to a need to enhance access by PLWs to these services, as a 2009 report by the National Statistics Office found that while at the national level 91 percent of pregnant women were receiving ante-natal care from a skilled provider, this reduced to just 47 percent in ARMM.\(^{19}\)

\(^{16}\) WFP Strategic Plan 2008-2013.


\(^{19}\) National Statistics Office (Philippines) and ICF Macro. Philippines National Demographic and Health Survey 2008: key findings. Calverton, Maryland, USA: NSO and ICF Macro. 2009
WFP’s approach of encouraging mothers and children to make better use of health facilities has been appropriate in addressing some of the underlying and immediate causes of under-nutrition in these communities. The provision of RUSF to these RHUs is an attraction that draws in mothers, giving them not only support to their malnourished children if necessary, but also access to a broader range of health care and family planning services that are much needed. However, access to health facilities, especially in remote areas of Central Mindanao, can be difficult. Barangay health workers do not always live in those communities they are meant to support, and the nearest rural health unit can often be many miles away along a dirt road.

At the same time as implementing activities on the ground in support of the population, WFP has sought to use its position at national level to build capacity of national government structures and engaged in a range of upstream activities in support of policy development and strengthening of food security and nutrition early warning systems/Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) and surveillance. This has been an appropriate and effective use of WFP’s technical knowledge and expertise and much appreciated by the Government. It is anticipated by WFP that support to the policy framework and piloting approaches on the ground will lead to government uptake and rollout of activities, including treatment of SAM and MAM. The majority of this work is still in progress with outcomes on the ground yet to be seen. Furthermore, the Philippines has recently signed up to the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) movement, which will reinforce multisectoral approaches to address malnutrition and garner political support. WFP’s support to the Government in this respect will continue to be highly relevant.

Examples of this work include:

- The Micronutrient Powder (MNP) study that investigated implementation modalities and assisted the Government to include MNPs in their policy. This linked with the MNP activity in MDG-F, which demonstrated the effectiveness of MNPs, showing a significant reduction in anaemia in the targeted population;
- Support to the DSWD Social Protection policy in terms of mainstreaming nutrition and food security considerations, especially into family development sessions in their ‘4Ps’ (conditional cash transfer) programme;
- Support to the National Nutrition Council (NNC) to demonstrate the IPC at the Local Government Unit level and institutionalise it as a national tool, alongside capacity development of NNC staff in mapping, training and technical writing (assessing situations and interpreting maps);
- A Nutrition in Emergencies (NIE) training manual was developed under DPR activities, accompanied by a Powerpoint package for standardised training. The aim of this activity is to enable training for all actors within a municipality, in addition to technical nutrition people;
- WFP is an active member of the Technical Working Group on rice fortification (Food Fortification Committee). Iron fortification of rice is mandatory in the Philippines,
however obstacles to its application and enforcement have arisen, resulting in the re-convening of a technical group to assess its ongoing relevance;

- WFP, in collaboration with UNICEF, continues to work with the Government on the Philippines Integrated Management of Severe Acute Malnutrition (PIMAM) protocol and to develop MAM guidelines as well as national policy around management of acute malnutrition (the continuum of SAM and MAM management).

- WFP is working with the Food and Nutrition Research Institute (FNRI) on the development of a locally produced Ready to Use Supplementary Food (RUSF). The product formulation is already done, and FNRI is doing the final round of shelf life tests.

- WFP, with FAO, has also supported DSWD in implementation of a food security and nutrition early warning system at local level that will be replicated nationally.

66. WFP has worked well to support the Government’s lead rather than create parallel structures and to assist with demonstrating the evidence base of what works and what is appropriate within the context of the Philippines, supporting rollout where necessary. Within this model, WFP is conducting operational research with Save the Children on targeted supplementary feeding programmes (TSFP), with the aim of testing Community-based Management of Acute Malnutrition (CMAM) guidelines for the Philippines, and advancing national policy. Three approaches to MAM treatment are being compared: TSFP; TSFP plus nutritional education through a Positive Deviance (PD) Hearth approach; and PD Hearth alone. The Government is understandably reticent around purchasing expensive imported products for CMAM, so WFP is collaborating with the FNRI-DOST to develop a local RUSF product based on mung beans.

Food Security and Livelihoods

Food for Assets (FFA) / Food for Training (FFT)

67. Working alongside the nutritional interventions, the emphasis placed within the programmes undertaken on both individual and collective livelihoods support was clearly also relevant to the needs of the population. The variety of FFA projects, encompassing the standard and common preparation and installation of protective dykes, farm to markets roads, and clearance of irrigation channels, to the more unusual fish cages and mangrove swamp installations, will have both a long term income generating and, due to the provision of rice as mode of payment, a short term food intake benefit. In virtually all villages visited rice was the appropriate form of payment, popular with beneficiaries. Only in those communities with access to local towns and markets was there some desire to be paid in cash.

68. Beyond generating income there were indications that the projects have contributed towards the peace building process in that, at times, whole communities worked together on projects, rebuilding community links that had been broken because some community members had been displaced while others had been involved in the conflict itself.

---

22 Normally the food provided would last for 2-3 weeks for an average household family.
Food for training (FFT) activities were particularly relevant, as they were primarily aimed at female participants, and were mostly focused on the provision of kitchen gardens. Such activities should be promoted in future interventions as they linked well with the need to diversify household food varieties and support nutrition programme interventions. New crop varieties and farming techniques were introduced to the predominantly female beneficiaries to be cultivated at home. These specialist crops also provided a source of revenue.

Food for asset work already undertaken will also link in well with the Disaster Preparedness activities that are just starting in Central Mindanao. A number of the projects were inherently disaster mitigation activities, the protective dykes and mangrove improvement activities, for example. This link can be strengthened in the future as the DPR programme expands.

Similar again to the DPR programme, the majority of the FFA projects undertaken are of a structural nature with comparatively fewer training activities undertaken (a ratio of approximately 6:1). The impression gained here is that the majority of projects have been asked for and implemented by male community members although projects implemented were for a communal good. When questioned, women in the community suggested they would have opted for something different to enhance their livelihoods, particularly those from female-headed households who could not engage with the project and were unable to benefit from the rice distributed, nor often from the product of the work. When specifically asked, women requested income-generating activity projects, such as dress-making or spice processing (particularly mentioned in Lanao del Sur where spices are grown).

Additionally, some projects have not been instigated by the community but were projects that the LGU and WFP had decided on in conjunction with the Department for Agrarian Reform (DAR). These were mostly infrastructure projects such as road to market installations, funded via the Asian Development Bank.

The FFA programme has also had difficulties in places controlling the influence of the barangay leaders who at times favoured those with the same political or family allegiances in terms of beneficiary selection. When the programme’s cooperating partners or monitoring organisations noticed these issues the WFP field officers raised them during their community visits. As mentioned previously, support in the form of rice was the most appropriate medium of payment; cash would have created issues of mistrust or misappropriation to deal with at the barangay level.

Furthermore, the FFA support at times has been somewhat reactive. Although it was concentrated in specific districts and regions it tended to support initiatives that were put forward rather than proactively targeting individually selected communities with an integrated approach and working with them to ensure they had a viable proposal that could be supported.

Finally, one general issue has been trying to ensure full programmatic support to remote communities. The transportation of rice to schools and for FFA payments, as well
as the distribution of RUSF, has not always been provided directly to the end user location, but sometimes to a central distribution point, such as the town hall or the end of the main road. In these instances the additional cost for the last leg of the journey has been met by the school teachers or barangay health workers themselves, and in some instances by the LGU. The question that arises is whether or not WFP could be doing more to increase the support provided to these remote communities? The option of using smaller trucks to distribute to these areas, thereby increasing the possibility of access, should be investigated.

School Feeding

76. With respect to the on-site school feeding programme, there is little doubt as to the appropriateness of the support provided during this emergency and post-emergency period. At the end of the conflict, attendance levels of children in schools was low as many parents lacked enough money for uniforms, school fees and food to provide children with the necessary packed lunch. Also insecurity remained a concern, and some schools were simply not fully functional. The on-site school feeding programme, in line with the nutritional programme objectives of the WFP Country Strategy 2012-2016, was consequently designed to encourage children to return to school following their displacement and return, and implemented in collaboration with the Government.

77. Although the main objective of this activity is to keep children in school, there are other beneficial outcomes inherent in the programme: parents are more involved in the children’s school life (the parents cook the food on a roster basis), parent teacher associations (PTAs) are more active, the school kitchen garden receives greater attention, and the children themselves study better. The children also do not need to walk home at lunchtime, which, in an insecure area, is better avoided if possible.

78. The Government recognises the challenge of hunger and undernutrition in its schools. Annual monitoring of nutritional status of schoolchildren using body mass index (BMI) measurements taken by teachers and reported to the Department of Education (DepEd) suggest that approximately 14 percent of 24 million students\(^{23}\) are undernourished. To address this, the DepEd has developed its centralised breakfast programme with limited funds into a decentralised school-based breakfast feeding programme, targeted towards individual children classified as having severe acute malnutrition (SAM). Although this programme has struggled to reach all eligible children, from June 2014 its budget will be significantly raised to enable a breakfast ration to be provided to all children identified with SAM in school. In conjunction with the Department of Agriculture (DoA), DepEd is also supporting schools to establish vegetable gardens through the provision of seeds and tools.

79. WFP’s ongoing school feeding programme is not aligned with the Government strategy\(^ {24}\) but nonetheless has the approval of the Government, which is happy to see engagement of other actors in school feeding, including certain actors from the private sector.

---

\(^{23}\) DepEd feedback.

\(^{24}\) The Government has a school feeding initiative based on targeted students linked to the “4Ps” programme, whereas WFP operates a feeding programme for all children in the targeted schools.
sector. However, with the increasing stabilisation of the situation and a move away from emergency programming in Central Mindanao, along with the development of the DepEd model in a different direction to WFP, it is time for WFP to consider the appropriateness and sustainability of its school feeding programme. WFP’s future role may be reduced to capacity building in terms of stock monitoring systems and logistical guidance, with responsibility for any feeding handed back to the Government.

80. The Department of Education has required each school to have its own three-year School Improvement Plan, where the Government funds each school’s plans. Currently UNICEF’s education sector helps schools in formulating such plans and building the capacity of the school’s leadership. As a part of the handover of the school feeding programme, WFP could work alongside UNICEF to ensure that school kitchen garden activities are incorporated into such plans.

Disaster Preparedness and Response

81. All communities in Mindanao, as throughout the country, are susceptible to natural and man-made disasters, evident in the number of typhoons that have affected the area in recent years. The need for community based hazard mapping and contingency planning is clear and this has started to be addressed in some targeted communities within the DPR initiative, working alongside local government structures.

82. Again, this intervention is appropriate to the ongoing needs in all communities in the Philippines. The training and equipping of emergency response teams, the provision of evacuation centres, and the support towards localised early warning systems provided within the WFP programme is well appreciated. Such activities have coincided with Government legislation that requires local authorities to undertake DRR activities at a community level and to appoint DRR officers to undertake such functions. Similarly, the initiation of climate change programme activities have commenced at a time when the Philippines authorities are witnessing an increased number of larger scale disasters at different times of the year than expected, and in different areas (for example, typhoons seem to be hitting further south than previously and later in the year than is the historic norm).

83. These activities are also in line with the WFP Strategic Planning 2008-2013, notably objective 2.2: “To support and strengthen resiliency of communities to shocks through safety nets or asset creation, including adaptation to climate change” as well as the WFP Philippines Country Strategy 2012–2016, priority 1: “To prepare communities to respond to disasters”.

84. Despite the positives listed above, there are some implementation and programme design difficulties. There has been a tendency towards spending funding on ‘hardware’ rather than ‘software’ activities. This is evident within the DPR programme where operational and evacuation centres have been followed up on and completed, but the

26 Republic Act 10121 was passed in July 2009 after two major typhoons, Ketsana and Parma, caused devastation in Northern Luzon.
contingency plans are still not available in some communities, even though the training was undertaken in 2013. There seemed to be less emphasis on mitigation activities as well.

**Coherence/Co-ordination**

85. Co-ordination with local authorities and government bodies has been excellent. The fact that the PRRO has benefited from substantial contributions from the Government is important and reinforces the clear coherence of the operation with national policies. It can also be seen as an element of future sustainability of the intervention.

86. Some of the larger FFA projects have been undertaken in co-operation with the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR), the Department for Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), the Local Government Unit (LGU), and the Bangsamoro Development Agency (BDA). Smaller projects have worked alongside the Department of Fisheries, and the Department of Agriculture programmes such as the *Gulayan sa Masa* or Community Garden Project, which is a hunger mitigation programme that promotes integrated school and home gardens, particularly in rural communities. It aims to reduce hunger and improve nutrition in targeted provinces and urban centres through the promotion of school, backyard, and communal gardens. There are information materials, training and start-up materials such as seeds that are provided. Also involved in the programme are LGUs, the Department of Health (DoH) through the National Nutrition Council (NNC), and the DSWD.

87. Beyond this, nutritional activities have been undertaken with the NNC, the DoH, and the rural health units. The DPR interventions have been implemented alongside national and provincial disaster risk reduction and management representatives and offices (NDRRMC), and the school feeding programme has worked with the co-operation of the Department for Education (DepEd).

88. WFP has at times been referred to as the catalyst that has brought these organisations together, with the ongoing FFA programme and the rice/labour provided encouraging local authorities to work in unison, to push ahead with municipal and barangay level development plans. In this respect WFP is very much in line with national and regional policies, not only with DAR concerning building roads to markets, but also with the Government’s peace and development initiatives such as PAMANA, and with poverty alleviation initiatives such as the DSDW ‘4Ps’ programme which distributes conditional cash to the most vulnerable in society. These recipients are in some cases the same beneficiaries as those included in the nutritional and school feeding interventions.

89. On a separate level, programmatic co-ordination with other UN organisations and international and local NGOs operational both in Central Mindanao and elsewhere, has gone reasonably well. For example, links with local universities within the DPR programme have provided technical partners to establish automated early warning systems. WFP Field Officers have also been able to negotiate with all sides of the conflict to gain access to targeted communities. Government partners particularly noted the

27 http://www.pamana.net/
flexible and approachable nature of the WFP team, who were always supportive to upcoming needs, and the organisation is deemed to be a highly collaborative and appreciated partner.

90. Unfortunately, the local government departments have not always been able to fulfil their part of the bargain as the DSWD has had trouble delivering their rice payments on time (they are two years behind schedule in places) and LGUs have sometimes been unable to come up with necessary equity funds to contribute their share of the costs. Both scenarios have led to delays. The LGUs are in need of capacity building support with respect to project management, reporting and working in a more transparent manner. Considering the upcoming establishment of the Bangsomoro autonomous region it is important in the years to come that WFP works together with the relevant authorities to improve their operational and administrative capacities.

91. Also, initial coordination challenges between UNICEF and WFP and their respective cooperating partners was reported at the start of the PRRO by the two agencies. The two organisations worked in a disjointed and unsupportive fashion, rather than moving together to implement a smooth continuum of care for treatment of acute malnutrition (MAM and SAM). However, there is clearly renewed commitment currently for improved joint approaches at both the policy and field implementation levels. The two agencies are adapting their MOU in country to improve collaboration and ensure closer working and a seamless approach to the treatment of acute malnutrition. In 2013 they shared emergency funding for Zamboanga of US$400,000. The MDG-F was reportedly a highly collaborative project that pulled UN agencies to work together in a harmonious approach.

