

# Standard Project Report 2015

Reporting Period: 1 January - 31 December 2015

## LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

### Restoring Food Security and Livelihoods through Assistance for Vulnerable Groups Affected by Recurrent Shocks in El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua

Project Number	200490
Project Category	Regional PRRO
Overall Planned Beneficiaries	2,247,291
Planned Beneficiaries in 2015	1,213,570
Total Beneficiaries in 2015	994,238

Project Approval Date	05 Nov 2013
Planned Start Date	01 Jan 2014
Actual Start Date	01 Feb 2014
Project End Date	31 Dec 2016
Financial Closure Date	n.a.

Approved budget as 31 December 2015 in USD	
Capacity Dev.t and Augmentation	1,206,200
Cash--based Transfer and Related Costs	101,579,429
Direct Support Costs	16,605,509
Food and Related Costs	38,975,258
Indirect Support Costs	11,085,648
<b>Total Approved Budget</b>	<b>169,452,044</b>

Commodities	Metric Tonnes
Total Approved Commodities	48,257
Planned Commodities in 2015	15,208
Actual Commodities in 2015	6,404

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### COUNTRY OVERVIEW

#### COUNTRY BACKGROUND

#### SUMMARY OF WFP ASSISTANCE

### OPERATIONAL SPR

#### OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES AND RELEVANCE

#### RESULTS

- Beneficiaries, Targeting and Distribution
- 'Story Worth Telling'*
- Progress Towards Gender Equality
- Protection and Accountability to Affected Population
- Outputs
- Outcomes
- Sustainability, Capacity Development and Handover

#### INPUTS

- Resource Inputs
- Food Purchases and in-kind Receipts
- Food Transport, Delivery and Handling
- Post-Delivery Losses

#### MANAGEMENT

- Partnerships
- Lessons Learned

#### OPERATIONAL STATISTICS (where applicable)

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

# Operational SPR

The boundaries and names shown on the maps in this document do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations

## OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES AND RELEVANCE

The regional PRRO 200490 supports government response to sudden and slow-onset emergencies that affect the food and nutritional security and livelihoods of populations in Central America. The overall function of the PRRO is preparedness and emergency response, granting WFP the flexibility to rapidly respond to different types and scales of shocks including earthquakes, hurricanes, floods, coffee rust, drought and other disasters. Its objectives are to support and coordinate responses to shocks by saving lives and protecting livelihoods through relief assistance (WFP Strategic Objective 1) and helping to establish and stabilize livelihoods and food security (WFP Strategic Objective 2) through recovery assistance.

This year WFP extended its assistance to the drought affected populations through a budget revision until the next harvest. This revision reflected a shift of beneficiaries from recovery to relief interventions in response to deteriorating food security.

The PRRO is an essential component of WFP's regional emergency preparedness and response framework. In Guatemala, WFP supported government drought response by working with the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food (MAGA) and the National Secretariat for Food and Nutrition Security (SESAN). In Honduras, interventions were aligned to national priorities and emergency drought plans defined by the Government. In El Salvador, the operation is in line with the national law for civil protection, disaster prevention and mitigation. In Nicaragua, the regional PRRO is aligned with the government's emergency preparedness and response plan: WFP support is only requested when the scope of an emergency surpasses national response capacities.

## RESULTS

### Beneficiaries, Targeting and Distribution

In 2015 drought affected the food security of the most vulnerable households in the Dry Corridor for the second consecutive year. Analysis conducted by WFP and partners indicated that more than 4.1 million people were affected by the prolonged drought with 2.2 million people suffering moderate or severe food insecurity. In response, WFP supported governments in conducting Emergency Food Security Assessments (EFSA) and it also provided food assistance to almost one million beneficiaries through relief and early recovery interventions.

The 2013 WFP Integrated Context Analysis used livelihood and food security profiling to identify both the areas most exposed to natural disasters and the most vulnerable food-insecure groups. In mid-2014, initial WFP assessments on the drought were carried out in all four countries, followed by EFSA and the 2015 initial drought impact assessment in El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras conducted in partnership with national governments, United Nations agencies, and NGOs.

