

OPERATION EVALUATION

Kenya, PRRO 200174, Food Assistance to Refugees:
An Evaluation of WFP's Operation (2011-2013)

Management Response

July, 2014



World Food Programme

wfp.org

Management response cleared by:

Country Director: **Ronald Sibanda/31 July 2014**

Detailed responses to evaluation recommendations

Evaluation Recommendations	Management Accepted, partially accepted or not accepted and COMMENT on the Recommendation, providing clear reasoning for partially accepted and not accepted	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible CO unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p>Recommendation 1:</p> <p>In preparation for the following programming cycle, we recommend that WFP conduct a well-designed and rigorous vulnerability assessment of the two camps. The purpose of this assessment would be to understand the patterns and drivers of vulnerability within the camp populations. It would further identify existing livelihood strategies and their distribution. In acknowledging the sensitivity of such an activity in Dadaab camp, it is recommended that the camp leaderships (including clan leaders) be consulted regarding the necessity to understand camp vulnerability for the next programming cycle, and to elicit their participation in implementing the activity (e.g., identifying enumerators and reviewing the tools). This is a critical first step to the design of the follow-up operation. Security permitting, this recommendation should be implemented in 2014.</p> <p>(Such a needs assessment was a primary recommendation of the JAM 2012 report).</p>	<p>Partially accepted:</p> <p>Vulnerability assessment of the refugees in the camps goes beyond food assistance and thus requires consensus of the wide range of stakeholder partners providing assistance in the camps (note that food is 41 percent of total international assistance provided to refugees in camps - Kenya Comprehensive Refugee Programme 2014). There have been reservations among partners on the feasibility of a vulnerability assessment proposed, given the insecurity in the camps, especially in Dadaab. WFP Kenya consulted WFP-HQ, ECHO and USAID and all parties agreed that findings from such a study would not be reliable in the current context as insecurity does not allow for household visits; the alternative approach agreed was to use existing monitoring structures like the food security outcome monitoring (FSOM) and expand the analysis and indicators. This was done in September 2013 but has not been acknowledged by the ET. The Joint Assessment Mission (JAM) in July 2014 (final report expected to be issued in mid-August) by WFP and UNHCR has recommended that a comprehensive vulnerability assessment is</p>	<p>WFP will continue dialogue with UNHCR and the Government of Kenya on how and when to undertake such assessment. The context is even more complex than at the time of the evaluation mission, with the new government directive for relocation of urban refugees to camps and renewed pressure for repatriation of Somali refugees. The frequency and intensity of attacks in Kenya by Al Shabaab have increased sharply since March 2014.</p> <p>A vulnerability assessment requires a series of consultations with UNHCR, cooperating partners, Government of Kenya, and refugees in order to</p>	<p>WFP Kenya: CD/DCD, Refugee Unit, VAM Unit, WFP Dadaab and WFP Kakuma.</p>	<p>2015</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Evaluation Recommendations	Management Accepted, partially accepted or not accepted and COMMENT on the Recommendation, providing clear reasoning for partially accepted and not accepted	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible CO unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
	undertaken to inform the possibility of targeting in the future. UNHCR will take the lead in formulating a livelihood strategy. However, it will not be possible to complete the vulnerability assessment in time for the design of the new PRRO (the deadline for the document from the WFP country office is 31 August).	reach consensus. Thorough planning and a clear method will be determined, taking into consideration security and access (particularly in Dadaab camps).			
Recommendation 2: WFP should eliminate the take-home ration for girls. Collaborate with education sector partners to identify alternative and non-food incentives that promote girls' enrolment and attendance. It is important to note here that WFP does not have the comparative advantage to play a key role in implementing a non-food alternative, thus a partnership agreement will be necessary.	Accepted: WFP Kenya agrees with the recommendation. The issue of take-home rations was further reviewed by the 2014 JAM, which recommended that the take-home ration be replaced by other, non-food, complementary services. This is also in line with the approach that WFP Kenya is taking with regard gender disparities in accessing education the arid and semi-arid lands (ASALs), i.e. not using a take-home ration for girls but seeking collaboration with education sector partners to identify alternative incentives that would promote girls' enrolment and attendance.	WFP Kenya will have consultations with stakeholders in the refugee camps and expects to phase-out the take-home ration for girls in school by the end 2014.	WFP Kenya: CD/DCD, Refugee Unit, WFP Dadaab and WFP Kakuma.	December 2014	No
Recommendation 3: WFP should significantly redesign the FFA interventions and, if they must remain within the refugee PRRO (for reasons unclear to the ET), the interventions should be based on clear, transparent objectives and upon a comprehensive needs	Accepted: The reasons for the FFA interventions being in the refugee PRRO rather than the relief/resilience PRRO are as follows: The relief/reliance PRRO uses nationwide assessments identifying Kenyans requiring	WFP Kenya will engage with counties authorities, communities and partners and clarify the focus on resilience, alignment with the objectives, and the	WFP Kenya: CD/DCD, PRRO Relief & Resilience Unit, PRRO Refugee Unit, WFP Dadaab, and	September-December 2014	Yes