92. UNICEF has provided no SAM support in Central Mindanao since 2012, while WFP has continued with MAM treatment, so there has been limited recent contact on the ground. In the absence of SAM treatment, the continuation of MAM treatment has been appropriate to support vulnerable populations.

93. Beyond programmatic co-ordination, liaison in terms of security issues have been ongoing between the WFP security staff, UNDSS and local military and government authorities, informing operational staff of which areas are accessible and which are not, and as such enabling programmatic progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary: Appropriateness of the Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Mindanao was badly affected by the years of conflict it has endured, and still remains in need of multi-sectoral support to help in its financial and social recovery. The WFP intervention, working in good co-operation and co-ordination with governmental counterparts, has contributed to that process with much needed livelihood support at a community level and capacity building activities aimed at both national and local health services which were relevant to requirements identified. The blanket supplementary feeding programme was appropriate to the needs of the affected communities at that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
time, and has encouraged mothers and children to make better use of the healthcare facilities that were available.

The school feeding support provided was very much appreciated by both the students and parents and has had benefits beyond maintaining school attendance levels. Similarly, in a country very prone to natural disasters, the expanding DPR programme, working alongside the NDRRMC, has provided support relevant to the national needs which can be expanded both horizontally throughout the country and vertically, focusing more a community level mitigation activities.

Future interventions need to be more targeted, however, both in terms of nutrition programme activities and in terms in of targeting the most vulnerable communities for livelihood support, which should be more closely linked to local disaster mitigation needs.

2.2. Results of the operation

94. The actual results of the operation to date against planned distribution numbers for Central Mindanao activities can be seen in Figure 3 below and Table 3 on page 19. It is evident that there has been a shortfall in beneficiaries supported in terms of FFA activities, whereas more have been supported with FFT courses, and where it can be seen that there have been reduced treatment of MAM cases, this is offset by gains in the supplementary feeding beneficiary numbers reached.

Figure 3: Beneficiaries reached as percentages of numbers planned, by sector/year


Nutrition

95. In terms of outputs, WFP reached only a small percentage of its planned beneficiary caseload for treatment of MAM. Reasons cited for this were the late start of activities in many locations (not starting at all in some planned sites of Maguindanao), as well as low numbers of MAM children detected through screening. Beneficiary coverage totals can be seen in Table 3 below.
Table 3: Nutritional outputs for 2012/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary Category</th>
<th>Yr.</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>% Actual v. Planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children 6-23 mo given food under supplementary feeding (MAM treatment)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children 24-59 mo given food under supplementary feeding (MAM treatment)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4,596</td>
<td>4,784</td>
<td>9,380</td>
<td>1,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children 6 to 23 months given food under BSFP (prevention)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>11,270</td>
<td>11,730</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>24,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>11,270</td>
<td>11,730</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>7,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children 6-23 mo given food under micronutrient supplementation (stand-alone activity)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>12,789</td>
<td>13,311</td>
<td>26,100</td>
<td>18,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>[\text{There was no micronutrient supplementation planned or implemented in 2013}]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pregnant and lactating women given food under MCH/supplementary feeding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>45,619</td>
<td>107,481</td>
<td>153,100</td>
<td>53,523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: SPR 2012/2013). N.B. It is worth noting that the percentages reached of male and female children are exactly the same for the SFP activities, which casts some doubt on the precision of these figures. “Total figures can be misleading as many of the same beneficiaries were targeted in 2012 as in 2013; therefore there is double counting of actual people served.

96. The activities targeting pregnant and lactating women (PLWs) reached just under 60 percent of the numbers planned in 2012, but did not get started in 2013. The Standard Project Report (SPR) for 2012 notes that “a critical resourcing gap affected nutrition-based interventions due to donor resources being earmarked for FFA. This resulted in the under-achievement of supplementary feeding activities, accounting for the low numbers of pregnant and lactating women and children under 59 months reached”. The programme was not prioritised in 2013.

97. However, blanket supplementary feeding activities for children aged 6-23 months far surpassed the planned number of beneficiaries in 2012, which was apparently expanded, along with micronutrient supplementation programmes, based on a request from the Government. These numbers were achieved without an equivalent increase in the provision of micronutrient powder (100.7 percent of the amount planned was distributed), and only 37.2 percent of the planned ready-to-use supplementary food (RUSF) was distributed, indicating that children received less than the originally planned supplement. A proportion of the SFP activity provided rice and beans, rather than the RUSF which is not an appropriate ration, as it will most likely be shared between the whole family, rather than be prioritised for the 6-23 month old child. This renders the programme less effective.

98. In Northern Cotabato and Maguindanao, WFP and partners are operating a targeted SFP for children aged 6-59 months. The PLWs are also selectively screened for MAM
treatment and admitted with a MUAC <23cm. At the time of the evaluation this activity was only just starting and 250 eligible PLWs had been admitted to the programme.

99. The WFP/Save the Children MAMM PILOT only began implementation in November 2013 in Maguindanao and in January 2014 in North Cotabato due to delays in coordination and organisation between WFP, Save the Children and the LGUs. This late start calls into question the timeliness of the response by WFP. The Save the Children Semi-Annual Report, 1 July–31 December 2013 notes that the project progressed well once started, and provides performance data showing a 92 percent cure rate and no deaths among 479 discharges.

100. The BSFP started on time in May 2012 in all locations28, but experienced pipeline breaks through its duration and diversion of food supplies to other typhoon hit areas. The RUSF for BSFP is distributed by RHUs with the additional aim of encouraging children to go to health facilities for vaccinations and care. It has proved difficult to distribute to remote areas, with responsibility falling on the individual BHWs, particularly in cases where there is no support from the LGU with transport. Mothers are often asked to travel to RHUs to collect RUSF, but this can mean a long and expensive journey which is not an option for the poorest (for example: from Bansayan, Lanao del Sur, it is a 40 minute jeepney ride to the RHU, costing 50 pesos each way, the equivalent to 2.5kg of rice, or half a day’s pay. Approximately two-thirds of eligible children do not go).

101. In Lanao del Norte the PLW feeding activity started in 2012 but ended in 2013. This activity has also suffered from commodity shortfalls. The BHWs and RHU staff are responsible for monitoring the nutritional status of children. However, a lack of equipment for health staff to accurately assess height and weight was reported everywhere as a significant constraint. Most RHUs have only one height board though they may serve up to 40 or more barangays. It was reported that tape measures were carried instead to barangays for use in measuring children, though staff were aware of their unreliability and the difference in measurements found by different brands.

102. Record-keeping and reporting by BHWs was observed to be variable and largely inadequate in sites visited. In most cases there was evidence of registration of children in the SFP and weights being recorded at least every other month. Height was less commonly recorded, often only done when the child joined the programme. Weight for height was often not calculated and WFP’s cooperating partners reported gaps in the documentation they receive from RHUs, but there seemed to be little follow up from WFP in this respect. Summarised data held by WFP from Maguindanao appeared incorrect and as such is not considered reliable enough to be included in the evaluation.

103. Community and Family Services International (CFSI), one of the programme’s cooperating partners, and WFP, assisted by RHMs, BHWs and Barangay Nutrition Scholars (BNS), conducted an assessment exercise during February and March 2013 which entailed measurement of weight and length of BSFP child beneficiaries, covering nine percent of programme beneficiaries. Approximately 88 percent of desired sample

28 Maguindanao, North Cotabato, Lanao del Sur and Lanao del Norte
size of 600 children were measured during the data collection in Lanao del Sur. Although these children were randomly selected, replacements comprised 27 percent of the final sample. Based on this data, the Lanao del Sur sample showed a low prevalence of wasting, at 4.9 percent of the children aged 6-23 months, while the incidence of overweight and obesity was almost at par at 3.9 percent. Confidence intervals were not reported with the data. This data will act as a baseline to be followed up before the end of the programme.

104. In the Lanao del Norte sample, replacements for the randomly selected children made up almost 50 percent of the sample, therefore invalidating the representativeness of the findings.

105. Although there is an overall consensus that GAM has reduced in the region, no surveys specific to the area have been supported during the period of the PRRO. This makes it impossible to assess any overall changes. Operation Timbang data\textsuperscript{29} is available for 2012, but there are still questions over its quality and potential use for assessing trends. The data is collected at sentinel sites and may not be adequately representative of the population. The most recent national nutrition survey is from 2011, which predates the start of the PRRO.

106. Qualitative data collected by the evaluation found that the SFP activities have resulted in improved health-seeking behaviour by PLWs and mothers of young children, who actively bring their children to child health clinics, and enhanced mothers’ knowledge on nutrition and infant and young child feeding through contact with health staff and nutrition education sessions. There were numerous anecdotal reports of reductions in under-nutrition and improved health of children in the community, from parents as well as health staff.

107. The PLW programme, when operational, provided an additional incentive for mothers to attend for health check-ups. However, it is important to note that most beneficiaries are also registered in the government’s ‘4Ps’ and have to attend some sessions at the health centre to be eligible for payments. It is therefore difficult to distinguish the effect of the WFP activity from that of the ‘4Ps’.

108. Health staff noted sharing of RUSF amongst all children in the household, as it is very popular and difficult for parents to restrict food to the BSFP beneficiary only. This is inevitable to a degree, particularly in households where the recipient child is not undernourished and closely followed by health staff.

109. The SFP is well accepted by communities and health workers alike. Health workers do not consider the programme an additional burden to their schedules, but welcome the programme and the support it provides to the undernourished children in their care, as well as the enhanced health-seeking behaviours they have noted in communities. No deaths were reported from acute malnutrition in sites visited by the evaluation team or reported by WFP staff.

\textsuperscript{29} A government-run annual weighing programme where all children aged 0-71 months (under 6 years) are weighed.
110. However, the programme has suffered from a restricted reach and it was found that many eligible beneficiaries in remote areas failed to access the programme as they were expected to travel long distances to collect the RUSF and benefit from health services. The BHWs and midwives had limited outreach capacity due to the requirement to carry the RUSF supplies. Some RHUs reported very high levels of defaulters – children who had been enrolled in the programme but failed to turn up due to the long distances. This appeared to be a particular issue in Maguindanao. This data is not formally captured at present and efforts should be increased to ensure it is adequately collected, analysed and a response formulated to address some of the challenges.

111. Coordination between Barangay Health Offices, LGUs and Provincial Health Offices has been effective, although as noted above there was variation in commitment by LGUs to provide financial support for transportation of RUSF to the remote barangays.

112. While most health staff working in the programme have attended at least an orientation on the SFP, some training sessions occurred as far back as 2011/2012 and there have not been refresher since. It is especially important to provide ongoing support and training to staff in the context of the changing approach, which now includes taking height measurements and calculating WFH for targeted SFP in Maguindanao and North Cotabato. A further round of training is reported to be under discussion at provincial level with the DoH in Lanao del Norte and Lanao del Sur.

113. In terms of ensuring expertise of cooperating partners, while WFP’s Field Level Agreement format is clear in requesting partners to be technically skilled, it would still be preferable to provide more than an orientation on processes and monitoring to the partner, and to include the conceptual basis for the programme, to ensure that all those working together appreciate and understand the common goal. In addition, the general context, the Government’s guidelines and approach, as well as the programme itself, have evolved over the course of this PRRO and WFP needs to ensure that both its staff and its operating partners are updated as new developments arise, and they should periodically reassess training needs.

114. Storage of commodities was sub-optimal in many sites visited. Issues of rat infestation were reported, and RUSF was often stored in inappropriate places, for example a toilet in one RHU.

115. PDHearth has been well accepted in communities where Save the Children and WFP are implementing the MAMM PILOT, and effective at reducing acute malnutrition according to an initial monitoring report, without experiencing defaulters. This is a sustainable element of the study that can continue after the SFP phases out, as communities and health staff (Barangay Nutrition Scholars and BHWs) are equipped with the experience gained. Mothers who graduate from PDHearth join the team and support others. It has also reportedly formed bonds between mothers in communities,}

30 A sample of performance data was shared from Maguindanao but considered inaccurate and will not be presented here.
31 PD/Hearth is a community-based rehabilitation and behaviour change intervention for families with underweight preschool children. The ‘positive deviance’ approach is used to identify behaviours practiced by the mothers or caretakers of well-nourished children from poor families and to transfer such positive practices to others in the community with malnourished children. The ‘Hearth’ or home is the location for the nutrition education and rehabilitation sessions (World Vision).
many of who did not know each other at the start. A Save the Children staff member described the approach as one of “discovering new things and correcting myths about what people/children can eat”.

116. The MNP activities, part of the MDG-F, included effectiveness studies in Zamboanga and central Mindanao. These led to a reduction in anaemia from 44 percent to 15 percent in children aged 6-23 months in the four targeted municipalities in Central Mindanao. Distribution of MNP has since been written into the national DoH protocol on micronutrient supplementation and is included in the PPAN 2011-2016 as a specific intervention to be pursued. The study helped demonstrate to the Government the importance of mothers’ knowledge and understanding for the success of the intervention and the information and support that should be provided alongside distribution. The MNP product has been given a local name and attractively designed packaging. The Government continues to refer to WFP for expertise and ongoing technical support.

117. However, currently there is no ongoing MNP distribution in central Mindanao. This gap represents an unfortunate break in activities, following the intense sensitisation of mothers and health staff and monitoring that went into the study, as momentum and familiarity with the product may be lost.

**Food Security and Livelihoods: Food for Assets/Food for Training**

118. Working in unison with local authorities and relevant government departments the operations to date have implemented 1,202 separate FFA projects. Approximately two thirds of these have been small scale infrastructure interventions such as improvements to community farm to market access roads, and the renovation or construction of school buildings, day care centres, shelters, and health centres (see Table 4 below). Projects to improve agricultural production, either in terms of animal husbandry, fisheries, vegetables, rice and corn production have also been undertaken, running alongside the FFT projects dealing with organic vegetable production or kitchen gardens. A comparison of beneficiaries supported compared to planned is indicated in Table 5 on page 24.

**Table 4: Types of FFA and FFT projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provinces</th>
<th>Number of FFA</th>
<th>Number of FFT</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural Production</td>
<td>Non-Production</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maguindanao</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Kudarat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Cotabato</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanao del Sur</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanao del Norte</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>397</strong></td>
<td><strong>805</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Actual vs. Planned Beneficiaries for FFA and FFT projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Planned Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Beneficiaries Reached</th>
<th>Planned MT</th>
<th>MT distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food for Training</td>
<td>95,472</td>
<td>157,848</td>
<td>3,182</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food for Assets</td>
<td>855,540</td>
<td>460,176</td>
<td>23,518</td>
<td>10,922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WFP Philippines Country Office.

119. The table shows additional FFT beneficiaries were reached (162 percent of those planned) but with less food distributed than planned (23 percent). The evaluation was unable to determine the reasons for this variation.

120. The diversity and quantity of such FFA/FFT projects implemented is impressive. All workers on such projects have been supported with a production related or daily wage of approximately 5kg of rice per day, equivalent to approximately 200 pesos per day, a rate considered commensurate with local wage rate norms, although originally planned to be at just 75 percent of the normal local wage. The average number of days worked was ten.