WFP responded to the needs of moderate and severely food-insecure populations unable to recover from the past two consecutive years of drought. Beneficiaries were mainly subsistence farmers in female-headed rural households, households without access to land and dependent on daily wages, and small coffee farmers. Households with pregnant and lactating women, children and elderly were prioritized. WFP worked closely with governments to refine community-based targeting mechanisms and used results of the Seasonal Livelihood Planning consultations to determine the timing and nature of asset creation activities.

Based on micro- and macro-level financial assessments, IT, security and seasonality considerations, risk and mitigation measures, cost efficiency and cost effectiveness analyses and beneficiary preferences, WFP distributed conditional and unconditional in-kind food assistance, cash-based transfers and vouchers. Food rations were generally aligned with the approved recovery ration of cereals, pulses and vegetable oil, whereas the daily CBT of approximately USD 0.5 per person was determined on the basis of actual local food prices.

In Guatemala, the Government declared an emergency in 2014 and established its national drought response plan. This was followed by the request of SESAN and the MAGA asking WFP's assistance in geographical areas not covered by the government. The number of beneficiaries receiving in-kind assistance was higher than planned: more than two-thirds of beneficiaries received food transfers under GFD and FFA/T activities whereas others received conditional cash transfers through banks or commodity vouchers under asset creation and training activities. Assistance was provided according to needs for a period of 60-150 days. MAGA was responsible for the planning and technical supervision of household and community assets creation through the National Rural Extension System. Asset creation focused on natural resource management, including terraces, water harvesting ponds and life fencing. In addition, beneficiaries attended trainings on nutrition and health. WFP also assisted people affected by river contamination and provided a small amount of food commodities to UNHCR for the "Casa del Migrante" within the Unaccompanied Migrant Children taskforce.

In Honduras, an EFSA was conducted in partnership with the government's Technical Unit for Food and Nutrition Security and other partners. Municipal committees subsequently identified the most vulnerable communities suffering chronic poverty and affected by the drought. The most affected families were selected for support by local level distribution committees. A transparency focal point, elected by the human rights commission, oversaw the selection process. WFP provided conditional food assistance in the form of food, cash, vouchers, or a combination of these. Cash was transferred through banks, cooperatives and mobile money, whereas value and commodity vouchers could be redeemed at government shops and neighborhood stores and e-vouchers at supermarkets. WFP directly managed all in-kind food distributions. The actual number of beneficiaries was lower than planned, due to limited funding WFP prioritized the most severely affected population groups. Assistance was based on assessed needs, and it was extended beyond the planned 90 days following the prolonged effects of the drought and in coordination with the Permanent Contingency Commission of the Government. Community consultations with beneficiaries identified the preferred assets, considering municipal and NGOs technical capacities. Cooperating NGOs provided training on the creation, use, and maintenance of assets as well as the use of CBT.

In Nicaragua the Government did not declare an emergency for the drought, but considered the phenomenon as a recurrent event requiring a long-term approach. Instead of direct emergency food assistance, the Government requested the support of the World Bank in designing a long-term strategy for the Dry Corridor to address agriculture, livelihoods, and water management. The government monitored the impact of the drought and based its response on reports of municipal governments and the results of a nutrition study by the Ministry of Health. In order to mitigate the immediate impact of the drought, the government extended its social protection programmes: children in 58 municipalities of the Dry Corridor received an additional meal through the National School Meals programme. In addition, family food packages were delivered to the most vulnerable poor, prioritizing families with young children, elderly persons, pregnant women and female-headed households. WFP helped strengthen the emergency preparedness and response capacities of the National System of Disaster Prevention, Attention and Mitigation through complementary regional projects.