Evaluation Recommendations	Management Accepted, partially accepted or not accepted and COMMENT on the Recommendation, providing clear reasoning for partially accepted and not accepted	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible CO unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
assessment. The FFA intervention should be supervised by the WFP Garissa and Lodwar sub-offices to ensure FFA activities are integrated in County Integrated Development Plans. Supervision from the county level allows WFP to plan with communities' and counties' line services. At the same time, the ET recommends a more robust design process that sets out an appropriate long-term theory of change for target communities and indicates clearly how the PRRO will contribute to the overall goal of food security resilience, including appropriate indicators for monitoring. As part of the design, WFP should consider not only community infrastructure, e.g., for improved water management, but provide more tailored support to livelihood diversification that addresses adaptive deficit. This could include introducing livestock herds and converting invasive mesquite forests into charcoal production sites.	<p>immediate food assistance. Targeting the most food-insecure areas in the country would not necessarily include populations hosting refugees. WFP, UNHCR, DRA and most donors agree that host communities should receive support in compensation for the burden of refugees on community resources and to reduce tensions between refugees and hosts. To ensure that host communities are targeted for FFA support and allow donors to target their resources to refugees <i>and</i> host communities, FFA for host communities has to be part of the refugee PRRO. This logic was explained to the ET.</p> <p>FFA activities will be based on a comprehensive needs assessment with clear objectives. FFA activities will continue to be supervised by WFP offices at county level (Garissa and Lodwar) to ensure integration with County Integrated Development Plans. The design will indicate how the PRRO will contribute to food security resilience and encourage other partners in livelihood areas where WFP does not have a comparative advantage.</p>	implementation arrangements. WFP will also explore the most appropriate transfer modality (food, cash, vouchers) in the successor PRRO.	WFP Kakuma.		
Recommendation 4: The ET feels well justified (by its review of experiences with school feeding in ASAL Kenya and elsewhere) that food should be provided to students, especially those who spend the entire day at school.	Accepted: WFP Kenya agrees with the recommendation. WFP will revisit the education strategy agreed by partners in 2012. In Dadaab, these issues are already being	WFP Kenya will work closely with relevant partners (UNHCR, UNICEF, CPs) as well as parents, teachers and camps leadership), to	WFP Kenya: Refugee Unit, Country Programme Unit (school feeding), VAM/	2015	No

Evaluation Recommendations	Management Accepted, partially accepted or not accepted and COMMENT on the Recommendation, providing clear reasoning for partially accepted and not accepted	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible CO unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
WFP should design the next school meals intervention as part of a broader collaboration with UNHCR, UNICEF, and the CPs to implement existing camp-wide educational strategies that effectively increase net enrolment and primary completion rates. The ET suggests an “Education Working Group” (including parents, teachers, and camp leadership) at sub-camp level as an appropriate governance structure to effect measurable change in education. As an implementation component of this recommendation and if school feeding is to be continued, it is important to explicitly state the objectives of the intervention and the expected impacts. If net enrolment and attendance are the objectives, the impacts need to be rigorously assessed.	discussed to a certain extent during the monthly meetings of the existing Education Working Group. In Kakuma, an integrated “School, Health and Nutrition project” will be implemented in all schools in partnership with UNHCR, UNICEF and LWF, the Education working group, and other local stakeholders. The project has been planned for August 2014 to July 2016. The operational plan has well-defined indicators to be monitored, and enrolment and attendance will be rigorously assessed.	improve the management and governance of schools.	Nutrition/ M&E Unit, WFP Dadaab, and WFP Kakuma		
Recommendation 5: Based on rigorous market assessment, WFP should expand the experience of FFV to substitute food vouchers, on a pilot basis, for the commodities that are most monetized, i.e., cereals and oil. The reduction in the ration size and composition would be supplemented by FFV, which would allow beneficiaries to purchase their desired food items. (The ET notes that at the time of the evaluation report review, WFP Kenya is undertaking a market assessment for cereals.	Accepted: WFP Kenya agrees with the recommendation. This is already recommended in the 2014 Dadaab/Kakuma Market Assessment and consistent with the preliminary findings of the evaluation of the Fresh Food Voucher pilot. The 2014 WFP/UNHCR JAM recommends <i>“introducing alternative transfer modalities on an incremental basis (vouchers preferred)”</i> . Part of the GFD ration (probably cereals and/or beans) can be replaced by a voucher. Vouchers should not be specifically for fresh foods: the voucher should be expanded to all food items	WFP Kenya will develop a strategy to expand market-based interventions under the successor PRRO.	WFP Kenya: Innovations Unit, Refugee Unit, WFP Dadaab, and WFP Kakuma.	September 2014	Yes