121. The rice, however, is merely a by-product of the activity, albeit very much appreciated by the workers themselves. Rice received often only lasted for 2-4 weeks, dependent on family size. What was of utmost importance was to establish or regenerate an asset of long term value to the community that would either improve access to health or education services, or would contribute to improved income levels in the years to come, and invariably this is what has happened. Similarly, the training on agricultural production or kitchen garden activities will enable families to both increase and diversify their household food consumption.

122. Food consumption scores (FCS) from the WFP programme areas can be seen in Figure 4 below taken from a December 2013 survey, which, when interviewing communities in general, indicated a rise in the food consumption score from the baseline 69 percent acceptable as of February 2013 to a 75 percent acceptable average over the five provinces. The question as to how much of this impact is attributable to the WFP intervention is, of course, difficult to assess, particularly as the study goes beyond programme recipients.

123. The change in FCS is also somewhat dependent on the recipient as well as the location. Internally displaced people (IDPs) are the group most affected by the conflict, followed by returnees and the resettled. Those never displaced are relatively better off in their level of food consumption. As much as showing increased FCS, Figure 4 indicates that the provinces of Lanao Del Norte and Lanao Del Sur have a significant proportion of IDP households, as FCSs have increased less than elsewhere.

---

32 2.5 kilos per day on the food for training courses.
124. Similarly, income levels have been seen to increase over the programme period in the same projects areas, as indicated in Figure 5 (again, attribution is an issue).

**Figure 5: Income increases by province during programme intervention period**

125. Undertaking such activities is not without its difficulties, and the provision of a daily ‘wage’ in a valuable commodity such as rice has made workforce selection an issue. Although intended to support the most vulnerable households in the communities the destination of this wage has been difficult to control. Barangay chiefs are influential leaders in such small communities and, at times, are not beyond utilising their influence when it comes to the selection of beneficiaries to undertake the work. WFP, through its cooperating partners such as CFSI, and monitoring agents Kaduntaya Foundation (KFI) and Kapamagagoppa Incorporated (KI), have responded where such favouritism has been
brought to their attention. They have discussed these issues with the communities in question, but even then the make-up of work teams has not always been as anticipated.

126. The decision to support communities with rice, the local staple diet, and not cash was very popular. Only those communities close to urban markets showed some preference for cash. Having rice delivered to the village made it cheaper by saving on transport costs, and enabled some sharing of wages with neighbours that would probably not have happened had hard currency been involved. The procedures for distributing cash in certain areas close to markets need to be finalised.

127. It has also been difficult to see a selection strategy in terms of the communities supported. Although in general the most conflict affected areas with the most returnees have been targeted, specific communities with the most concerning social indicators could have been targeted with an integrated approach. At present it seems the most proactive communities were supported as WFP processed those applications received rather than seeking out and supporting communities that most needed the projects. Furthermore, at times LGUs have tried to incorporate their ‘Bottom Up budget’ development plans into the programme with WFP contributing the unskilled labour payment as a FFA initiative. Projects have sometimes therefore been designed around the Government’s goals rather than the needs of communities, and the WFP contribution has merely reduced local authority expenditure.

128. What is evident from community feedback is that there are more projects that could be undertaken. Whether or not there needs to be a daily ‘wage’ involved is questionable. Most communities seem willing to work together for collective projects in what is traditionally known as bayanihan, and would be satisfied if only materials and tools were provided, noting that in many of the projects to date the workers have had to borrow tools. WFP must be careful not to work against such traditional bayanihan practices.

129. It would be beneficial if future interventions took into account the seasonal calendar, whereby infrastructure project work would not coincide with the busy agricultural harvesting peaks in activity, which occur twice a year. Workers have reported the difficulty of working on both their land and the FFA project at the same time. For this to be possible, a more streamlined authorisation process needs to be installed. The current process is said to take too long (up to two months) as final authorisation sits with the Project Review Committee (PRC) in Manila. Any delays can negate attempts to enable work to coincide with seasonal calendar work commitments and can demotivate communities who would consider such delays as a lack of commitment. One suggestion was that this authority was returned to Mindanao for the sake of expediency.

130. Overall, the FFA/FFT element of the response has attained a reasonable level of success. It has provided timely, and in places sustainable support to the conflict-affected communities. A great deal of co-ordination and co-operation has been undertaken by WFP’s Field Officers, dealing not only with the local government officials, beneficiaries, cooperating partners and monitoring agents, but also various groups such as MILF or

---

33 Accepting that these statistics are not always readily available.
clan leaders in the communities. Access issues in the rainy season have been overcome, and there are indications that income levels have increased in many households as a result of the activities undertaken.

131. A lot of the projects have disaster mitigation aspects and could easily have been incorporated into the DPR programme in Mindanao had it been more active previously. Projects such as mangrove restoration work not only protect villages from coastal erosion, but they also provide breeding grounds for fish, generating a source of protein for the communities as well as an additional income. Such projects will remain popular and need to be continued to support economic recovery and to stimulate local businesses.

**School Feeding**

132. The school feeding programme targeted 400 schools (100,000 children in grades 1-6) in returnee communities. Sites were selected, as for FFA, according to the World Bank/WFP 2010/2011 assessment, and then individual schools with the highest dropout rates were selected in collaboration with the Department of Education. Schools receive 150g rice, 20g mung beans and 10g vegetable oil per child per day for 20 days per month during term-time, which is cooked on-site by parent volunteers on a rotation basis. Table 6 below illustrates that, in terms of numbers of beneficiaries planned for school feeding, WFP achieved high percentages, with boys and girls equally represented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children receiving school meals</th>
<th>Planned (assumed 51/49% split between girls/boys)</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Percentage Actual vs. Planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** WFP Philippines Country Office.

*NB the numbers exclude those supported in response to typhoon Bopha and in the conflict zone of Zamboanga city in 2013. However the exact same percentages of boys and girls covered makes the accuracy of the data somewhat questionable.*

133. The retention rate in WFP-assisted primary schools for the school year 2011-2012 was already high at 99.34 percent (June 2012, Department of Education data) and for the 2012-2013 school year was maintained at 99.76 percent.

134. Qualitative data collected through focus group and key informant interviews with local government actors, WFP cooperating partners and at schools visited by the evaluation team, provided evidence of additional perceived benefits of the programme. These included improved academic performance, increased admissions and encouragement of drop-outs to return, as well as enhanced engagement of parents with schools, as the programme encouraged them to send their children to school and participate in school gardening and cooking sessions. Relationships between teachers and

---


35 Department of Education data, June 2013. Source: WFP SPR 2013
parents have been strengthened with parents spending more time at the school and having greater opportunities to discuss their children.

135. Products from school kitchen gardens, together with items that parents, in many schools, are contributing themselves from their own gardens or through market purchase, diversify ingredients to school meals. An ethos of communal sharing has reportedly been strengthened through children eating together, as well as through parent and teacher contributions towards running the programme. It was noted that the programme has also relieved some burden on household budgets as parents can save the cost of lunches for each child in school.

136. The school lunch was reported to be a potent motivating factor for children to go to school and has improved their concentration in class by reducing feelings of tiredness and hunger. Improved health of children was noted as a result of their enhanced nutritional status through consumption of school meals and fresh vegetables, as well as a reduction in absenteeism, as pupils who were frequently absent before now come to school for food. Teachers’ attendance was also said to have improved; in particular the issue of teachers frequently not returning to school after going home for their lunch break has been addressed.

137. Staying in school to eat lunch was reported to have had benefits for children who live far from the school and who no longer have to go home at lunch time but can take that time to relax, read, do homework, as well as eat with their classmates. This also has positive implications for security in areas affected by conflict, through keeping children on the school grounds all day.

138. There was significant variety in the schools visited by the evaluation team in terms of quality of facilities, availability of teaching staff and income bracket of parents. In some schools many children miss breakfast as parents have nothing to give them, especially those families with many children or during the planting season and other difficult times; whereas in better-off schools, the issue of the monotony of daily rice and beans was raised.

139. It was evident that not all schools are cooking every day, the reasons for which included the challenge of getting enough parents to cook, especially when parents live far away or have small children at home, making it difficult for them to go to the school and participate. When cooking does not occur each day, many of the programme benefits may be lost.

140. Pipeline issues were experienced with the school feeding programme as delays of days or weeks were mentioned, due to impassable roads during the rains or food diversion to other emergencies (February 2013, WFP Cotabato). All schools mentioned the lack of cooking pots, pans, plates and utensils to prepare food as well as the lack of support for school infrastructure; for example many have improvised cooking facilities/kitchens and lack sufficient toilets and handwashing facilities. Contributions

36 Most recently in September and December 2013 and in January 2014 in Iligan
were solicited from parents to purchase cooking utensils and, in some cases, to transport the food commodities from the main road to the school.

141. Storage of food commodities is sub-optimal in many sites, with no use of pallets, and libraries or sick bays being doubled up for commodity storage, or commodities kept in the head teacher’s home. The latter is far from ideal in terms of transparency and puts undue pressure on the head teacher when people know the stores are there.

142. In terms of accountability, parents were aware of the food entitlements for each child in most sites and often a food management committee had been set up to record stock and check attendance. However, in the majority of sites visited the head teacher controlled food storage and ration distribution, with support from the PTA representatives. Cooperating partners and field monitors, as well as WFP’s monitoring partners, examine stock records and conduct headcounts to verify attendance data.

143. In terms of sustainability, parents and teachers are committed to continue with the vegetable gardens and to try to supply school meals if the WFP programme stops. In some areas there is also effective support from the Department of Education and the LGUs. As one stakeholder commented: “The programme was an eye-opener for us; it showed us things that we can achieve” (stakeholder meeting, Cotabato). Schools have yet to be informed of the impending end of the programme, though the school year finishes in March. In all places visited they are hoping for (and expecting) a continuation of the programme.

144. A further suggestion from stakeholders for future programming is to re-orient the targeting to include more remote schools (in the areas where indigenous people are living), where children are walking very far to school, while exiting from schools that are now considered sufficiently stable with an active PTA.

145. Challenges to the overall impact of the programme include its limited coverage: targeting just 400 schools is a low percentage of all the schools in the four targeted provinces.

146. From the available data, it is clear that retention rates have been maintained in the targeted schools. Attribution of the high rates of retention to the programme is difficult due to the number of other factors that would affect whether or not a family would be able to return their child to school. For example, the increased stability in the region during the implementation period of the PRRO, and the influence of the ‘4Ps’ programme that requires school-aged children to attain 85 percent attendance. It would be useful to collect comparative data from neighbouring schools outside the programme to provide some indication of the likely contribution of WFP school feeding.

147. More could have been built into the school feeding programme in terms of measuring its impact. At the start and end of each school year all schools measure each student’s body mass index, and take part in the national assessment exams. These statistics are held with local education authorities and could have been used to compare performance in schools that receive the school feeding support compared to others that do not.
Disaster Preparedness and Response

148. Following on from a calamitous year in the Philippines in terms of natural and man-made disasters, there can be no doubt as to the need for a thoroughly competent disaster response and disaster risk reduction capacity to be systematically incorporated into the local and national government systems. WFP, in co-ordination with the Office of Civil Defence (OCD), particularly the National Disaster Risk Reduction Management Council (NDRRMC) (predominantly funded by USAID/OFDA and AusAid and utilising local partners and technical institutions) is a part of a movement that is trying to do just that. The Phase 1 pilot intervention was completed in July 2012, with Phases 2 and 3 currently ongoing. Table 7 below gives a sample indication of the activities completed to date, compared to planned numbers.

Table 7: Planned vs. actual DPR programme achievements to date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of government staff members trained in contingency planning</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>5,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of government staff members trained in early warning systems</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>2,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of local early warning systems in place</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WFP Philippines Country Office.

149. Within the most disaster prone, low economic status regions of the country, WFP, working through provincial and municipal government offices, has funded the construction of a number of disaster operations centres, storage points and evacuation centres.\(^{37}\) WFP has also provided emergency response equipment to provincial and barangay level emergency response teams that have been trained within the programme itself. Expanding gradually southwards from Northern Luzon into Mindanao the programme currently covers 23 municipalities and two cities, having originally started with only nine municipalities. Several MoUs with LGUs are currently under consideration for signature.

150. The quality of structures built seems good, overseen by the structural engineers of the provincial or municipal offices in the provinces with which WFP are in partnership. Similarly, the equipment provided seems of good quality in terms of the rubber dinghies and hard bottom boats inspected, and a number of radios, life jackets, helmets etc. have already been distributed.

151. Early warning system technology has been updated at programme sites in co-operation with state university technical departments\(^{38}\) where automated rain gauges and water level measurements are undertaken in rivers at key locations. So far only tested in simulation exercises, it will be interesting to see the technology working should an actual disaster strike. Text message warnings and automatic siren systems are already operating.

152. The trainings undertaken to date have concentrated on hazard mapping and barangay level contingency plans, as well as instructing the barangay level emergency

---

37 The exact list of facilities provided to date is currently unavailable.
38 For example, the Cagayan State University and the University of Philippines, Los Banos College.
response volunteers as to what their role entails and what their responsibilities will be. These trainings have been conducted at a municipal level and then replicated and filtered down into the relevant barangays, encompassing emergency assessment, first aid, camp management, communication and search and rescue activities. One concern, however, is that these teams are predominantly male. More female recruits need to be identified and recruited.

153. The programme has co-ordinated well with provincial, municipal and barangay government departments, who are very appreciative of the support provided. On a national level, linkages with NDRRMC have been mutually beneficial and need to be further enhanced as the latter attempts to standardise a national curriculum for government disaster management officers, in essence creating a new profession within the Government system. WFP needs to ensure that they remain synchronised with the other United Nations, governmental, and INGO DPR actors.

154. Partnerships with local cooperating partners have also been beneficial as it is they who have undertaken most of the programme implementation work, co-organising and facilitating training courses, while co-ordinating between WFP and the local authorities. For example, the Philippines Businesses for Social Progress (PBSP) (a non-profit social development foundation), have worked well in Mabitic, Laguna, and their co-operation should be sought as the programme expands into Mindanao.

155. The programme has also incorporated Climate Change Adaption activities, similar to those undertaken in a Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) intervention, into the programme, such as the planting of vetifer grass to protect river banks in Ballesteros and a rainwater harvesting project in Cagayan de Oro. These initiatives need to be mainstreamed into the overall DPR programme in future.

156. The impact of the programme to date is difficult to measure, especially as no overall programme report has been issued since May 2013 and no baseline data is available for comparison. It is clear that the technical and physical capacity of the recipient organisations to date have been augmented due to the availability of operations centres, early warning equipment, and of the trained evacuation teams, although the usage of such items is yet to be tested.

157. The DPR programme, unfortunately, has been kept somewhat separate to the other ongoing operations. Some co-operation has been ongoing in Mindanao recently between the FFA projects (many of which could be considered as disaster mitigation projects) and the Disaster Management officers. In future, the WFP DPR staff need to be fully integrated into other operational activities to ensure synergies are possible and expertise is available. Although work has been done identifying local hazards and drawing up contingency plans, only a few localised mitigation activities have been undertaken in
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39 DSWD has provided food for work on some of the construction projects.
40 Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), for example, are producing DM/DRR training Manuals.
41 Implemented alongside the CdO Municipal DM dept.
those areas outside of Mindanao. As mentioned previously, the emphasis on hardware in the form of bricks and mortar has remained dominant.