In El Salvador, the selection of geographic areas took into consideration government requests for assistance to populations affected by the drought and the coffee rust and consultations with the Ministry of Interior and the National Council for Food and Nutrition Security. The selection of households was done in collaboration with local authorities, relying on village health promoters employed by the Ministry of Health. The response to the drought consisted mainly of conditional value voucher transfers for those who participated in trainings and asset creation activities. A small group of beneficiaries was assisted through in-kind food transfers. While WFP had planned for eventually providing cash to beneficiaries, this modality was not implemented because of beneficiary protection considerations and clear government preferences for the provision of value vouchers. Beneficiaries received assistance according to assessed needs. High energy biscuits, purchased in view of contingencies like quick-onset emergencies, were used to increase the relief ration for the most vulnerable. WFP could only provide assistance only to one-third of the planned number of beneficiaries.

Beneficiary Category	Planned			Actual			% Actual v. Planned		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
<b>Guatemala</b>									
Number of adults	132,578	134,716	267,294	148,510	150,430	298,940	112.0%	111.7%	111.8%
Number of children 5 to 18 years of age	107,852	114,038	221,890	135,857	145,480	281,337	126.0%	127.6%	126.8%
Number of children below 5 years of age	87,037	92,079	179,116	67,647	83,091	150,738	77.7%	90.2%	84.2%
Total number of beneficiaries in 2015	327,467	340,833	668,300	352,014	379,001	731,015	107.5%	111.2%	109.4%
Total number of beneficiaries in 2014	131,404	134,596	266,000	155,171	168,934	324,105	118.1%	125.5%	121.8%
The total number of beneficiaries includes all targeted persons who were provided with WFP food during the reporting period - either as a recipient/participant in one or more of the following groups, or from a household food ration distributed to one of these recipients/participants									
<b>Honduras</b>									
Number of adults	55,422	66,130	121,552	33,021	53,650	86,671	59.6%	81.1%	71.3%
Number of children 5 to 18 years of age	45,085	55,979	101,064	37,972	39,207	77,179	84.2%	70.0%	76.4%
Number of children below 5 years of age	36,384	45,200	81,584	20,915	21,595	42,510	57.5%	47.8%	52.1%
Total number of beneficiaries in 2015	136,891	167,309	304,200	91,908	114,452	206,360	67.1%	68.4%	67.8%
Total number of beneficiaries in 2014	112,336	115,065	227,401	115,084	105,408	220,492	102.4%	91.6%	97.0%
The total number of beneficiaries includes all targeted persons who were provided with WFP food during the reporting period - either as a recipient/participant in one or more of the following groups, or from a household food ration distributed to one of these recipients/participants									
<b>Nicaragua</b>									
Number of adults	12,470	12,174	24,644	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Number of children 5 to 18 years of age	10,144	10,305	20,449	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Number of children below 5 years of age	8,186	8,321	16,507	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total number of beneficiaries in 2015	30,800	30,800	61,600	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total number of beneficiaries in 2014	56,032	57,393	113,425	139,738	145,442	285,180	249.4%	253.4%	251.4%
The total number of beneficiaries includes all targeted persons who were provided with WFP food during the reporting period - either as a recipient/participant in one or more of the following groups, or from a household food ration distributed to one of these recipients/participants									
<b>El Salvador</b>									
Number of adults	34,877	36,887	71,764	4,187	4,116	8,303	12.0%	11.2%	11.6%
Number of children 5 to 18 years of age	28,372	31,225	59,597	9,559	9,144	18,703	33.7%	29.3%	31.4%
Number of children below 5 years of age	22,897	25,212	48,109	14,072	15,785	29,857	61.5%	62.6%	62.1%
Total number of beneficiaries in 2015	86,146	93,324	179,470	27,818	29,045	56,863	32.3%	31.1%	31.7%
Total number of beneficiaries in 2014	63,064	64,596	127,660	41,932	43,514	85,446	66.5%	67.4%	66.9%
The total number of beneficiaries includes all targeted persons who were provided with WFP food during the reporting period - either as a recipient/participant in one or more of the following groups, or from a household food ration distributed to one of these recipients/participants									