Evaluation Recommendations	Management Accepted, partially accepted or not accepted and COMMENT on the Recommendation, providing clear reasoning for partially accepted and not accepted	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible CO unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
	<p>that households are purchasing, probably as an “open” voucher.</p> <p>As the donors with most interest in cash/voucher transfers have not been the main donors to the refugee operation in recent years, the potential to introduce cash may be limited by donor commitments in cash.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 6:</p> <p>WFP should maintain the BSF and TSF interventions but with an improved implementation strategy. Greater emphasis should be given to the “soft” side of the intervention, i.e., a more focused nutrition orientation for mothers, including information provision and counselling on food utilization. This could include a community outreach component in which nutritional staff or community health workers visit the blocks to carry out public counselling sessions with beneficiary mothers and children. Such a community component is crucial for the success of nutrition programmes for follow-up of clients at home and for defaulter tracing in order to reduce cases of relapse. Quality supervision of the community services is an integral component of nutrition programmes. Thus, this recommendation will require a great emphasis on CP staff training and more effective supervision of these field workers.</p>	<p>Accepted:</p> <p>WFP Kenya agrees with the recommendation. The BSF and TSF interventions in the PRRO follow the current guidance from the WFP at corporate level and from the Nutrition Cluster.</p> <p>Data does show that Supercereal Plus has played an important role in reducing the prevalence of bothwasting and stunting, a factor which the ET did not include in its report.</p>	<p>WFP Kenya will work with cooperating partners and reflect the changes in the successor PRRO.</p> <p>A budget for Behaviour Change Communication (BCC) will be included in the new PRRO, including using film media messages. This will disseminate advice on how and for whom the Supercereal Plus is designed. Video screens would be placed in queuing areas.</p>	<p>WFP Kenya Nutrition Unit, Refugee Unit, WFP Dadaab, and WFP Kakuma.</p>	<p>September 2014</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Evaluation Recommendations	Management Accepted, partially accepted or not accepted and COMMENT on the Recommendation, providing clear reasoning for partially accepted and not accepted	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible CO unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p>Recommendation 7:</p> <p>We recommend, prior to a new programme cycle, a reflective review of the monitoring and evaluation system. As stated above, it appears that the detail and effort of data collection are not commensurate with the utility of the reports produced. Such a review would identify a limited number of input, output, and impact indicators for the new PRRO (complementary to the mandated FSOM system) and would issue reports more frequently and with more impact detail than the SPRs. Such a review of the M&E system for the new PRRO would also give careful thought to quality, particularly to construct validity and internal validity in order to reduce sampling bias and sampling error.</p>	<p>Partially accepted</p> <p>A new M&E strategy was presented and agreed by the country office in January 2014, though the ET report has not acknowledged this.</p> <p>The ET did not indicate where sampling bias and errors are found. Monitoring in Dadaab is restricted by insecurity in the camps.</p> <p>It is acknowledged by WFP Kenya that reports had not been timely but this has been back on track since June 2014. WFP Kenya also acknowledges that reports from VAM and M&E have not been used sufficiently by programme managers.</p>	<p>For the new corporate strategic results framework (SRF), the monitoring tools in WFP Kenya are being moved to an online platform where programme managers can look at the progress on a day-to-day basis.</p> <p>Heads of sub-offices in Dadaab and Kakuma will be urged to take fuller responsibility to supervise their monitoring staff and set up a direct feedback mechanism.</p>	<p>WFP Kenya: M&E Unit, Refugee Unit, WFP Dadaab, and WFP Kakuma.</p>	<p>December 2014</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Recommendation 8:</p> <p>Important decisions will be made in the event of anticipated reduced pipelines. In this event, WFP should fully incorporate the formal camp leadership and the informal clan leaders from each sub-camp into decision-making relative to the GFD ration in terms of size, composition, and targeting, as well as the supplementary feeding strategy for those most vulnerable. The biometrics success has offered a good example of how participatory decision-making can go beyond just negotiating the acceptance of a decision</p>	<p>Accepted:</p> <p>WFP works closely and engages frequently with camp leadership for various operational issues and they are fully part of local decision-making mechanism.</p> <p>In Dadaab and Kakuma, this is already being done through regular pre-distribution cycle meetings Refugee Camp Leadership with Food Aid Committee (FAC) members and periodic meetings with refugee leaders and partners.</p>	<p>WFP Kenya will continue engagement with camps leadership in major operational decisions affecting refugees.</p> <p>A more dynamic and medium/long-term pipeline outlook for discussion with the camp leadership can be developed.</p>	<p>WFP Kenya: CD/DCD, Refugee Unit, Resource Management Unit, WFP Dadaab, and WFP Kakuma.</p>	<p>2015</p>	<p>No</p>