Unfortunately, some of the trainings have also not been followed up on, whereby contingency planning events have taken place, but the designated local partner has not been able to allocate sufficient resources to write up the end results. Similarly one or two local partner projects could have been implemented more thoroughly.

It is clear that there remains a great need in terms of evacuation centre renovation and construction, and that a great deal of training for municipal and barangay emergency response teams needs to be undertaken. Equipment such as radios, helmets, flashlights, gloves, boots etc., needs to be made available. Mitigation projects need to be based on hazard mapping exercises, and successful projects already established need to be replicated elsewhere. How to utilise evacuation and operations centres when there is no ongoing emergency needs to be considered.

A lessons learnt event would prove beneficial for all stakeholders at the same time providing a forum for the exchange of information, techniques and best practices. Information/education/communication (IEC) materials need to be agreed on and a communication strategy established. Liaison is essential with local authorities, which should also be encouraged to appoint a permanent local authority DRRM officer. Currently the incumbent undertakes a number of different roles as a result of budget shortages. This appointment should be possible as five percent of the municipality’s annual budget has to be legally allocated to the local DPR/calamity fund.

**Summary: Results of the Programme**

Nutrition programme outputs have only met a small percentage of the caseload for MAM. Similarly, activities targeting PLW reached under 60 percent of planned beneficiaries for 2012 and did not get started in 2013. However, blanket supplementary feeding activities for children 6-23 months far surpassed planned beneficiary numbers for 2012, as did micronutrient supplementation programmes.

Barangay health workers need additional equipment and training to ensure that the monitoring of children’s nutritional status is undertaken properly. Record keeping and reporting was observed to be variable and largely inadequate.

It has proved difficult to extend support to remote areas, both within the BSFP programme, where responsibility fell on individual BHWs to ensure that supplies reach the beneficiaries, and within the school feeding programme where food was sometimes dropped at the nearest main junction, schools had to undertake the remainder of the journey utilising their own resources. This situation needs to be improved.

---

42 For example, mangrove rehabilitation in the provinces of Cagayan and Sorgoson.
43 The local partner concerned has only three staff, and needed to write up 18 barangay contingency plans.
44 For example – the Vetifer Grass project in Cabayo, Ballesteros.
The diversity and quantity of the FFA projects is impressive. These have been mostly small scale infrastructure interventions. FFT activities have been mostly concerned with kitchen gardens and organic vegetable production, which have benefited both the income status and nutritional intake of the families involved. The decision to support communities with rice as a daily wage, and not cash, has decreased levels of interference and was welcomed by the beneficiaries themselves.

Similar to the DPR programme, a lot of “hardware” activities have been undertaken within the FFA initiative, where an emphasis on construction has dominated. Women need to be more involved in the FFA project selection process and, with greater linkages between the two programmes established, so that more female centred and localised mitigation activities could be organised within future responses. Within the DPR programme, contingency plans and hazard mapping exercises should be utilised to identify FFA projects.

School feeding support has contributed to school attendance figures and has supplemented the diets of the child beneficiaries although there have been some pipeline breaks and meals are not always served every day. More could have been built into the programme to monitor its impact compared to similar schools nearby.
2.3. External and internal factors affecting operational results

**External Factors:**

**Government and cooperating partners’ capacity:**

161. With respect to the nutrition interventions, WFP is fortunate that good Integrated Provincial Health Office (IPHO) staff capacity exists in their programmatic locations, especially among the more senior staff. However, capacity development of staff in concepts concerning the management of acute malnutrition and nutritional programming is still required, particularly for implementing staff such as BHWs.

162. However, there is no nutrition strategy for central Mindanao, which makes it difficult for agencies to work towards a common goal or purpose, or to work outside an emergency framework. MUAC is a new tool and routine height measurements were only introduced last year. There are no national guidelines yet approved for treatment of acute malnutrition. The programme has therefore lacked strategic focus and is only targeting specific sites; examples of SAM and MAM treatment are being showcased in Mindanao to demonstrate to the Government what can be done and provide local evidence to support a CMAM protocol. The NNC has asked WFP to support a literature review and advise on developing guidelines for SFPs. These are now in draft.

163. There is an existing ongoing national programme of nutrition education – *Pabasa se nutrisyon* – reinforced by the nutritional education components of the SFP and offering a system to work with to enhance sustainability of the nutritional messages provided through the WFP support. It has been suggested that it could be adapted to a PD/Hearth model (which includes cooking demonstrations and getting mothers together in groups) in areas of the Save the Children/WFP study and beyond.

164. The lack of infrastructure in isolated areas make access a problem for the programme. Almost a third (30 percent) of the barangays assessed as part of the HAP 2013 Multi-Cluster Needs Assessment had no barangay health station and many suffer from poor roads. These factors also discourage mothers and children from accessing appropriate health care and nutrition support. Similarly, barangay health workers often have low capacity and may be volunteers or earning a minimal wage despite being the frontline actors of the SFP.

165. In Maguindanao WFP lacks an cooperating partner and was initially dependent on UNICEF and its partners’ support to government health staff at the start of the PRRO. When SAM treatment stopped and UNICEF and its partners moved out, WFP continued with SFP, although this placed a heavier burden on government health staff in terms of monitoring and reporting.

166. In the majority of RHUs, health staff had good contacts with the cooperating partners (CFSI or Save the Children), but frequently had no contact number for WFP staff. This was not reported as a problem during the evaluation, but should be considered in future programmes for accountability purposes.

---

167. The DoA is providing support to schools to develop kitchen gardens through its Gulayang sa Paraalan programme, as gardening is a part of the DepEd home economics curriculum. The DoA provides garden tools and vegetable seeds to the DepEd who implement the programme. WFP has supported this project through FFA, providing rice to parents to cultivate the soil and plant vegetables, working in unison with the Government. This has involved good coordination with these government departments on a programme that offers a sustainable contribution to the school communities, who will have some resources to continue feeding children beyond the WFP project duration.

168. In some locations teachers have worked with parents to ensure their school has toilet facilities in preparation for the school feeding programme. Hand washing programmes have also been established in some schools; several with the support of a German government (GIZ) funded project that also provides toothbrushes, toothpaste and soap. In other places strong LGU support (through money or materials) and commitment is evident, and assistance from the LGUs has enabled schools to erect hand washing facilities (e.g. Lanao del Norte). Barangay officials attend school feeding orientation sessions so that each stakeholder is aware of the necessary commitments to support the programme. Other stakeholders have complemented efforts in some schools with feeding utensils, kitchen utensils, reconstruction of schools and sanitary facilities.

169. The FFA programme has benefited from a number of ongoing governmental initiatives with which it was able to co-ordinate and integrate. As mentioned previously, the ongoing initiatives of the Department for Agrarian reform, the Department of Agriculture and the PAMANA activities are good examples. WFP has also been able to work alongside municipal and barangay development plans, and has taken advantage of the traditional bayanihan system that has made community based interventions more easily acceptable. Beneficiary involvement in how the project is established and implemented has at times been good. Delays within the LGU and with DSWD in terms of providing funding and FFA have been detrimental to the timely completion of some projects.

170. Coinciding with the expansion of DP and DRR activities in national and local government circles as a follow on to the Republic Act 10121, the WFP DPR programme has benefited from a national realisation that they need to be better prepared for the natural disasters that hit the country each year with such devastating effect. The fact that five percent of each municipality’s Internal Revenue Allotment now has to be allocated to disaster response activities, of which 70 percent is to be spend on preparedness with 30 percent available for food and supplies, bodes well for future programme activities and for the support of Governmental DRRM officers. The fact there are a number of other agencies also willing to get involved in this sector gives hope that sufficient resources will be available to build capacity, not only at a national level but at a barangay level as well.

171. Collaborating with technically strong external partners has enabled a great deal of progress in terms of organising automated early warning systems. However, at times the capacity of one or two of the cooperating partners has been somewhat questionable. An annual review of partner’s performance should be undertaken before contract extensions are agreed.
Security and political factors:

172. The security situation in Central Mindanao remains unstable. Staff cannot stay overnight in the field, and there are time restrictions on how late in the day they can remain in rural communities. Conflict breaks out from time to time, either in the form of anti-Government activities, fighting between rival factions, inter-clan rivalry, or a specific *rido* or dispute between two families that often escalates into gunfire and violence. Such incidents affect staff, implementing and monitoring partners and access to communities, and therefore the implementation process itself.

173. Another external factor, which has led to delays in programme implementation, are the local elections. Apart from the closure of Government offices, they cannot implement any activities 45 days before or after an election. Once a new mayor or provincial leader is appointed, changes in government officials are quite likely to follow whereby any working relations already established have to be restarted.

Recurrent Natural Disasters:

174. The last 15 months have seen typhoon Bopha in Eastern Mindanao, an earthquake in Bohol, a conflict situation in Zamboanga, and the widespread devastation of typhoon Yolanda. These have been major operational distractions that have side-tracked WFP staff attention away from the ongoing Central Mindanao response.

Internal Factors:

Management systems:

175. With respect to WFP internal management procedures, for the most part these have gone well, especially in terms of the usage of the PRRO itself as a flexible tool, resource mobilisation, the leverage of funds from partner organisations, security management, and the use of available staff to transfer to other, more immediate, emergencies. However, there have been some areas where there is room for improvement as mentioned below.

176. There has been a lack of effective monitoring, and a shortfall in the analysis of programmatic outcomes has been a significant constraint to adaptation of the programme and to a better understanding of the changing situation. Individual monitoring and the follow up of children and defaulters has been weak. In a context where overweight prevalence is almost as high as underweight (Lanao del Sur WFP/CFSI 2013 data), consideration of the appropriateness of continuation of BSFP to all children should have been reviewed on an ongoing basis, supported by a review of weight gain from beneficiary records. WFP currently lacks nutritional expertise and analytical capacity in its Cotabato sub-office, which further exacerbates the problem of limited technical expertise available to support the programme. This situation needs to be addressed at the earliest opportunity.

177. The use of cooperating partners and external monitors has proved beneficial in terms of counteracting some of the influence of barangay captains and local politics.

---

46 The PRRO was 83.6 percent covered as of January 2014.
Although tensions in the communities have been known to block monitoring visits, and monitoring enumerators can be perceived as spies, regular feedback meetings and the intervention of WFP staff have enabled issues to be resolved wherever possible. The monitoring system, whereby results are fed back instantly into the WFP database, works well. However there is a great need for analytical capacity to ensure the full utilisation of such data.

178. Holding on to good external monitoring staff is of great importance. Longer contracts, and improved communication about contract renewals, would be advantageous to offset the tendency for field monitors to seek alternative employment on the assumption that their contracts will shortly be discontinued.

179. Communication with partners in general needs to be improved. As mentioned above, there has been no clear message to stakeholders as to the future of the on-site school feeding programme. Similarly, reporting on project activities to date is at times difficult to obtain (please note the comment in paragraph 155 above regarding the DPR programme), and reports do not relate to the activities and objectives indicated in the programme log frame established at the outset of the intervention.

180. The transfer of staff from the Central Mindanao operational area to another area has both advantages and disadvantages. Firstly in terms of additional experience gained by the staff deployed and the programmatic support they have been able to provide, but conversely in terms of the shortfall in capacity of the operations they leave behind. How to establish an emergency pool of staff, available at short notice and with relevant experience, needs to be investigated and incorporated into emergency plans.

**Logistics**

181. Logistically, there has been a large volume of goods distributed, not only within Central Mindanao, but also for other major emergency responses such as Bopha and Yolanda. However, there have been gaps in the pipeline in Central Mindanao meaning the some schools have not received food for a number of months, and some FFA workers have been paid slowly. Problems have specifically occurred with respect to procurement agreements with DSWD and the National Food Authority with whom the food procurement arrangements need to be reviewed.

182. The objective of the school feeding activity was to keep children in school, reducing absenteeism and dropout rates. Readiness of schools was an important selection criterion, which included evidence of an active parents’ association and the availability of some form of sanitation facilities. Furthermore, WFP’s final distribution point also needed to be near a road accessible by truck. These criteria presented challenges for including the most remote schools and also those that may have had a low dropout rate yet high levels of child hunger and undernutrition.

183. An effective mechanism for delivering supplies of RUSF to remote barangays has not been developed in the programme and delivery often depends on BHWs or midwives to carry supplies on outreach visits. Beneficiaries cannot be expected to spend excessive time and money travelling to collect supplies and access care. This has likely resulted in inconsistent support to remote beneficiaries and reduced effectiveness of the programme.
Summary: Factors affecting the results

A number of internal and external factors have had an influence on programmatic activities, a number of which (such as the effects of natural disasters, the ongoing security context and the occurrence of local and national elections) are beyond the control of WFP.

Similarly the capacity of local government health units to undertake the nutrition interventions has not been as good as wished. However, with greater training this can be improved.

Those internal factors that have had a detrimental effect on operations need to be addressed, and the CO must ensure that data management, availability and reporting functions are given sufficient resources and are improved. Every attempt should be made to ensure that there are no future pipelines gaps even when relevant departments are distracted by other natural disasters or emergencies. Furthermore, WFP needs to ascertain how to ensure remote communities feel the full benefit of supplies provided within each programme.

Finally, a shortfall in the analysis of programmatic outcomes has been a significant constraint to adaptation of the nutrition programme and to a better understanding of the changing situation. Individual monitoring and the follow up of children and defaulters has been weak and needs to be improved.

3. Conclusions and Recommendations

3.1. Overall Assessment

184. Targeting the most underdeveloped region in the Philippines, with the highest levels of stunting and wasting, PRRO 200296 has contributed to the general recovery of livelihood, nutritional and security conditions in targeted communities through an appropriate mixture of programmatic activities addressing beneficiary needs in line with the objectives set out in its original proposal.

185. According to the majority of stakeholders interviewed, the nutritional situation in the communities has improved significantly since their original displacement in 2008, and the prevalence of high acute malnutrition rates has diminished. WFP’s focus on both prevention and treatment of moderate acute malnutrition has reportedly had a positive effect, despite coverage figures that were lower than planned, and the support to PLWs has been beneficial in that it has encouraged the mothers to make better use of health facilities available, increasing access to health care and family planning services.
186. Ongoing BSF programmes are no longer appropriate. Targeted SFPs are more appropriate while the underlying causes of acute malnutrition remain unaddressed, particularly in the absence of treatment for SAM. However, work remains to be done in terms of training implementing staff in targeted SFP management and improving monitoring systems. In addition, mechanisms for programme outreach to enhance accessibility for underserved children have not been given adequate attention or support.

187. WFP’s continued work at the policy level is highly relevant to assist the Government to put in place appropriate and relevant national protocols for the prevention and treatment of acute malnutrition, which the organisation can then support on the ground. These policy level initiatives would not be possible without the ongoing funding stream that the PRRO provides. WFP needs to ensure that PRRO activities remain effective and well supported, so that the policy level activities can be maintained.

188. Another positive element of the PRRO has been the on-site school feeding programme, which the educational authorities, LGUs, teachers and parents strongly believe has provided benefits in terms of improved educational performance and the increased involvement of parents in the schooling of their children, going beyond the intended programmatic objective of merely encouraging school attendance levels, which have remained high.\(^47\) School kitchen gardens have added a diversity of ingredients to the rice and beans provided by WFP, increasing nutritional impact. Unfortunately, statistics taken in schools that measure a student’s weight and height are held within the educational system and were not integrated into the programme, and therefore any additional impact indicators were not accessed.