Beneficiary Category	Planned			Actual			% Actual v. Planned		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
<b>Guatemala</b>									
Participants in Food For Training	30,826	32,084	62,910	73,139	63,928	137,067	237.3%	199.3%	217.9%
Participants in Food For Assets	30,826	32,084	62,910	73,139	63,928	137,067	237.3%	199.3%	217.9%
Beneficiaries of General food distribution (GFD)/ targeted food distribution/assistance (GFD-TFD/A)	38,416	39,984	78,400	21,997	23,683	45,680	57.3%	59.2%	58.3%
Cash-Based Transfer Beneficiaries	104,350	108,610	212,960	108,376	111,669	220,045	103.9%	102.8%	103.3%
<b>Honduras</b>									
Participants in Food For Assets	22,770	27,830	50,600	16,231	25,041	41,272	71.3%	90.0%	81.6%
Beneficiaries of General food distribution (GFD)/ targeted food distribution/assistance (GFD-TFD/A)	23,040	28,160	51,200	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cash-Based Transfer Beneficiaries	100,296	122,584	222,880	75,053	93,462	168,515	74.8%	76.2%	75.6%
<b>Nicaragua</b>									
Participants in Food For Training	1,988	1,988	3,976	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Participants in Food For Assets	1,988	1,988	3,976	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Beneficiaries of General food distribution (GFD)/ targeted food distribution/assistance (GFD-TFD/A)	21,850	21,850	43,700	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cash-Based Transfer Beneficiaries	12,320	12,320	24,640	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>El Salvador</b>									
Participants in Food For Training	5,644	6,115	11,759	4,811	6,575	11,386	85.2%	107.5%	96.8%
Participants in Food For Assets	5,644	6,115	11,759	4,811	6,575	11,386	85.2%	107.5%	96.8%
Beneficiaries of General food distribution (GFD)/ targeted food distribution/assistance (GFD-TFD/A)	42,432	45,968	88,400	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cash-Based Transfer Beneficiaries	57,979	62,811	120,790	24,975	26,083	51,058	43.1%	41.5%	42.3%

## Commodity Distribution

Commodity	Planned Distribution (mt)	Actual Distribution (mt)	% Actual v. Planned
<b>Guatemala</b>			
Beans	3,661	1,581	43.2%
Corn-soya Blend (csb)	888	722	81.3%
Maize	3,169	2,548	80.4%
Rice	2,238	410	18.3%
Vegetable Oil	384	151	39.2%
<b>Sum</b>	<b>10,340</b>	<b>5,412</b>	<b>52.3%</b>
<b>Honduras</b>			
Beans	239	127	53.0%
Corn-soya Blend (csb)	286	200	70.0%
Iodised Salt		1	
Maize	795	67	8.4%
Rice		448	
Vegetable Oil	122	66	54.0%
<b>Sum</b>	<b>1,442</b>	<b>908</b>	<b>63.0%</b>
<b>Nicaragua</b>			
Beans	254	0	-
Corn-soya Blend (csb)	244	0	-
Maize	849	0	-
Rice	849	0	-
Vegetable Oil	138	0	-
<b>Sum</b>	<b>2,334</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>El Salvador</b>			
Beans	398	6	1.4%
Corn-soya Blend (csb)	493	0	-
High Energy Biscuits		18	
Maize		30	
Rice		24	
Vegetable Oil	201	6	3.2%
<b>Sum</b>	<b>1,092</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>7.6%</b>
<b>Total for 2015</b>	<b>15,208</b>	<b>6,404</b>	<b>42.1%</b>
<b>Total reported in 2014 SPR</b>	<b>15,127</b>	<b>12,772</b>	<b>84.4%</b>

Cash-Based Transfer	Planned Distribution (USD)	Actual Distribution (USD)	% Actual v. Planned
Cash	16,090,005.13	8,642,441	53.7%
Vouchers	21,193,340	7,972,896.74	37.6%
<b>Total for 2015</b>	<b>37,283,345.13</b>	<b>16,615,337.5</b>	<b>44.6%</b>



## 'Story Worth Telling'

Maria Dolores Jacinto received her first cash transfer in the department of La Paz, Honduras. Due to the severe drought, her family lost their maize and garlic harvest. She said: "As a single mother I was very concerned that we lost everything to the drought and was desperate because we had nothing to eat. I could not feed my children anymore. But, thanks to the support we have received our situation is now different in the community."