Evaluation Recommendations	Management Accepted, partially accepted or not accepted and COMMENT on the Recommendation, providing clear reasoning for partially accepted and not accepted	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible CO unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
made in Nairobi to a more integrated problem-solving process during the decision-making that precedes actual programming.					
<p>Recommendation 9:</p> <p>WFP should explore the possibility of an alternative distribution site for super-cereal for the BSF for children 6-23 months old in Dadaab. One of the proposals made by the agencies is that the distribution of the super-cereal continue at GFD sites but only children who have been taken for growth monitoring promotion at the health posts qualify to get the food. This approach would be more efficient than transferring the distribution to the health post. Nonetheless, this will require additional staffing to conduct anthropometric measurements and nutrition education. This could first be tried on a pilot basis in one of the camps and if successful expanded to the other camps. A suggestion made by the ET is for the programme to explore the possibility of providing a ready-to-use food (RUTF) that is nutrient- and energy-dense to replace the super-cereal. There is less likelihood of sharing of such foods at the household level even if distributed with the general ration. RUTFs are regarded as therapeutic and therefore not for consumption by the entire household.</p>	<p>Partially accepted:</p> <p>Essential food commodities for the most vulnerable group should not be conditional. However a closer link to maternal, infant and young child nutrition (MIYCN) should be prioritized.</p> <p>RUSF should not replace Supercereal Plus for BSF as it is important to differentiate between a regular food (SuperCereal Plus is a porridge) and a commodity that is used for treatment and thus regarded more as a medicine. WFP Kenya is following corporate guidance of WFP as well as the guidance of the Nutrition Cluster. As noted in the management response to Recommendation 6, there needs to be an increased and intensified BCC campaign to ensure that SuperCereal Plus is used for children only before recommending another commodity</p> <p>Sharing is unfortunately a reality regardless of the commodity and thus BCC should be the first step to ensure better usage.</p>	WFP Kenya will continue to monitor the nutrition situation of refugees in the camps and will continue to align to WFP corporate guidance and guidance from the Nutrition Cluster. WFP will also work with partners to strengthen the link with IYCF.	WFP Kenya: Nutrition Unit, Refugee Unit, and WFP Dadaab, and WFP Kakuma.	2015.	No

Evaluation Recommendations	Management Accepted, partially accepted or not accepted and COMMENT on the Recommendation, providing clear reasoning for partially accepted and not accepted	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible CO unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p>Recommendation 10:</p> <p>Building upon the technical success of the biometrics experience, we recommend the expanded use of electronic information to improve coherency and targeting in the entire food assistance programme in the two camps. Such a system could track children flagged during the nutrition monitoring process and identify the more vulnerable households.</p>	<p>Partially accepted:</p> <p>The focus of the ET on the <i>"biometrics experience"</i> is somewhat misleading. The biometrics system relies on data stored in UNHCR's corporate refugee registration system (proGres), so using information in the system for other purposes will be dictated by the extent to which proGres can be modified to meet the needs of particular food assistance programmes.</p>	<p>WFP Kenya will explore this further with UNHCR as part of a vulnerability assessment.</p>	<p>WFP Kenya: Refugee Unit, Innovations Unit, VAM/Nutrition Unit, WFP Dadaab, and WFP Kakuma.</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>