

## OPERATION EVALUATION

Malawi PRRO 200692 - Responding to Humanitarian Needs  
and Strengthening Resilience (2014- 2017): A mid-term  
evaluation of WFP's Operation [2014-2016]

### **Management Response**

[June, 2016]



**World Food Programme**

Management response cleared by:

Country Director: Coco Ushiyama/ date

## Detailed responses to evaluation recommendations

Evaluation Recommendations	<b>Management</b>  <b>Accepted, partially accepted or not accepted</b> 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)
<b>Recommendation 1: Design structured recovery activities within a funded project context.</b> The CO needs to re-define and formalise the recovery activities in the context of relief. This will require designing site- and partner-specific projects that can be supported to March 2017. The CO should be explicit with respect to the target group and the role of conditional food assistance. To better link relief and recovery there should be a clear and formal mechanism by which relief beneficiaries are reached and retained by Cooperating Partners. In particular, the projects should define the community structure through which the recovery activity is delivered, whether it utilises existing community groups or establishes new ones and the precise relationship to the partner's pre-existing activity. This will require establishing beneficiary targeting guidelines, focussed activities and processes with a select number of Cooperating Partners best suited to recovery. Building on its experiences to date with complementary activity, the CO should identify and reduce: 1) the Cooperating Partners to be engaged in this funded PRRO recovery	<b>Partially accepted.</b>  The MWCO programmes around resilience principles, incorporating relief, recovery and longer term resilience activities, and doesn't recommend focusing only on recovery. The MWCO already embeds recovery activities into its programmes under the PRRO. This is articulated through the complementary activities implemented during the emergency responses of the 2015 floods and the 2015/2016 MVAC, the latter of which were clearly articulated and tracked. In addition, recovery activities are embedded in the FFA process. This is also reflected in the 3PA planning tools which are all seasonally sensitive and clearly	1. Finalize tools for integrating resilience and recovery into the MVAC response, building on existing complementary activity tracking tools, and test through 2016/2017 lean season response. This is in response to the recommendation on redefining recovery activities in the context of relief.	Programme/ Resilience	Q4 2016 - Q1 2017 (to be finalized based on learning from the 2016/2017 MVAC)	Yes

Evaluation Recommendations	<b>Management</b>  <b>Accepted, partially accepted or not accepted</b> 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)
activity and; 2) the range of activities that constitute recovery at household and community level.	<p>identify activities to anticipate and respond to shocks.</p> <p>The MWCO accepts that these activities are sometimes hard to track within the PRRO when compartmentalized against the Strategic Objectives 1-3, and is working to more clearly disambiguate recovery activities reported under the SOs through the complementary activities.</p> <p>The MWCO has also taken a range of tools it uses under FFA to improve design, M+E and reporting of recovery and resilience activities under the emergency response.</p> <p>Joint Emergency Food Assistance Programme (JEFAP) guidelines clearly articulate the approach to community engagement, household targeting, and partner engagement.</p> <p>The point concerning selecting partners for recovery activities</p>				

Evaluation Recommendations	<b>Management</b>  <b>Accepted, partially accepted or not accepted</b> 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)
	and reducing the number of CPs is not accepted. On partner selection, WFP considers partner capacity in delivering assistance across relief and recovery/resilience, as recovery is embedded into complementary activities under the relief response. Furthermore, given the scope and the multiple objectives under the PRRO, MWCO does not see the basis for reducing the number of CPs.				
<b>Recommendation 2: Maintain and improve responsiveness of cash transfers.</b> The CO should review the responsiveness of cash transfers well in advance of the next lean season. Rapid and unexpected food inflation rates, as experienced in the 2015-2016 lean season, should be factored in to the calculation of cash transfers if the transfer value is to meet local food requirements. The network of 51 mVAM-monitored markets corresponds closely to the cash beneficiary sites and the real time price data from these markets could be used in the calculation of projected monthly food inflation rates. In addition, the Emergency and VAM Units could work closer with the financial service providers to	<b>Accepted</b> , subject to agreement with stakeholders (Government and INGO Consortium)	1. CO to institute food basket cash transfer value variations based on the market price monitoring outcomes, validated through the food and nutrition security working groups.	Programme/ Emergency	Q3 2016	Yes
		2. CO to strengthen staffing capacity to support expansion of mVAM price monitoring explore expanding coverage of mVAM to cover all districts with cash-based transfers (CBT).	Programme/ VAM; Emergency	Q3 2016	Yes