Because of her precarious situation, a community leader selected her to participate in the programme, where she is now receiving regular cash transfers. "Because of the high level of violence in the country, each month, we organize ourselves in groups and are escorted by municipal committee members to receive the money from the local bank" she explained. "Once we have received our transfer, we go to the pulperia (local store) and buy food. We organize ourselves to build assets around our houses and community infrastructure. I feel so happy I could restore my farmland and do not need to worry what to prepare for my children. I use the cash to buy maize, beans, rice, salt and some delicious vegetables, eggs and meat we could otherwise rarely get this year."

## Progress Towards Gender Equality

Cultural patterns remain a significant obstacle to achieving gender equality in Central America where women are traditionally limited to carrying out household chores and childcare. Increasing criminal activity in the region and women's heightened susceptibility to attacks reduces their ability to participate in activities outside the home.

In Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador, the project provided an opportunity for women to become active beyond their traditional roles. Their engagement in asset creation activities and committees or discussions with local authorities have empowered them to take up leadership roles. Women acquired skills and capacities through participation in all stages of the project. The high share of female CBT entitlement holders has increased women's autonomy and purchasing power.

In Guatemala, WFP strongly encouraged women's participation in project management committees by engaging them in various project activities. Women participated in planning exercises that identified the most needed assets in their communities. The proportion of households with women and men jointly deciding over the use of cash, voucher or food increased thanks to the high number of female CBT entitlement holders. While most of the heavy soil and water conservation work was carried out by men, complementary activities were designed to suit the needs of women. WFP also strengthened institutional capacities of the MAGA's Gender Unit in six departments of the Dry Corridor. MAGA facilitated trainings involving its female rural staff regarding the implementation of the Healthy Home Program in the Dry Corridor.

In Honduras, the selection of beneficiary households relied on local committees to reach out to female-headed households with children at risk of malnutrition. Programme monitoring confirmed an increased share of female project participants taking up leadership positions in the community. Designating women as CBT entitlement holders has also enhanced their decision making power within their families with regard to the use of the household budget and the management of assets. In addition to asset creation activities, more than 500 poultry packages and 2,000 agricultural packages were distributed to women to promote income generating activities and long-term food security. Local women's associations managed the created assets with a view to increase household incomes.

In El Salvador, WFP witnessed a high level of female participation in the project. This can be attributed to targeting vulnerable groups including female headed households. The relatively high participation of women in asset creation activities can also be linked to scarce labor opportunities in the drought affected areas, where men are more likely to find income generating activities as agricultural laborers. Women participated in FFA as a means to maximize household income, especially in areas where households rely on both subsistence agriculture and agricultural wage labor in the coffee sector. As a means of empowering women and redressing existing gender inequalities in rural areas, cooperating partners supported high-level female participation in project committees. High female participation in the planning stage influenced the choice of assets, including a clear preference for vegetable gardens. The positive impact of training activities related to the use of vouchers is clearly reflected in the high proportion of households in which women decide over the use of entitlements. Gender aspects were mainstreamed in all training modules and the timing of trainings was scheduled so as not to increase the burden on women. The participation of men in trainings on healthy eating practices informed the changes in the consumption pattern of the assisted population.