189. Additionally, a wide range of livelihood skills trainings and FFA improvements to community based assets addressing either a health, livelihood or disaster preparedness related need have been undertaken that will improve individual and collective financial security in the long term.

190. Procedures for the selection of such projects need to be reviewed to ensure that the process can be expedited efficiently. Working within the localised political and administrative barangay structures, where the influence of barangay captains has made it difficult at times to implement projects as anticipated. However, day to day operational difficulties have been dealt with as effectively as possible. Monthly feedback and ad hoc review sessions with the cooperating partners and monitoring agencies have contributed to controlling the implementation process.

191. With respect to ongoing FFA/FFT activities, there are certainly enough opportunities and needs in the communities for this work to continue. The Government’s initiatives will certainly be ongoing and the authorities would be glad to continue working alongside WFP. However, the approach needs to be more proactive and targeted towards those specific communities with the most needs and integrated alongside other nutritional interventions.

\(^{47}\) WFP/CFSI data collection assessment of children aged 6-23 months in Lanao del Sur, February – March 2013.
192. In future it would also be appropriate to undertake a community level gender assessment to ensure projects are selected with both genders in mind. There is a number of locally based development organisations that focus on women in rural settings. One of these could be brought into the project design and selection process to undertake a gender assessment to capture a full understanding of women’s roles in each community and ensure the needs of women are appropriately supported. The possibility of having two projects per community, being one per gender, could be considered.

193. Programmatic impact has been seen at its most effective when an integrated approach has been utilised in a community. The synergy created when both FFT and FFA activities are undertaken in the same location, and where school feeding and nutritional support via the rural health centres is available, has seen communities working together well to generate the maximum benefit.

194. Remote areas, although targeted, have not seen the full benefit of the programme implemented to date due to certain constraints identified, such as access in general, and in particular transport issues regarding the delivery of food supplies. The programme would provide an increased impact if it could improve its coverage in these remote areas where malnutrition levels are higher, and it is perhaps in these areas that future interventions should concentrate. Within such activities, the possibility of looking into projects for the re-integration of combatants should be considered, especially as they tend to have resettled in the more inaccessible areas.

195. The ongoing DPR project has succeeded in strengthening some provincial and local government capacities, as well as equipping and training a number of barangay emergency response teams, but there is much more that needs to be done. The programme needs to be continued and expanded, working very closely with the NDRRMC to provide capacity building and training for municipal and barangay level disaster management staff. A greater focus on grass roots community based mitigation projects should be encouraged in preference to larger scale construction activities, and a lessons learnt event would be beneficial in terms of documenting and sharing programme to date best practices.

196. Co-ordination with external partners has gone well with the work of WFP very much appreciated by government ministries, local authorities, donors, and beneficiary communities. The activities undertaken have been very much in coherence with the plans and objectives of partner stakeholders, both at a national and at a barangay level. Similarly, cooperating partners and monitoring agencies have worked well with the WFP field staff to address daily operational difficulties and to liaise with the wide range of actors included within programme boundaries.

197. The implementation process has been reasonably efficient despite the number of external factors described above that have had a detrimental effect on operational activities. When the Mindanao based staff have been deployed elsewhere to address the

---

48 For example, RIC, the Rural Improvement Club for women.
operational needs of other more pressing disasters, these distractions have led to some logistical and operational gaps and delays.

198. Gender balance in the office is good: there are more women than men at a field officer level, although there are more men at a senior management level. Gender issues in the communities have been harder to deal with, especially in Lanao del Sur where it has been hard to overcome society influences whereby men meet men to discuss what a community needs. It is no surprise, therefore, that projects have tended to be somewhat male dominated.

199. The nutritional, livelihoods and security situation in Central Mindanao has improved considerably in recent years, and what was appropriate at the outset of the intervention would not be so applicable now. No deaths due to malnutrition are reported and very few cases of SAM appear in the RHUs. The Government of the Philippines is coordinating its own approach to school health and nutrition which aims to target acutely malnourished individual children with a breakfast ration at school. This programme currently targets 562,000 SAM children in 46,000 schools. The DepEd has recently had a proposal approved to feed all of the identified SAM children nationally in the coming school year. It is now preparing an expanded budget for support for all MAM and SAM children which it hopes will be funded in 2015.

200. There are also various private sector groups supporting feeding in schools. The Department of Education is happy to coordinate with other actors in school feeding and to date has agreed to omit schools where WFP or others are working from its programme, to avoid duplication. However, WFP needs to decide if they wish to continue with this programme or hand over their current schools to the Government. Their role could possibly change to more of a monitoring and capacity building function - certainly the schools cannot suddenly be expected to generate their own resources to feed the children, although they should still be encouraged to supplement and provide variety to the diet.

201. Internal systems have coped reasonably well with what has been a very demanding year for the country delegation in terms of the number and magnitude of man-made and natural disasters that have occurred. Agreements with the national FDA need to be reviewed, however, to avoid any repetition of the supply chain and pipeline gaps that have occurred previously.

202. Internal improvements are also required in terms of the provision, accuracy and analysis of data for the response in general. Beyond the difficulties this has presented to the evaluation team (as mentioned in the introduction), there is a need for programme managers to be able to review ongoing performance and to measure programmatic impact, which does not seem to be being met at present. Similarly, the provision of timely and accurate project reporting needs to be improved as well.

203. The signature of the Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro may provide an opportunity for increased funding and access to operational areas previously difficult to access in Central Mindanao. The accord will also bring with it some disharmony amongst the groups excluded from the agreement and as such there will still be security
considerations to be aware of as the current PRRO, which has been extended to the end of 2014, is replaced effective 01 January 2015.

204. The new Bangsamoro authorities will contain a mix of new political appointees and possibly representatives from ARRM. The majority will probably be unaware of ongoing programmes and as such there will be a renewed need for liaison and capacity building within the Government ministries.

205. The physical boundaries of the Bangsamoro entity are yet to be determined, but the area will still remain one of the poorest, least developed parts of the Philippines. Agricultural practices and livelihood income need to be improved and increased, as most adults in the communities are very poor, working as seasonal day labourers or tenant farmers, receiving low rates of pay. With respect to improving levels of undernutrition the need will be to address the underlying causes, i.e. poor access to health services, inappropriate feeding practices, insufficient nutritional knowledge and large family sizes. A good proportion of mothers with acutely malnourished children tend to be those with large numbers of children (reaching 10 or more) and teenage pregnancy is common.

3.2. Recommendations

206. Based on the findings of this evaluation the team offers the following recommendations, as already discussed with the WFP CO, to be considered during the design process of the forthcoming PRRO:

i. A more targeted approach to the treatment of acute malnutrition would now be more appropriate, moving away from blanket feeding to targeting children with MAM. At the same time, mechanisms should be found to improve outreach work and enhance access for remote communities to the programme; delivery of supplies needs to move beyond the RHU and reach the targeted barangay level.

ii. WFP should continue its high quality upstream work, advising and advocating with the Government at a national level and with local government units (LGUs) to improve the nutrition policy framework, including consideration of the underlying causes of undernutrition, and to ensure this work results in improved programming on the ground. With the Philippines recently joining the SUN movement, WFP should consider, through multisectoral engagement, enhancing its supportive collaboration with the Government and other agencies to focus on the prevention of stunting as well as acute malnutrition. Future engagement with Government bodies should include capacity building initiatives whenever possible or necessary, particularly at LGU level.

iii. Increase training and capacity development of local health unit staff, together with their counterparts at the local and provincial government levels, to ensure a complete understanding of nutritional support needs and practices, in terms of rationale for
and modalities of WFP programming to address acute malnutrition, and to improve reporting systems for collection and analysis of performance data.

iv. FFA projects need to be more targeted to the most vulnerable communities and integrated with DPR activities, being based on local contingency plans and hazard profiling results. FFA projects in communities should not be limited to one, but should reflect community needs, while increasing women’s participation in the project identification and design. Delays in the project approval system need to be addressed. The finalisation of cash for work programming procedures should be agreed as a matter of urgency as this will enable flexibility in beneficiary support and the revival of local markets.

v. Working with the education authorities WFP should help schools develop their resource mobilisation capacity, kitchen gardens and logistical practices to ensure the continuation of the benefits gained from the on site feeding programme as WFP hands over the schools it currently supports into the Government’s own school feeding initiative.

vi. WFP needs to increase follow up support within the DPR programme to ensure cooperating partners make community/barangay level contingency plans and hazard mapping available in the targeted communities to enable better linkages with future FFA interventions. A greater emphasis on mitigation and training activities should be incorporated into the programme, which needs to be integrated and mainstreamed into the overall operational response.

vii. Programmatic reporting and data management needs to improve in terms of its timeliness, accuracy and regularity, becoming more analytical, and with outcomes measured against identified impact-related objectives and indicators.
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1. Introduction

1. These Terms of Reference (TOR) are for the evaluation of the Philippines protracted relief and recovery operation (PRRO) 200296 “Support for Returnees and other Conflict-Affected Households in Central Mindanao, and National Capacity Development in Disaster Preparedness and Response”. This evaluation is commissioned by the WFP Office of Evaluation (OEV) and will take place from October 2013 to March 2014. In line with WFP’s outsourced approach for operations evaluations (OpEv), the evaluation will be managed and conducted by an external evaluation company amongst those having a long-term agreement with WFP for operations evaluations.

2. These TOR were prepared by the OEV focal point based on an initial document review and consultation with stakeholders and following a standard template. The purpose of the TOR is twofold: 1) to provide key information to the company selected for the evaluation and to guide the company’s Evaluation Manager and Team throughout the evaluation process; and 2) to provide key information to stakeholders about the proposed evaluation.

3. The TOR will be finalised based on comments received on the draft version and on the agreement reached with the selected company. The evaluation shall be conducted in conformity with the TOR.

2. Reasons for the Evaluation

2.1. Rationale

4. In the context of renewed corporate emphasis on providing evidence and accountability for results, WFP has committed to increase evaluation coverage of operations and mandated OEV to commission 12 Operations Evaluations (OpEv) in 2013; 24 in 2014 and up to 30 in 2015.

5. Operations to be evaluated are selected based on utility and risk criteria. From a shortlist of operations meeting these criteria prepared by OEV, the Regional Bureau (RB) has selected, in consultation with the Country Office (CO), the Philippines PRRO 200296 “Support for Returnees and other Conflict-Affected Households in Central Mindanao, and National Capacity Development in Disaster Preparedness and Response” for an independent evaluation. In particular, the evaluation has been timed to ensure that findings can feed into future decisions on programme design. The current PRRO 200296 is due to end in April 2014 but will be extended until December 2014. The CO plans to prepare a new PRRO that will be submitted to the June Executive Board session and will start in January 2015.

2.2. Objectives

6. This evaluation serves the dual and mutually reinforcing objectives of accountability and learning:

- **Accountability** – The evaluation will assess and report on the performance and results of the operation. A management response to the evaluation recommendations will be prepared.

---

49 The utility criteria looked both at the timeliness of the evaluation given the operation’s cycle and the coverage of recent/planned evaluations. The risk criteria was based on a classification and risk ranking of WFP COs taking into consideration a wide range of risk factors, including operational and external factors as well as COs’ internal control self-assessments.
- **Learning** – The evaluation will determine the reasons why certain results occurred or not to draw lessons, derive good practices and pointers for learning. It will provide evidence-based findings to inform operational and strategic decision-making. Findings will be actively disseminated and lessons will be incorporated into relevant lesson sharing systems.

### 2.3. Stakeholders and Users

7. **Stakeholders.** A number of stakeholders both inside and outside of WFP have interests in the results of the evaluation and many of these will be asked to play a role in the evaluation process. Table one below provides a preliminary stakeholders’ analysis, which will be deepened by the evaluation team in the inception package.

**Table 1: Preliminary stakeholders’ analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Interest in the evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Office (CO)</td>
<td>Responsible for the country level planning and operations implementation, the CO is the primary stakeholder of this evaluation. It has a direct stake in the evaluation and an interest in learning from experience to inform decision-making. It is also called upon to account internally as well as to its beneficiaries, partners for the performance and results of its operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Bureau (RB) in Bangkok</td>
<td>Responsible for both oversight of COs and technical guidance and support, the RB management has an interest in an independent account of the operational performance as well as in learning from the evaluation findings to apply this learning to other country offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Evaluation (OEV)</td>
<td>OEV is responsible for commissioning OpEvS over 2013-2015. As these evaluations follow a new outsourced approach, OEV has a stake in ensuring that this approach is effective in delivering quality, useful and credible evaluations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP Executive Board (EB)</td>
<td>The WFP governing body has an interest in being informed about the effectiveness of WFP operations. This evaluation will not be presented to the EB but its findings will feed into an annual synthesis of all OpEvS, which will be presented to the EB at its November session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>As the ultimate recipients of food assistance, beneficiaries have a stake in WFP determining whether its assistance is appropriate and effective. As such, the level of participation in the evaluation of women, men, boys and girls from different groups will be determined and their respective perspectives will be sought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>The Government has a direct interest in knowing whether WFP activities in the country are aligned with its priorities, harmonised with the action of other partners and meet the expected results. Issues related to capacity development, handover and sustainability will be of particular interest. Various ministries are partners in the design and implementation of WFP activities, including the Department of Social Welfare and Development, Department of Agriculture, Department of Agrarian Reform, Department of Environment and Natural Resources, the Department of Health, Department of Education, Department of Interior and Local Government, Department of Science and Technology and the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council (NDRRMC) and Provincial and Municipal Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Country team</td>
<td>The UNCT’s harmonized action should contribute to the realisation of the Government developmental objectives. It has therefore an interest in ensuring that WFP operation is effective in contributing to the UN concerted efforts. Various agencies are also direct partners of WFP at policy and activity level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NGOs are WFP’s partners for the implementation of some activities while at the same time having their own interventions. The results of the evaluation might affect future implementation modalities, strategic orientations and partnerships.

Donors

WFP operations are voluntarily funded by a number of donors. They have an interest in knowing whether their funds have been spent efficiently and if WFP’s work has been effective and contributed to their own strategies and programmes.

Private sector

Several private sector partners have been providing support to WFP interventions in the Philippines, particularly for the school feeding activities in Central Mindanao. The National Ambassador against Hunger Ms. K.C. Concepcion has been instrumental in raising awareness and also linking private sector and individuals to support WFP operations in the Philippines.

8. Users. The primary users of this evaluation will be:

- The CO and its partners in decision-making related notably to programme implementation and/or design, country strategy and partnerships.
- Given RB’s core functions of strategic guidance, programme support and oversight, the RB is also expected to use the evaluation findings as well as the office responsible for support to RBS under the Chief Operating Officer.
- OEV will use the evaluation findings to feed into an annual synthesis report of all OpEvs and will reflect upon the evaluation process to refine its OpEv approach, as required.
- The Government at central and local levels may use the evaluation findings to guide the strengthening of its social protection, productive safety nets, disaster preparedness, and mitigation and response mechanisms.