Evaluation Recommendations	<b>Management</b>  <b>Accepted, partially accepted or not accepted</b> 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)
reduce delivery times of cash transfers and so minimise the impact of inflation. This would involve reviewing the time between the calculation of cash transfer values, the initiation of bank transfers and disbursement to the beneficiaries. The CO could take as its benchmark a two week time-window, which has been achieved in the past and the CO should seek formal financial service provider commitments to response times well in advance of likely increases in caseload and geographic coverage. These issues could be explored in partnership with the INGO Consortium and other stakeholders in the process of developing national guidelines for emergency cash transfers.		3. CO to explore expanding financial service provider base to ease capacity constraints, considering the large scope and increased caseload of the emergency response.  4. CO will continue discussions with relevant stakeholders regarding developing national guidelines for emergency cash transfers.	Programme/ Emergency          Programme/ Emergency	Q2-Q3 2016          Q2-Q3 2016	Yes          No
<b>Recommendation 3: Reassess the characteristics and impact of ration sharing.</b> In advance of the final lean season relief response under the PRRO, the CO should work to develop a clear understanding of sharing of both in-kind food and cash rations. With the support of the RB, the M&E system could be modified to capture additional qualitative and quantitative data related to sharing so that extra attention can be given during reporting and analysis with respect to its influence in shaping food security and nutrition outcomes at	<b>Accepted</b>	1. The CO in collaboration with the government and all food security cluster members are already working to review the guidelines for designing and implementing relief response. This process is expected to address many design and implementation issues including sharing.	Programme	Q3, 2016 – Q2 2017	Yes

Evaluation Recommendations	<b>Management</b>  <b>Accepted, partially accepted or not accepted</b> 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)
household level. This additional level of knowledge could be used to inform modality choice and aspects of delivery and targeting. These issues could be explored in the context of a workshop with Cooperating Partners, other PRRO stakeholders and external livelihoods experts to explore the significance and impact of sharing for its operations. The workshop and broader CO review could cover: 1) the prevalence and cultural relevance of sharing and its social function in each region; 2) sharing with respect to in-kind rations and purchased foods; 3) sharing in the context of collective labour during recovery activities; 4) consequences for M&E and reporting; 5) options for revised delivery or targeting and; 6) options for nutrition and other messaging that acknowledge and accommodate sharing.		2. The CO in collaboration with the Food Security Cluster, plans to engage a consultant that will facilitate the review process including consultation with all relevant stake holders. 3. M&E to incorporate relevant findings from the Food Security Cluster review into redesign of tools to better capture sharing amongst targeted communities.	Programme           Programme/ M&E	Q3, 2016 – Q2 2017           Q3 2016 – Q2 2017	Yes           No
<b>Recommendation 4: Develop a CO position on individual and household targeting.</b> The CO should explore the consequences of targeting based on the assumed household size of 5.5 and develop a position on an alternative application of individual targeting or targeting based on actual household size. The adoption of	<b>Accepted</b> , subject to discussion and decision-making in JEFAP and Food Security Cluster Meetings.	1. For the 2015/16 response the CO implemented a pilot study on individual targeting to inform its position on the same. Based on evidence generated from this process, the CO will disseminate key	Programme/ PI	Q2-Q3 2016	No