Cross-cutting Indicators	Project end Target	Base Value	Previous Follow-up	Latest Follow-up
	Target Val	(at start of project or benchmark)	(penultimate follow-up)	(latest value measured)
<b>Guatemala</b>				
<b>Proportion of households where females and males together make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, PDM Process Monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring, Programme monitoring.	90	0		98
<b>Proportion of women beneficiaries in leadership positions of project management committees</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, PDM Process Monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring, Programme monitoring.	50	21.9		100
<b>Proportion of women project management committee members trained on modalities of food, cash, or voucher distribution</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, PDM Process Monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring, Programme monitoring.	60	21.9		100
<b>Honduras</b>				
<b>Proportion of households where females and males together make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, PDM Process Monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring, Programme monitoring.	50	46		19
<b>Proportion of households where females make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, PDM Process Monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring, Programme monitoring.	30	42		66
<b>Proportion of households where males make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, PDM Process Monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring, Programme monitoring.	20	12		15
<b>Proportion of women beneficiaries in leadership positions of project management committees</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, PDM Process Monitoring., Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring, Programme monitoring.	60	40		80
<b>Proportion of women project management committee members trained on modalities of food, cash, or voucher distribution</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, PDM Process monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring, Programme monitoring.	50	43		52
<b>El Salvador</b>				
<b>Proportion of households where females and males together make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Base value: Jun-2015, PDM Process monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring, Programme monitoring.	80	50		80
<b>Proportion of households where females make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Base value: Jun-2015, PDM Process monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring, Programme monitoring.	10	20		10
<b>Proportion of households where males make decisions over the use of cash, voucher or food</b>				
Base value: Jun-2015, PDM Process monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring, Programme monitoring.	10	30		10
<b>Proportion of women beneficiaries in leadership positions of project management committees</b>				
Base value: Jun-2015, Focus group discussion, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, Focus group discussion, Programme monitoring.	60	50		50
<b>Proportion of women project management committee members trained on modalities of food, cash, or voucher distribution</b>				
Base value: Jun-2015, Focus group discussion, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, Focus group discussion, Programme monitoring.	100	10		80

## Protection and Accountability to Affected Populations

Country offices employed different strategies to ensure the protection of, and accountability to, the affected populations. In Guatemala and El Salvador, WFP placed suggestion boxes at distribution points, which allowed assisted communities to voice their concerns and complaints. In El Salvador, the country office gathered information from targeted voucher beneficiaries and addressed their concerns. In Honduras, the National Commission for Human Rights was entrusted with the monitoring of the operation and with responding to eventual complaints. These mechanisms are crucial in a context of persistent security challenges including violence, extortion and homicides. Regular security assessments have also evaluated the situation in all intervention areas.

In 2015, Guatemala experienced heightened security risks due to political instability. In collaboration with local authorities and banks, WFP reinforced security arrangements on food assistance delivery dates in the areas around the sites of distribution, including banks. Local police discreetly escorted cash receiving beneficiaries. WFP strengthened its targeting mechanism to ensure that its assistance was not impaired by political instability. As previously agreed with the government, food assistance was suspended for one week before the elections. Prior to commencing the activities, WFP organized meetings and trainings with beneficiaries to explain project objectives, transfer modalities, and beneficiary selection criteria. Beneficiaries were verified by scanning identification cards. Vulnerable groups such as women with small children, pregnant women, elderly and disabled persons, were given priority during the distribution process.

In Honduras the largest security challenge for beneficiaries was extortion. Beneficiaries receiving CBT were protected in various ways, such as grouping beneficiaries at community or municipal levels during food distribution and voucher redemption processes, providing transportation to and from distribution/redemption sites and even police escorts where necessary. Beneficiaries received information on the modalities of food, cash and voucher distribution from NGOs, community committees, trainings, and information posters. A dedicated hotline was established to allow beneficiaries to report concerns related to project implementation. Protection related questions formed part of the regular post-distribution monitoring.