3. Subject of the Evaluation

9. The Philippines is a lower-middle-income country ranking 114th of 187 countries in the 2012 human development index. Despite improved economic growth and a strong financial capacity, the country faces several challenges, including rapid urbanisation with rising poor population, high population growth, and high levels of undernutrition and micronutrient deficiencies. The long-running conflict between the Government and separatists in Mindanao has claimed the lives of 150,000 people, displaced 2 million, undermined livelihoods and access to services and perpetuated the cycle of poverty and food insecurity. In addition, violent family feuds are common in Mindanao and have caused significant temporary displacements and losses of household and productive assets. The Philippines is also one of the most disaster-prone countries in the world, ranking ninth in the World Bank list of natural disaster hotspots. The Government has prioritized disaster risk reduction, but gaps in disaster risk management and response remain at the national and local levels, as revealed during tropical storm Washi in December 2011, and typhoon Bopha in December 2012.

10. WFP’s interventions in the Philippines are aligned with the Philippines Development Plan 2012–2016, which supports the Government’s peace and development framework, and with the United Nations Philippines (Mindanao) Humanitarian Action Plan (2012) for integrated assistance for conflict-affected communities. The operation is supported by the Government, which has pledged in-kind and cash resources through an expanded partnership.

11. This operation follows PRRO 200131 with a view to supporting the recovery of the livelihoods of food-insecure communities affected by conflict in Central Mindanao and to increase their
resilience to shocks, thus contributing to peace building. WFP provides targeted support through cash/food for assets (C/FFA), cash/food for training, school feeding and nutrition interventions. The PRRO also intends to develop the capacities of national and local actors to improve disaster preparedness and response. A small contingency stock of rice and high-energy biscuits was originally included for immediate disaster response. A first budget revision expanded the geographical coverage of the PRRO to: i) scale up nationwide the Disaster Preparedness and Response (DPR) capacity development activities with an additional focus on climate change adaptation (CCA), and ii) provide early recovery assistance (through FFA and school feeding) to over 100,000 beneficiaries affected by tropical storm Washi in northern Mindanao (Sendong area). A second budget revision significantly scaled up the PRRO interventions in order to respond to Typhon Bopha that struck the country in December 2012 (particularly eastern Mindanao).

12. The project document including the project logframe, related amendments (Budget revisions) and the latest resource situation are available by clicking here.\(^{50}\) The key characteristics of the operation are outlined in table two below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>The operation was approved by the Executive Board in February 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>2 years (01 May 2012 to 30 April 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments</td>
<td>There have been 2 amendments to the initial project document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BR1 (June 2012): Scaled up the Disaster Preparedness and Response capacity development activities originally envisaged, and expanded the geographical coverage of the PRRO to provide early recovery assistance (through FFA) to over 100,000 beneficiaries affected by tropical storm Washi in northern Mindanao (Sendong area), who had been provided relief assistance under the previous PRRO. Resulted in a total budget increase of US$4.1 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BR2 (January 2013): to expand geographical coverage of the PRRO, by providing emergency food assistance and cash and vouchers transfers to 400,000 people affected by the typhoon Bopha. Resulted in a total budget increase of US$19.8 million.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Planned beneficiaries | Initial: 977,112 | Revised: 1,480,112 |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| Planned food requirements | In-kind food: 38,947 mt |
|                        | Cash and vouchers: US$2 million |
|                        | In-kind food: 56,072 mt |
|                        | Cash and vouchers: US$2 million |

\(^{50}\) From WFP.org – Countries – Philippines – Operations or http://www.wfp.org/node/3497/3770/32617
Main Partners

Government:
Department of Social Welfare and Development, Department of Agriculture, Department of Agrarian Reform, Department of Environment and Natural Resources, the Department of Health, Department of Education, Department of Interior and Local Government, Department of Science and Technology and the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council (NDRRMC) and Provincial and Municipal Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Offices

UN:
FAO, UNDP, UNFPA, UN HABITAT, UNHCR, UNICEF

NGOs:
International: 3 (Community and Family Services International, Helen Keller International, Save the Children) National: 17

US$ requirements
Initial: US$49 million
Revised: US$72.9 million

Contribution level (by September 2013)
The operation received US$58.7 million; i.e. 78% of the total US$ requirements.

Top five donors (by September 2013)
USA (27% of total donations); Philippines (16%); European Commission (16%); Australia (6%), and Multilateral (4%)
Table three below summarizes the operation’s specific objectives and corresponding activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate Strategic objectives*</th>
<th>Operation specific objectives</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Strategic Objective 1           | Reduce moderate acute malnutrition (MAM) among children aged 6–59 months and pregnant and lactating women (PLW) | • Prevention and treatment of moderate acute malnutrition (MAM) among children aged 6–59 months  
• Prevention of acute malnutrition among PLW |
| Strategic Objective 2           | Increase disaster preparedness and response capacity at national, provincial and local level | • providing technical support for local Governments implementing small-scale disaster-mitigation projects;  
• enhancing planning for national and local preparedness and response capacities through training and the sharing of best practices;  
• strengthening the food security cluster; and  
• enhancing the preparedness capacity of the country office with a contingency food stock for immediate disaster response |
| Strategic Objective 3           | Ensure adequate food consumption over assistance period for targeted returnee and other food-insecure households  
Increase access to productive assets for food-insecure households  
Enhance livelihood skills of food-insecure households  
Support the enrolment and continued attendance of schoolchildren in remote areas | • FFA/CFA  
• Skills training (FFT/CFT)  
• On-site school feeding |

* As per WFP Strategic Plan (2008-2013). The logframe will be realigned to WFP new Strategic Plan (2014-2018) in the coming months.
4. Evaluation Approach

4.1. Scope

14. **Scope.** The evaluation will cover PRRO 200296 including all activities and processes related to its formulation, implementation, resourcing, monitoring, evaluation and reporting relevant to answer the evaluation questions. As such, the period covered by this evaluation spans from the PRRO formulation (mid-2011) to October 2013, when the evaluation will start.

15. Following the typhoon Bopha, which struck eastern areas of Mindanao in December 2012, WFP used the existing PRRO to facilitate a more timely response to the needs of 400,000 people affected by the typhoon. The PRRO geographical coverage was expanded to include additional provinces in eastern Mindanao. While the interventions envisaged under this expansion were in line with the original objectives of the PRRO of ensuring adequate food consumption and reducing acute malnutrition, such a large scale relief response had not been initially anticipated under the PRRO. Therefore, the response to the typhoon Bopha in eastern Mindanao will be considered by the evaluation to the extent it affected the performance of the interventions originally envisaged under the PRRO in Central Mindanao, but the results of this specific intervention will not be evaluated.

4.2. Evaluation Questions

16. The evaluation will address the following three questions:

**Question 1: How appropriate is the operation?** Areas for analysis will include the extent to which the objectives, targeting, choice of activities and of transfer modalities:

- Are appropriate to the needs of the food insecure population.
- Are coherent with relevant stated national policies, including sector policies and strategies and seek complementarity with the interventions of relevant humanitarian and development partners.
- Are coherent with WFP strategies, policies and normative guidance.

**Question 2: What are the results of the operation?** While ensuring that differences in benefits between women, men, boys and girls from different groups are considered, the evaluation will analyse:

- the level of attainment of the planned outputs;
- the extent to which the outputs led to the realisation of the operation objectives as well as to unintended effects;
- how different activities of the operation dovetail and are synergetic with what other actors are doing to contribute to the overriding WFP objective in the country.
- The efficiency of the operation and the likelihood that the benefits will continue after the end of the operation;
- How effective has been WFP’s resource mobilisation strategy not only in generating resources for the PRRO, but also leveraging resources from the Government and other partners as multipliers, thus contributing to sustainability and handing over strategies?

**Question 3: Why and how has the operation produced the observed results?** The evaluation should generate insights into the main internal and external factors that caused the observed
changes and affected how results were achieved. The inquiry is likely to focus, amongst others, on:

- Internally (factors within WFP’s control): the processes, systems and tools in place to support the operation design, implementation, monitoring/evaluation and reporting; the governance structure and institutional arrangements (including issues related to staffing, capacity and technical backstopping from RB/HQ); the partnership and coordination arrangements; etc. How has the CO been able to position itself as a partner at various levels?
- Externally (factors outside WFP’s control): the external operating environment; the funding climate; external incentives and pressures; etc.

17. Throughout the evaluation and in making recommendations, the evaluation team should give: i) due consideration to the unique context of the Philippines; and ii) special consideration to the concerns of the CO, ensuring to include forward considerations and lessons that would lead to programme enhancements as part of the design of the next phase of the PRRO. Notably, the evaluation team should emphasize the following components that the CO expects to be most prominent in future interventions:

- Food and nutrition support to conflict-affected households in Central Mindanao; and,
- DPR/CCA capacity building nationwide (mostly in northern part of the country).

4.3 Evaluability Assessment

18. Evaluability is the extent to which an activity or a programme can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion. The below provides a preliminary evaluability assessment, which will be deepened by the evaluation team in the inception package. The team will notably critically assess data availability and take evaluability limitations into consideration in its choice of evaluation methods.

19. In answering question one, the team will be able to rely on assessment reports, minutes from the project review committee, the project document and logframe, an external evaluation of the previous PRRO 200131 as well as documents related to Government and interventions from other actors. In addition, the team will review relevant WFP strategies, policies and normative guidance.

20. For question two the operation has been designed in line with the corporate strategic results framework (SRF) and selected outputs, outcomes and targets are recorded in the logframe. Several baseline reports are available: The Philippine Food and Nutrition Security Atlas (PFNSA) dated March 2012 provides a political and physical map of an initial analysis of trends and the most recent available data of selected determinants of food security and malnutrition, including food production and imports, economic access to food, food consumption and utilization and relevant social parameters. An Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) exercise was facilitated by FAO and WFP end-2012. In early 2013, WFP also undertook a baseline survey for a project supported by the European Union in Central Mindanao.51 Regular reports from the food security monitoring system (FSMS), monitoring reports as well as annual standard project reports (SPRs) detail achievement of outputs and outcomes thus making them evaluable against the stated objectives.

---

51 Report available here.
21. However, answering question two is likely to pose some challenges owing in part to data gaps in relation to efficiency.

22. For question three, the team members will have access to some institutional planning documents and is likely to elicit further information from key informant interviews.

23. Furthermore, security issues in Central Mindanao may pose a challenge to field visits and the applicable security measures will be followed.

4.4. Methodology

24. The methodology will be designed by the evaluation team during the inception phase. It should:

- Employ relevant internationally agreed evaluation criteria including those of relevance, coherence (internal and external), coverage, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability (or connectedness for emergency operations);
- Use applicable standards (e.g. SPHERE standards);
- Demonstrate impartiality and lack of biases by relying on a cross-section of information sources (e.g. stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries, etc.) and using mixed methods (e.g. quantitative, qualitative, participatory) to ensure triangulation of information through a variety of means. In particular, the sampling technique to select field visit sites will need to demonstrate impartiality and participatory methods will be emphasised with the main stakeholders, including the CO.
- Be geared towards addressing the key evaluation questions taking into account the evaluability challenges, the budget and timing constraints;
- Be based on an analysis of the logic model of the operation and on a thorough stakeholders analysis;
- Be synthesised in an evaluation matrix, which should be used as the key organizing tool for the evaluation.

4.5. Quality Assurance

25. OEV’s Evaluation Quality Assurance System (EQAS) defines the quality standards expected from this evaluation and sets out processes with in-built steps for quality assurance, templates for evaluation products and checklists for the review thereof. It is based on the UNEG norms and standards and good practice of the international evaluation community (DAC and ALNAP) and aims to ensure that the evaluation process and products conform to best practice and meet OEV’s quality standards. EQAS does not interfere with the views and independence of the evaluation team.

26. At the start of the evaluation, OEV will orient the evaluation manager on EQAS and share related documents. EQAS should be systematically applied to this evaluation and the evaluation manager will be responsible to ensure that the evaluation progresses in line with its process steps and to conduct a rigorous quality control of the evaluation products ahead of their submission to WFP.

27. The evaluation company is ultimately responsible for the quality of the evaluation products. If the expected standards are not met, the evaluation company will, at its own expense, make the necessary amendments to bring the evaluation products to the required quality level.
28. OEV will also subject the evaluation report to an external post-hoc quality assurance review to report independently on the quality, credibility and utility of the evaluation in line with evaluation norms and standards.

5. Phases and deliverables

29. Table four below highlights the main activities of the evaluation, which will unfold in five phases.

Table 4: Activities, deliverables and timeline by evaluation phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity responsible</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Key dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE 1 – PREPARATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEV</td>
<td>Desk review, consultation and preparation of TOR</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO / RB</td>
<td>Stakeholders comments on TOR</td>
<td>26-30 Sept 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEV</td>
<td>☐ Final TOR</td>
<td>1 Oct 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEV</td>
<td>Evaluation company selection and contracting</td>
<td>11 Oct 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE 2 – INCEPTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEV</td>
<td>Management hand-over to the EM (including briefing on EQAS, expectations and requirements for the evaluation)</td>
<td>14-17 Oct 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Evaluation team briefing on EQAS, expectations and requirements for the evaluation.</td>
<td>18-21 Oct 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Desk review, initial consultation with the CO/RB, drafting of the Inception Package</td>
<td>22 Oct – 7 Nov 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Quality Assurance of the Inception Package</td>
<td>8 Nov 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>☐ Final Inception Package</td>
<td>11 Nov 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE 3 – EVALUATION MISSION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Preparation of the evaluation mission (including setting up meetings, arranging field visits, etc.)</td>
<td>Nov 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Introductory briefing</td>
<td>18 Nov 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Interviews with key internal and external stakeholders, project site visits, etc.</td>
<td>18 Nov – 5 Dec 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Exit debriefing / workshop</td>
<td>5 Dec 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>☐ Aide memoire</td>
<td>5 Dec 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE 4 – REPORTING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Evaluation Report drafting</td>
<td>5 Dec – 9 Jan 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Quality Assurance of draft Evaluation Report</td>
<td>10-16 Jan 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>☐ Draft Evaluation Report</td>
<td>16 Jan 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO/RB/OEV</td>
<td>Stakeholders comments on Evaluation Report</td>
<td>17-31 Jan 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Comments matrix</td>
<td>3-5 Feb 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Revision of the Evaluation Report</td>
<td>6-14 Feb 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>☐ Final Evaluation Report</td>
<td>17 Feb 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>☐ Evaluation brief</td>
<td>21 Feb 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE 5 – FOLLOW-UP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Coordination of the preparation of the Management Response</td>
<td>17 Feb 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEV</td>
<td>☐ Management Response</td>
<td>28 Feb 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEV</td>
<td>Post-hoc Quality Assurance</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEV</td>
<td>Publication of findings and integration of findings into OEV’s lessons learning tools.</td>
<td>Upon completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEV</td>
<td>Preparation of annual synthesis of operations evaluations.</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. **Deliverables.** The evaluation company will be responsible for producing as per the timeline presented in table 4 above the following deliverables in line with the EQAS guidance and following the required templates:

- **Inception package (IP)** – This package focuses on methodological and planning aspects and will be considered the operational plan of the evaluation. It will present a preliminary analysis of the context and of the operation and present the evaluation methodology articulated around a deepened evaluability and stakeholders’ analysis; an evaluation matrix; and the
sampling technique and data collection tools. It will also present the division of tasks amongst team members as well as a detailed timeline for stakeholders’ consultation.