Evaluation Recommendations	<b>Management</b>  <b>Accepted, partially accepted or not accepted</b> 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)
SCOPE and improved registration processes provides an opportunity to refine targeting to each beneficiary household. In the first instance, the CO could undertake a joint-review with Joint Emergency Food Assistance Programme members of the 5.5 household size which has been used by the Joint Emergency Food Assistance Programme for over a decade. In addition, the individual targeting pilot conducted in two areas of Lilongwe in late-2015 should yield useful information with respect to logistical issues (pre-positioning, packaging sizes etc.), costs and outcomes associated with this approach and with targeting tailored to actual household size. In response to a full analysis of this pilot with Post Distribution Monitoring and qualitative beneficiary feedback to assess beneficiary preference and gender-specific issues, the CO should develop a clear position on the appropriateness of individual targeting and targeting based on actual household size and plan accordingly with Cooperating Partners for the final relief lean season under the PRRO.		findings and seek feedback from stakeholders that will shape CO position. 2. The CO to scale up SCOPE to support beneficiary data collection and management for the MVAC relief response.	Programme	Q2-Q3 2016	Yes
<b>Recommendation 5: Continue to support MVA capacity and overall stakeholder awareness of the assessment process.</b> The CO should extend its key role in	<b>Accepted;</b> provided any methodological changes are subject to discussion and	1. The CO will continue to advocate and support sensitization meetings on MVAC methodologies to	Programme	Q2 – Q4 2016	Yes (to provide financial and





Evaluation Recommendations	<b>Management</b>  <b>Accepted, partially accepted or not accepted</b> 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)
<b>Recommendation 6: Develop a medium-term strategy for resilience based on a simple but contextualised theory of change.</b> The CO should develop a simple but contextualised theory of change (TOC) in coordination with the HQ technical units of OSZP. As part of the design process for a future WFP Malawi PRRO, the CO should now be drawing on best practice and mapping the pathway by which beneficiary households and communities are expected to graduate from chronic food insecurity, vulnerability to climatic trends and shocks and towards resilience. In particular, the CO needs to articulate the precise strategic function of the Rural Resilience Initiative and Global Facility for Climate Services pilots and their overall contribution to prevention and recovery. A TOC would: 1) represent how sub-sets of WFP resilience activity are expected to combine for the target group(s); 2) map an increasing emphasis on household and productive assets and; 3) clarify the prospective role of the pilot activity and its relevance in scale-up within districts and to new districts. It is important that the CO fully outline the link to this pilot activity and, if possible, a clear link to Purchase 4 Progress. The TOC should be consistent with the food-assistance-for-assets Guidance Manual and draw from current best practice elsewhere such as under the MERET programme in Ethiopia. The process would help the CO present the evolution of its previous DRR under the Country Programme towards an integrated planning approach for resilience, with conditional assistance at its	<b>Accepted.</b> This is under design as was explained to the evaluation team.	1. CO to finalise Resilience strategy and Theory of Change	Programme	Q4 2016	No

Evaluation Recommendations	<b>Management</b>  <b>Accepted, partially accepted or not accepted</b> 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)
core. The TOC would support the remainder of the PRRO but would inform future programme design, working to communicate the intervention to other resilience programmes and stakeholders, including Cooperating Partners and donors.					
<b>Recommendation 7: Further develop gender capacity at district and local levels.</b> The CO should ideally identify a specific gender officer, or focal point, within each of its Cooperating Partners. This would ensure consistency across Cooperating Partners and help drive gender programming within the PRRO that draws on the partners' existing capacity and knowledge of the intervention areas. However, there are greater institutional and social challenges at district and community levels. The CO could look to extend its capacity building work on gender issues to District Council partners under both the relief and prevention and recovery components. At local level, there is increasing awareness that chiefs and community leaders can play a progressive role in inclusive planning in Malawi and the CO could consider extending its social and behavioural change communication work via a role for Traditional Authorities, Civil Protection Committees and Village Development Committees. CO could plan and implement such a strategy in partnership with its Cooperating Partners, identifying a clear potential messaging role for	<b>Partially Accepted</b> – Extension of capacity building work to district level partners is subject to partner and Government capacity.	1. CO is already working with the prospective partners for both relief and recovery components to ensure gender-related responsibilities are allocated to existing CP programme staff. Staffing capacity for gender to be reflected in proposal budget.	Programme/ Gender	Q2-Q3 2016	Yes
		2. CO will conduct training of all gender focal points in Gender and Protection.	Programme/ Gender	Q3-Q4 2016	Yes
		3. The CO to conduct case study to inform feasibility of expansion of the Theatre for Development SBCC pilot. This model would then yield involvement of local structures, to a wider coverage.	Programme	Q3-Q4 2016	Yes