In El Salvador, in a situation of generalized insecurity in the targeted geographic areas, the project met challenges in accessing specific communities. The presence of field-based cooperating partners, however, mitigated this risk to a great extent, making it possible to negotiate access while maintaining neutrality and impartiality. Given the mitigation measures employed and efforts to avoid harm to beneficiaries or expose them to risk through the project, only 20% of beneficiaries experienced security problems when travelling to project sites. The organized transportation of groups of beneficiaries to supermarkets to redeem their vouchers clearly influenced the perception of security risks by beneficiaries. In many cases, however, beneficiaries traveling to/from their communities had to use alternative routes to avoid criminal threats. WFP is working on improving its communication mechanism used to inform beneficiaries about the project. Current challenges are related to the dissemination of information by community leaders, and the different family members attending project activities.

Cross-cutting Indicators	Project end Target	Base Value <i>(at start of project or benchmark)</i>	Previous Follow-up <i>(penultimate follow-up)</i>	Latest Follow-up <i>(latest value measured)</i>
<b>Guatemala</b>				
<b>Proportion of assisted people (men) informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, PDM Process Monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring, Programme monitoring.	80	24.4		100
<b>Proportion of assisted people (men) who do not experience safety problems travelling to/from and at WFP programme sites</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, PDM Process Monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring, Programme monitoring.	90	0		100
<b>Proportion of assisted people (women) informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, PDM Process Monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring, Programme monitoring.	80	21.1		100
<b>Proportion of assisted people (women) who do not experience safety problems travelling to/from and at WFP programme sites</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, PDM Process Monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring, Programme monitoring.	90	0		100
<b>Honduras</b>				
<b>Proportion of assisted people (men) informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, PDM Process Monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring, Programme monitoring.	80	54		98
<b>Proportion of assisted people (men) who do not experience safety problems travelling to/from and at WFP programme sites</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, PDM Process Monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring, Programme monitoring.	100	97		92
<b>Proportion of assisted people (women) informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, PDM Process Monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring, Programme monitoring.	80	40		100
<b>Proportion of assisted people (women) who do not experience safety problems travelling to/from and at WFP programme sites</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, PDM Process Monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring, Programme monitoring.	100	100		100
<b>El Salvador</b>				
<b>Proportion of assisted people (men) informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)</b>				
Base value: Jun-2015, PDM - Process monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring, Programme monitoring.	80	30		70
<b>Proportion of assisted people (men) who do not experience safety problems travelling to/from and at WFP programme sites</b>				
Base value: Jun-2015, PDM Process monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring, Programme monitoring.	100	100		80
<b>Proportion of assisted people (women) informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain)</b>				
Base value: Jun-2015, PDM Process monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring, Programme monitoring.	80	40		80
<b>Proportion of assisted people (women) who do not experience safety problems travelling to/from and at WFP programme sites</b>				
Base value: Jun-2015, PDM Process monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring, Programme monitoring.	100	100		80

## Outputs

In 2015, the PRRO 200490 provided mainly conditional food assistance aiming to offer immediate relief and support medium-term household food security. WFP provided cash, vouchers, and food transfers to households participating in asset creation and training activities. In addition, unconditional food assistance was provided using Central Emergency Response Funds (CERF) in Guatemala.

Activities focused on soil and water conservation, livelihood diversification and the rehabilitation of community assets. The local context determined what the most appropriate asset was: while water springs were crucial for food insecure communities in El Salvador and Honduras, beneficiaries opted for biological measures to stabilize soil structure and innovative agroforestry techniques in Guatemala and Honduras. Plant nurseries were established to grow fruit trees for orchards or timber trees for forestry. In order to strengthen resistance to climatic shocks, farmers in Honduras and El Salvador participated in trainings related to soil fertility management.

Assets related to livelihood diversification progressively included more household assets, given the challenges related to private land ownership and the difficulties in securing communal lands. The identification of necessary assets also proved difficult in communities where the majority are landless agricultural laborers. These beneficiaries participated in constructing assets linked to basic service infrastructure and road rehabilitation. This has been of crucial importance in the coffee producing regions where the rehabilitation of tertiary roads improved physical access to markets and health centers. Assets were determined in participatory consultation with communities while training ensured the transfer of technical skills for the construction, use and maintenance of the asset in question. In addition, trainings addressed underlying causes of food insecurity, such as nutrition and health.