- **Aide memoire** – This document (PowerPoint presentation) will present the initial analysis from the data stemming from the desk review and evaluation mission and will support the exit debriefing at the end of the evaluation phase.

- **Evaluation report (ER)** – The evaluation report will present the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation. Findings should be evidence-based and relevant to the evaluation questions. Data will be disaggregated by sex and the evaluation findings and conclusions will highlight differences in performance and results of the operation for different beneficiary groups as appropriate. There should be a logical flow from findings to conclusions and from conclusions to recommendations. Recommendations will be provided on what changes can be made to enhance the achievements of objectives and will include forward considerations to inform the design of the next phase of the PRRO. Recommendations will be limited in number, actionable and targeted to the relevant users. These will form the basis of the WFP management response to the evaluation.

- **Evaluation brief** – A two-page brief of the evaluation will summarise the evaluation report and serve to enhance dissemination of its main findings.

31. These deliverables will be drafted in English. The evaluation TOR, report, management response and brief will be public and posted on the WFP External Website (wfp.org/evaluation). The other evaluation products will be kept internal.

### 6. Organization of the Evaluation

#### 6.1. Outsourced approach

32. Under the outsourced approach to OpEvs, the evaluation is commissioned by OEV but will be managed and conducted by an external evaluation company having a long-term agreement (LTA) with WFP for operations evaluation services.

33. The company will provide an evaluation manager (EM) and an independent evaluation team (ET) in line with the LTA. To ensure a rigorous review of evaluation deliverables, the evaluation manager should in no circumstances be part of the evaluation team.

34. The company, the evaluation manager and the evaluation team members will not have been involved in the design, implementation or M&E of the operation nor have other conflicts of interest or bias on the subject. They will act impartially and respect the code of conduct of the profession.

35. Given the evaluation learning objective, the evaluation manager and team will promote stakeholders’ participation throughout the evaluation process. Yet, to safeguard the independence of the evaluation, WFP staff will not be part of the evaluation team or participate in meetings with external stakeholders if the evaluation team deems that their presence could bias the responses.

#### 6.2. Evaluation Management

36. The evaluation will be managed by the company’s Evaluation Manager for OpEvs (as per LTA). The EM will be responsible to manage within the given budget the evaluation process in line with EQAS and the expectations spelt out in these TOR and to deliver timely evaluation products meeting the OEV standards. In particular, the EM will:
• Mobilise and hire the evaluation team and provide administrative backstopping (contracts, visas, travel arrangements, consultants’ payments, invoices to WFP, etc.).

• Act as the main interlocutor between WFP stakeholders and the ET throughout the evaluation and generally facilitate communication and promote stakeholders’ participation throughout the evaluation process.

• Support the evaluation team by orienting members on WFP, EQAS and the evaluation requirements; providing them with relevant documentation and generally advising on all aspects of the evaluation to ensure that the evaluation team is able to conduct its work.

• Ensure that the evaluation proceeds in line with EQAS, the norms and standards and code of conduct of the profession and that quality standards and deadlines are met.

• Ensure that a rigorous and objective quality check of all evaluation products is conducted ahead of submission to WFP. This quality check will be documented and an assessment of the extent to which quality standards are met will be provided to WFP.

• Provide feedback on the evaluation process as part of a 360 assessment of the evaluation.

### 6.3. Evaluation Conduct

37. The evaluation team will conduct the evaluation under the direction of the evaluation manager. The team will be hired by the company following agreement with OEV on its composition.

38. **Team composition.** The evaluation team is expected to include 3 members, including the team leader. It should include women and men of mixed cultural backgrounds and nationals of the Philippines. The need for local interpreters should be considered.

39. **Team competencies.** The team will be multi-disciplinary and include members who together include an appropriate balance of expertise and practical knowledge in:

- Food security
- Nutrition
- Disaster preparedness and response
- Capacity development/institutional capacity

40. All team members should have strong analytical and communication skills; evaluation experience and familiarity with the country or region as well as with middle-income countries.

41. **The Team leader** will have technical expertise in one of the technical areas listed above as well as expertise in designing methodology and data collection tools and demonstrated experience in leading similar evaluations. She/he will also have leadership and communication skills, including a track record of excellent English writing and presentation skills.

42. Her/his primary responsibilities will be: i) defining the evaluation approach and methodology; ii) guiding and managing the team during the evaluation process; iii) leading the evaluation mission and representing the evaluation team in meetings with stakeholders; iv) drafting and revising, as required, the inception package, aide memoire and evaluation report in line with EQAS; and v) provide feedback to OEV on the evaluation process as part of a 360 assessment of the evaluation.

43. **The team members** will bring together a complementary combination of the technical expertise required and have a track record of written work on similar assignments.
44. Team members will: i) contribute to the design of the evaluation methodology in their area of expertise based on a document review; ii) conduct field work; iii) participate in team meetings and meetings with stakeholders; iv) contribute to the drafting and revision of the evaluation products in their technical area(s) and v) provide feedback on the evaluation process as part of a 360 assessment of the evaluation.

7. Roles and Responsibilities of WFP Stakeholders

45. The Country Office. The CO management will be responsible to:

- Assign a focal point for the evaluation to liaise with the OEV focal point during the preparation phase and with the company evaluation manager thereafter. Dipayan Bhattacharyyya (Head of CO Food Security unit) will be the CO focal point for this evaluation.
- Provide the evaluation manager and team with documentation and information necessary to the evaluation; facilitate the team’s contacts with local stakeholders; set up meetings, field visits and the exit briefing; provide logistic support during the fieldwork; and arrange for interpretation, if required.
- Participate in a number of discussions with the evaluation team on the evaluation design and on the operation, its performance and results. In particular, the CO should participate in the evaluation team briefing and debriefing (possibly done in the form of a workshop) and in various teleconferences with the evaluation manager and team on the evaluation products.
- Comment on the TORs and the evaluation report.
- Prepare a management response to the evaluation.
- Provide feedback to OEV on the evaluation process as part of a 360 assessment of the evaluation.

46. The Regional Bureau. The RB management will be responsible to:

- Assign a focal point for the evaluation to liaise with the OEV focal point during the preparation phase and with the company evaluation manager thereafter, as required. Yukako Sato, Regional M&E Adviser will be the RB focal point for this evaluation. Samir Wanmali, Senior Regional Programme Adviser will be involved at key milestones.
- Participate in a number of discussions with the evaluation team on the evaluation design and on the operation, its performance and results. In particular, the RB should participate in the evaluation team briefing and debriefing (possibly done in the form of a workshop) and in various teleconferences with the evaluation manager and team on the evaluation products.
- Provide comments on the TORs and the evaluation report.
- Coordinate the management response to the evaluation and track the implementation of the recommendations.
- Provide feedback to OEV on the evaluation process as part of a 360 assessment of the evaluation.

47. Headquarters. Some HQ divisions might, as relevant, be asked to discuss WFP strategies, policies or systems in their area of responsibility and to comment on the evaluation TOR and report. These include: Operations Department (OS), Policy, Programme and Innovation Division (OSZ), Emergency Preparedness (OME), Procurement Division (OSP), Logistics Division (OSL), Government Partnerships Division (PGG).
48. **The Office of Evaluation.** OEV is responsible for commissioning the evaluation and Julie Thoulouzan, Evaluation Officer is the OEV focal point. OEV’s responsibilities include to:

- Set up the evaluation including drafting the TOR in consultation with concerned stakeholders; select and contract the external evaluation company; and facilitate the initial communications between the WFP stakeholders and the external evaluation company.
- Enable the company to deliver a quality process and report by providing them with the EQAS documents including process guidance and quality checklists as well as orient the evaluation manager on WFP policies, strategies, processes and systems as they relate to the operation being evaluated.
- Comment on, and approve, the evaluation report.
- Submit the evaluation report to an external post-hoc quality assurance process to independently report on the quality, credibility and utility of the evaluation and provide feedback to the evaluation company accordingly.
- Publish the final evaluation report (together with its quality assessment) on the WFP public website and incorporate findings into an annual synthesis report, which will be presented to WFP’s Executive Board for consideration as well as in other lessons-learning platforms, as relevant.
- Conduct a 360 assessment (based on an e-survey) to gather perceptions about the evaluation process and the quality of the report to be used to revise the approach, as required.

8. **Communication and budget**

8.1. **Communication**

49. Issues related to language of the evaluation are noted in sections 6.3 and 5, which also specifies which evaluation products will be made public and how and provides the schedule of debriefing with key stakeholders. Section 7 paragraph 48 describes how findings will be disseminated.

50. To enhance the learning from this evaluation, the evaluation manager and team will also emphasize transparent and open communication with WFP stakeholders. Regular teleconferences and one-on-one telephone conversations between the evaluation manager, team and country office focal point will assist in discussing any arising issues and ensuring a participatory process.

8.2. **Budget**

51. **Funding source:** The evaluation will be funded in line with the WFP special funding mechanism for Operations Evaluations (Executive Director memo dated October 2012). The cost to be borne by the CO, if applicable, will be established by the WFP Budget & Programming Division (RMB).

52. **Budget:** The budget will be prepared by the company (using the rates established in the LTA and the corresponding template) and approved by OEV. For the purpose of this evaluation the company will use the management fee corresponding to a small operation. Internal flight travel should also be budgeted for (at US$255 each).

Please send queries to Julie Thoulouzan, Evaluation Officer:
Email: Julie.thoulouzan@wfp.org
Phone number: + 39 06 65 13 35 04.
# Annex 2: Workplan and Timeline

**Work Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Site Activity</th>
<th>Team Members</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-Feb 2014</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>JD &amp; TW</td>
<td>Depart UK</td>
<td>JD &amp; TW</td>
<td>Depart UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Depart CdO</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Feb</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>JD, TW &amp; NM</td>
<td>Arrival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Feb</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>WFP Office</td>
<td>JD, TW &amp; NM</td>
<td>Briefings with key WFP Head Office staff. Finalisation of logistics arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Feb</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Tuguegarao</td>
<td>DP/DRR</td>
<td>JD &amp; NM</td>
<td>14.00 PAL flight - arrival 15.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>NUT</td>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Meetings with DSWD, UNICEF, MoH, UN partner agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Feb</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Ballesteros and Appari</td>
<td>DP/DRR</td>
<td>JD &amp; NM</td>
<td>Project site visits. Meeting w/ Barangay Chiefs/ Cooperating partners and beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>NUT</td>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Meetings with DSWD, UNICEF, MoH, UN partner agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Feb</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Appari and Amulung (PAL 15:45) to Manila</td>
<td>DP/DRR</td>
<td>JD &amp; NM</td>
<td>Project site visits. Meeting w/ Barangay Chiefs/ Cooperating partners and beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-Feb</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Cotabato</td>
<td>JD/TW/NM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Travel to Cotabato City PAL - 12:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Feb</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Cotabato</td>
<td>JD, TW &amp; NM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Briefing with Cotobato office. Meetings with govt authorities and cooperating partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Cotabato</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Feb</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Aleosan (Dungguan)</td>
<td>School Feeding and MAMM/ FFA</td>
<td>JD, TW &amp; NM</td>
<td>Project site visits. Meeting with Barangay Chiefs/ representatives and beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Libugnan (Batican)</td>
<td>FFA/FFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Libugnan (Sinawignan and Ulamina)</td>
<td>FFA/FFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pigkawayan (Buluan)</td>
<td>FFA/FFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pigkawayan (Bulacawon)</td>
<td>FFA/FFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maguindanao 2 District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Feb</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Parang (Magsaysay)</td>
<td>SFC-Blanket and MAMM</td>
<td>JD, TW &amp; NM</td>
<td>Project site visits. Meeting with Barangay Chiefs/ representatives and beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matanog (Bayanga)</td>
<td>FFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sultan Kudrat (Tariken)</td>
<td>FFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sultan Kudarat</td>
<td>Rural Health Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sultan Kudrat (Lower Ungap and Lower Pinaring)</td>
<td>FFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Site Activity</td>
<td>Team Members</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Feb</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Maguindanao 2 District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project site visits. Meeting with Barangay Chiefs/ representatives and beneficiaries. Debrief with Head of Sub Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Datu Odin Sinsuat</td>
<td>School Feeding &amp; FFA</td>
<td>JD, TW &amp; NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Sapalan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Datu Odin Sinsuat</td>
<td>FFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Bugawas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Datu Odin Sinsuat</td>
<td>FFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Kuritem)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Datu Odin (District</td>
<td>RHU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Feb</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Lanao del Norte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Travel to Iligan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iligan</td>
<td></td>
<td>JD, TW &amp; NM</td>
<td>Briefing with Iligan Office staff, meeting with cooperating partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kauswagan (Libertad)</td>
<td>School Feeding/SFC-C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-Mar</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Lanao del Sur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project site visits. Meeting with Barangay Chiefs/ representatives and beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kolambangan (Caromatan)</td>
<td>FFA-SFP</td>
<td>JD, TW &amp; NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bacolod (Poblanacion)</td>
<td>SFP only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kauswagan (Libertad and</td>
<td>FFA/FFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tingintignin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-Mar</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Lanao del Sur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidation of initial findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iligan</td>
<td></td>
<td>JD, TW &amp; NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-Mar</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Lanao del Sur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project site visits. Meeting with Barangay Chiefs/ representatives and beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ditaan ramain (Rantian)</td>
<td>FFA/SFP-C</td>
<td>JD, TW &amp; NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Piagapo (Bansayan)</td>
<td>FFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-Mar</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Lanao del Sur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balindong (Bualan)</td>
<td>FFA/School Feeding/SFP-C/SFP-W</td>
<td>TW &amp; NM</td>
<td>Travel Back to Manila (ex CdO) Meeting with National Disaster Response Agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marantao (Ragayan)</td>
<td>FFT/FFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cagayan De Oro</td>
<td>DPR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Debrief to Iligan Office Team JD, TW &amp; NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-Mar</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Manila</td>
<td></td>
<td>JD, TW &amp; NM</td>
<td>AusAid, EU Donor, DepEd meetings Presentation of initial findings (Aide Memoire) with CD, Country Team, BKK Regional Office, Rome office of Evaluation, and Evaluation Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-Mar</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>WFP Office</td>
<td>JD, TW &amp; NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-Mar</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Manila</td>
<td></td>
<td>JD, TW &amp; NM</td>
<td>USAID Meeting. Field Trip to Laguna DPR Site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Meetings held

**Manila, Wednesday February 19th**
Dipayan Bhattacharyya, Head, Food Security, WFP Manila.
Roselie Asis, National Officer Nutrition, WFP Manila.
Onoura Daniels DPR Co-ordinator/Climate Change Adaption Programme, WFP Manila.
Dragoslav Djuraskovic, Head of Logistics, WFP Manila.
Vielka Alvaraz, Finance/Admin Officer, WFP Manila.
Praveen Agrawal, Country Director, WFP Manila.

**Manila, Thursday February 20th**
Camilo Gudmalin, Assistant Secretary, DSWD.
Henry Mdebwe, Nutrition Specialist, UNICEF.
Willibald Zeck, Chief, Health and Nutrition, UNICEF.
Cecilia Pastores, FAO.
Alberto Aduna, Emergency Coordination Officer, FAO.

**Cagayan, Tuguegarao, Thursday February 20th**
Provincial Disaster Risk Reduction Management Council, Cagayan Province, Tuguegarao.
Joeffrey Laggui, Project Assistant, CAVAPPED.
Bonie Jane Gregario, Project Assistant, CAVAPPED.