Evaluation Recommendations	<b>Management</b>  <b>Accepted, partially accepted or not accepted</b> 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)
these stakeholders and the training and support required to promote it.					
<b>Recommendation 8: Make better use of gender indicators in analysis and reporting.</b> The CO should place greater emphasis on gender-related and cross-cutting indicators in its monitoring and reporting in order to better reflect the social features that influence effectiveness and appropriateness. The CO generated base values for cross-cutting indicators six months into the PRRO but it is important that in the case of new food-assistance-for-assets locations, for instance, base values are collected as the activity is established. Cross-cutting indicators should be routinely reviewed and interpreted, not in isolation, but alongside quantitative outcomes data derived via Post Distribution Monitoring. This would support the CO to reflect on the role of representation and decision-making in the attainment of food security outcomes and overall PRRO objectives. The CO should ensure base values are established in advance of additional food-assistance-for-assets activity and the 2015-2016 relief response.	<b>Accepted;</b> however, not all cross-cutting indicators can be collected at baseline, ie control of food assistance by household head, as per the Strategic Results Framework Indicator Compendium.	1. CO has streamlined its data collection tools to be inclusive of gender indicators and will ensure all upcoming activities are additionally well-streamlined.	Programme	Q2 2017	No
		2. The CO will ensure in-depth gender and protection analysis to assess the impact on the overall project outcomes/ results. Gender and Protection analysis results will be reflected in all M&E reports.	Programme	throughout	No

Evaluation Recommendations	<b>Management</b>  <b>Accepted, partially accepted or not accepted</b> 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)
<b>Recommendation 9: Streamline partner reporting through joint-learning and increased field-level interaction.</b> Partner reporting represents a challenge to both the Cooperating Partners and to the CO staff. The CO could streamline CP reporting commitments further and should extend its local support to M&E and operations, ideally via additional Field Monitoring Assistant capacity. Increasing the frequency of interaction between Field Monitoring Assistants and CP field staff would help counteract the effect of high staff-turnover at local level, improve process reporting and increase consistency between the partners' understanding of the PRRO and the activities delivered to the communities, particularly in the context of recovery activity delivered within the relief context. Additional capacity building and co-learning should ideally operate within the established set of partners as a platform to support the PRRO to become more effective and consistent to March 2017.	<b>Accepted.</b>  The resilience section has adapted and adjusted M+E and reporting tools, work norms and community engagement guidelines, both for FFA and as part of the MVAC response, to reduce the number of reports and enhance the ability of all partners as well as FMAs to easily monitor activities in the field. These are being disseminated as of now for the next 6 months.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The CO will align the implementation needs with the staff field presence.</li> <li>2. CO will ensure WFP field staff are engaged in training of cooperating partners to improve coordination and reporting capacity between partner and WFP at field level.</li> <li>3. CO to enhance partner and WFP field staff capacity to monitor and report on recovery/ resilience activities through trainings and in-person onsite support visits.</li> </ol>	Programme  Programme  Programme	Q3 – Q42016  Q3 – Q42016  Througho ut	Yes  Yes  Yes



Evaluation Recommendations	Management	Management - Action to be taken			
	Accepted, partially accepted or not accepted and COMMENT on the Recommendation, providing clear reasoning for partially accepted and not accepted	Action	Responsible CO unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
Processors Association (GTPA) in order to dampen the effects of unstable food supply and prices during the final relief cycle under the PRRO.					