**Manila, Friday February 21st**
Maria Fatima Dolly Reario, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, Helen Keller Int’l. (HKI).
Emerita Garma-Barquilla, Nutrition Program Officer, HKI.
Ame Stormer, Regional Director of Programs, HKI.
Jigay Gawe, Chief of Nutrition Surveillance Division, National Nutrition Council (NNC).
Didi Vega, Chief of Nutrition Policy and Planning Division, NNC.

**Cagayan, Ballesteros and Aparri, Friday February 21st**
Philip Umblas, MDRRMO, Ballesteros Municipal office.
Myrla Addun, DSWD.
Alfredo Quines, Municipal Engineer, Ballesteros Municipal office.
Maysul Pascual, MDRRMO, Ballesteros Municipal office.
San Juan Barangay officials.
Rarraga Barangay officials.
Cabayu Barangay officials.
Appari Municipal Office:
Gil Oranda, Municipal Engineer.
Ronald Villon, Municipal Budget Officer.
Corazon Cabanatan, Municipal Welfare Officer.
Antonio Painlayon, Construction and Maintenance Foreman
Lucito Lubbin, Inspector – NDRRMC Secretariat.
Ria Capina, OIC, Appari Municipal Office.
Cagayan, Amulang, Saturday February 22nd
Nicador de Leon, Municipal Mayor, Amulang Municipality.
Clarorecto Barcelanno, Councillor, Amulang Municipality.
DR Shiela Enyes, Municipal Health Officer.
Innocencio Gracens, NDRRMO.
Dindo Mallillin, Municipal Engineer.

Cotabato City, Mindanao, Manila, Monday February 24th
Stakeholders meeting with local govt and cooperating partners:
ARMM officials (DoH, DAF, DepEd, DSWD, DRRMO, DILG, BFAR).
Maguindanao Provincial representatives (PHO, School Superintendents, DAR, PDRRMO).
Farida Mangcaan, project officer, CFSI.
Alazain Tahir, project officer, CFSI.
Guiamel Alim, Executive Director, Kadtuntaya Foundation Inc.
Mohammed Yacob, Executive Director, Bangsamoro Development Agency.
Amado Parawan, Health and Nutrition Advisor, Save the Children.

WFP Briefing:
Asaka Nyangara, Deputy Country Director, Cotabato City Sub Office.
Mihret Bizuneh, Programme Officer, VAM and M&E.
Mishael Argonza, Head of sub office, WFP Cotabato City.
Daren Diel, Monitoring Officer, North Cotabato.
Mercideta Pacio-valdez, Assistant Field Monitor /Data officer.
Jennelyn Clanto, Field Monitor, DPR.
Mamatanto Madidis, Assistant Field Monitor, Maguindanao.
Latip Macapintal, Assistant Field Monitor, Sultan Kudurat.
Sahabudin Kuli, Assistant Field Monitor, Maguindanao.
Bonnie Singayao, Security Officer.
Jubaira Abas, Field Monitor, School Feeding
Zhurbohida Balading, Field Monitor, SFP
Herman Ongkiko, National Manager, Dept. of Agrarian Reform.
Macmillan Lucman, ARMM Dept of Agrarian Reform, OIC, Regional Secretary

Tuesday February 25th
Field Trip – North Cotabato.

Wednesday February 26th
Field Trip – North Maguindanao.
Thursday February 27th
Field Trip – South Maguindanao.
Debrief with Mishael Argonza, Head of sub office, WFP Cotabato City.
KFI Meeting:
Guiamel Alim, Executive Director.
Nash Binasan, Team Leader.
Jordan Talusob, Field Monitor.
Datuparito Ampilan, Field Monitor.

Friday February 28th
Travel to Lanao del Norte.
Stakeholders Meeting:
Ganie Amlain, Monitoring Officer, KI
Ramon Serapio, Environmental Conservation and Sustainable Livelihood Programme Manager.
Teresita Encalicas, DSWD.
Kristine Suan, Rural Health Unit Officer.
Epefania Recopelacion, Rural Health Unit Officer.
Farida Manginan, CFSI, Head of office, Iligan.
Flor Montibon, Dept. of Education.
Government Department Officials.

Field Visit – School feeding site, Kauswagan.

Security briefing at WFP office – Illigan:
Bhergil Anima – Security Officer.

Saturday March 1st
Field Trip – Llanao del Norte.

Monday March 3rd
Field Trip – Llanao del Sur.
Departmental briefing at WFP Iligan:
Baicon Macaraya, Head of Sub Office, Iligan.
Anuar Mustapha, DPR Officer.
Norma Constantine, Field monitoring assistant, on site school feeding and gender.
Susan Batutay, Nutritionist.

Tuesday March 4th
Field Trip – Lanao del Sur.
Field Trip – Cagayan de Oro, Mahogany Resettlement Site, DPR Project.
Col. Mario Monsanto, City DRRM Officer.
Geo Rudolf Valerio, Climate Change Adaption Officer, Cagayan de Oro Municipality.
Wednesday March 5th
General Dalmas, Chief, Education and Training Dept., NDRRMTI.

Thursday March 6th
Dr Juan Araojo, Chief, Education Program Specialist, Office of the Assistant Director, School Health and Nutrition, Dept. of Education.
Ms Caroline Maningo, Programme Manager, European Union.
Ms Anne Orquiza, Portfolio Manager, AusAid.
Pablo Lucero, AusAid.

Debrief (Thursday March 6th):
Praveen Agrawal, Country Director, WFP Manila
Dipayan Bhattacharyya, Head, Food Security, WFP Manila.
Asaka Nyangara, Deputy Country Director, Cotabato City Sub Office.
Mihret Bizuneh, Programme Officer, VAM and M&E.
Roselie Asis, Nutrition Officer, WFP Manila.
Dragoslav Djuraskovic, Head of Logistics, WFP Manila.
Vielka Alvaraz, Finance/Admin Officer, WFP Manila.

Via teleconference:
Julie Thoulouzan, Office of Evaluation, WFP Rome.
Yukako Sato, WFP Bangkok, Regional Office.
Martin Fisher, Evaluation Manager, KonTerra.

Friday March 7th
Mabitac, Laguna Field Trip:
Ronal Sana, Mayor, Mabitac Municipality.
Edwin Wartero, Philippines Businesses for Social Progress (PBSP).
Evelyn Fasardo, Philippines Businesses for Social Progress (PBSP).
Thaddeus Lawas, School of Environmental Science and Management, University of Philippines, Los Banos College, Laguna.
Norbie Tubana, NDRRMO, Mabitac, Laguna.
Muktar Farah (by phone), UNOCHA Cluster Co-ordinator, Mindanao.
## Annex 4: Evaluation Matrix

### Key Question 1: How appropriate is the operation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Question</th>
<th>Measure/Indicator</th>
<th>Main Sources of Information</th>
<th>Data Collection Methods</th>
<th>Data Analysis Methods</th>
<th>Evidence quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 To what extent are the objectives, targeting, choice of activities, and transfer modalities, appropriate to the needs of the food insecure population?</td>
<td>Beneficiary satisfaction.</td>
<td>Site Visits, project documentation, WFP staff, beneficiaries, govt. depts.</td>
<td>Secondary research, key stakeholder interviews, focus group discussions, beneficiary feedback.</td>
<td>Triangulation, linkages to current research, peer review.</td>
<td>Participatory and interactive approaches, experienced evaluation staff, inclusive/impartial stakeholder selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 To what extent are the objectives, targeting, choice of activities, and transfer modalities, coherent with relevant stated national policies, including sector policies and strategies and seek complementarity with the interventions of relevant humanitarian / development partners?</td>
<td>Linkages with governmental plans and with those of other relevant actors.</td>
<td>Interviews with Govt. staff, major donors and other stakeholders.</td>
<td>Secondary research, key stakeholder interviews.</td>
<td>Triangulation, linkages to current research, peer review.</td>
<td>Participatory and interactive approaches, experienced evaluation staff, inclusive/impartial stakeholder selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 To what extent are the objectives, targeting, choice of activities, and transfer modalities, coherent with WFP strategies, policies and normative guidance?</td>
<td>Assimilation with other regional and national WFP plans and strategies.</td>
<td>Interviews with WFP senior staff.</td>
<td>Secondary research, key stakeholder interviews.</td>
<td>Triangulation, linkages to current research, peer review.</td>
<td>Participatory and interactive approaches, experienced evaluation staff, inclusive/impartial stakeholder selection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Question 2: What are the results of the operation? (noting differences in benefits between women, men, girls, boys)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Question</th>
<th>Measure/Indicator</th>
<th>Main Sources of Information</th>
<th>Data Collection Methods</th>
<th>Data Analysis Methods</th>
<th>Evidence quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 What is the level of attainment of the planned outputs?</td>
<td>Reduced moderate acute malnutrition (MAM) among children aged 6–59 months and pregnant and lactating women (PLW).</td>
<td>UNICEF. Ministry of Health, DSWD, health offices, midwives, NDRRMC, Ministry of Education, Schools, beneficiaries.</td>
<td>Secondary research, key stakeholder interviews. Site visits.</td>
<td>Triangulation, linkages to current research, peer review.</td>
<td>Participatory and interactive approaches, experienced evaluation staff, inclusive/impartial stakeholder selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased disaster preparedness and response capacity at national, provincial and local level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food consumption levels over assistance period for targeted returnee and other food-insecure households.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance of schoolchildren in remote areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 How do different activities of the operation dovetail and are synergetic with what other actors are doing to contribute to the overriding WFP objective in the country?</td>
<td>Linkages with governmental plans and with those of other relevant actors.</td>
<td>UNICEF, Ministry of Health, DSWD, NDRRMC, Ministry of Education, UNOCHA.</td>
<td>Secondary research, key stakeholder interviews.</td>
<td>Triangulation, linkages to current research, peer review.</td>
<td>Participatory and interactive approaches, experienced evaluation staff, inclusive/impartial stakeholder selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Question</td>
<td>Measure/Indicator</td>
<td>Main Sources of Information</td>
<td>Data Collection Methods</td>
<td>Data Analysis Methods</td>
<td>Evidence quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 What is the efficiency of the operation and the likelihood that the benefits will continue after the end of the operation?</td>
<td>Timeliness of the response. Increased access to productive assets for food-insecure households. Enhance livelihood skills of food-insecure households.</td>
<td>Site Visits, project documentation, WFP staff, and beneficiaries.</td>
<td>Secondary research, key stakeholder interviews, focus group discussions, beneficiary feedback.</td>
<td>Triangulation, linkages to current research, peer review.</td>
<td>Participatory and interactive approaches, experienced evaluation staff, inclusive/impartial stakeholder selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 How effective has been WFP’s resource mobilisation strategy not only in generating resources for the PRRO, but also leveraging resources from the government and other partners as multipliers, thus contributing to sustainability and handing over strategies?</td>
<td>Percentage of appeal budget received. Diversity of contributors.</td>
<td>Donors, financial status reports.</td>
<td>Secondary research, key stakeholder interviews.</td>
<td>Triangulation, linkages to current research, peer review.</td>
<td>Participatory and interactive approaches, experienced evaluation staff, inclusive/impartial stakeholder selection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Question 3: Why and how has the operation produced the observed results?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Question</th>
<th>Measure/Indicator</th>
<th>Main Sources of Information</th>
<th>Data Collection Methods</th>
<th>Data Analysis Methods</th>
<th>Evidence quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.1 What were the main internal and external factors that caused the observed changes and affected how results were achieved? | Internal factors within WFP’s control - success of:  
- the processes, systems and tools in place to support the operation design, implementation, monitoring/evaluation and reporting.  
- the governance structure and institutional arrangements (including issues related to staffing, capacity and technical backstopping from RB/HQ).  
- the partnership and coordination arrangements.  
- how the CO been able to position itself as a partner at various levels? | Interviews with WFP senior staff, Donors, Other Stakeholders. | Secondary research, key stakeholder interviews. | Triangulation, linkages to current research, peer review. | Participatory and interactive approaches, experienced evaluation staff, inclusive/impartial stakeholder selection. |
| | Externally factors outside WFP’s control:  
- the external operating environment.  
- the funding climate.  
- external incentives and pressures. | DSWD, NDRRMC, UNOCHA, Donors. | | | |
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Annex 6: Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARMM</td>
<td>Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDA</td>
<td>Bangsamoro Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHW</td>
<td>Barangay Health Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIFF</td>
<td>Bangsamoro Islamic Freedom Fighters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSFP</td>
<td>Blanket supplementary feeding programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAVAPPED</td>
<td>Cagayan Valley Partners in People Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFSA</td>
<td>Community and Family Services International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFW</td>
<td>Cash for work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAM</td>
<td>Community Based Management of Acute Malnutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Country Office (WFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAR</td>
<td>Department for Agrarian Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DepEd</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoA</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRRM</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Disaster Preparedness and Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSWD</td>
<td>Department of Social Welfare and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>European Commission Humanitarian Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food &amp; Agriculture Organisation (UN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFA</td>
<td>Food for assets (WFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFE</td>
<td>Food for education (WFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFS</td>
<td>Farmer Field School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFT</td>
<td>Food for training (WFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLA</td>
<td>Field level agreement (WFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNRI-DOST</td>
<td>Food &amp; Nutrition Research Institute, Dept. of Science &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAM</td>
<td>Global acute malnutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFD</td>
<td>General food distribution (WFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>Hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKI</td>
<td>Helen Keller International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organisation (UN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPC</td>
<td>Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (FSNAU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPHO</td>
<td>Integrated Provincial Health Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFI</td>
<td>Kadtuntaya Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI</td>
<td>Kapamagogopa Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGU</td>
<td>Local Government Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAM</td>
<td>Moderate acute malnutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMM PILOT</td>
<td>Moderate Acute Malnutrition Management Partnerships for Implementation, Localization and Technology Transfer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG-F</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals – achievement fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCH</td>
<td>Mother and child health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICS</td>
<td>Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoH</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILF</td>
<td>Moro Islamic Liberation Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNLF</td>
<td>Moro National Liberation Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNP</td>
<td>Micronutrient Powder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Metric tonne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUAC</td>
<td>Mid-Upper Arm Circumference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFA</td>
<td>National Food Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDRRMC</td>
<td>National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIE</td>
<td>Nutrition in Emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNC</td>
<td>National Nutrition Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>National Nutrition Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCD</td>
<td>Office of Civil Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBSP</td>
<td>Philippines Business for Social Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Positive Deviance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMAM</td>
<td>Philippines Integrated Management of Severe Acute Malnutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLW</td>
<td>Pregnant and lactating women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPAN</td>
<td>Philippines Plan of Action for Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>Project Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRRO</td>
<td>Protracted relief and recovery operation (WFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Parent Teacher Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Regional Bureau (WFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHU</td>
<td>Regional Health Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSF</td>
<td>Ready-to-use supplementary food (WFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAM</td>
<td>Severe acute malnutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>School Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR</td>
<td>Standard Project Report (WFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSFP</td>
<td>Targeted supplementary feeding programme (WFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDSS</td>
<td>United Nations Department of Safety and Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOCHA</td>
<td>United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAM</td>
<td>Vulnerability Assessment Mapping (WFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFH</td>
<td>Weight for height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme (UN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>