In Guatemala, WFP provided conditional food assistance in the framework of the government drought response. Based on the positive results of activities implemented under component 2 of WFP's Country Programme, MAGA adopted the model of conditional asset creation, including the focus on natural resource management and relevant technical norms. Activities included the creation or repair of terraces, water harvesting ponds, compost, life fencing, natural resource management, latrines and stone fencing. In this context, WFP complemented government aid by providing food assistance in form of in-kind, cash and voucher transfers or a combination of these. The use of different transfer modalities has ensured constant nutritional transfer to beneficiaries under conditions of rising food prices on local markets. In order to guarantee the nutritional value of CBT, WFP has been sensitizing beneficiaries on the use of cash and has developed visibility items such as shopping bags depicting a nutritionally balanced diet. Technical assistance and trainings were provided by cooperating partners. Almost all targets for the creation, rehabilitation and maintenance of assets were met.

In Honduras, in order to enhance the long-term food security of the drought affected population, beneficiaries of the project were involved in the creation of community and household assets. Assets focused on enhancing agricultural production, resilience, and access to, and quality of, basic social infrastructure. The majority of assets created by smallholder farmers concerned soil and water conservation, especially water harvesting and the creation of reservoirs. In addition to food assistance, vouchers were distributed for agricultural inputs. This has greatly enhanced income generating activities and rural entrepreneurship. Beneficiaries received 2,160 agricultural supply packages, and more than 510 poultry farming packages, corresponding to an estimated value transfer of USD 200,000. These packages facilitated income generation complementing the food assistance and leading to revitalization of the local economy. Furthermore, this also enabled local women's associations to provide fresh vegetables and eggs to the locally managed National School Meals Programme. Drought affected communities were also hit by an outbreak of the mosquito-borne viral disease, chikungunya. In order to fight this debilitating disease, WFP food assistance helped reduce through sanitation and awareness campaigns the number of container habitats with natural and artificial water favorable to mosquitoes.

In El Salvador, assets constructed in 2015 focused on soil and water conservation and livelihood diversification. The first category included activities related to natural resource management and reforestation, while the second mainly involved the creation of household and community gardens. Assets related to natural resource management proved very useful in fighting the drought. Therefore, several communities shifted their preference during project implementation. Every assisted community constructed or rehabilitated a community asset in addition to various household assets. Training activities consisted of four compulsory modules after which 6 out of 12 additional modules were chosen according to community preferences, necessities and the requirements of the asset to be constructed. The four standard modules implemented by WFP treated the use of the voucher, healthy eating practices, household economy, and WASH. All project beneficiaries participated in training and asset creation activities. The WFP intervention in the drought-affected area heightened the visibility of the assisted community and catalyzed complementary projects to ensure the food security of the population. This often entailed WFP beneficiaries advancing to longer term development projects. Assets related to livelihood diversification have fostered new partnerships with development actors.

Output	Unit	Planned	Actual	% Actual vs. Planned
<b>Guatemala</b>				
<b>SO 1: FFA</b>				
C&V: Number of beneficiaries receiving a combination of cash transfers and vouchers	Individual	103,575	103,895	100.3%
C&V: Number of beneficiaries receiving cash transfers	Individual	103,575	103,895	100.3%
C&V: Number of beneficiaries receiving vouchers	Individual	253,640	220,045	86.8%
C&V: Number of men collecting cash or vouchers	Individual	20,426	16,171	79.2%
C&V: Number of women collecting cash or vouchers	Individual	30,302	27,838	91.9%
C&V: Total amount of cash transferred to beneficiaries	US\$	8,603,099	2,181,389	25.4%
C&V: Total cash equivalent of food redeemed through cash vouchers	US\$	7,910,001	5,937,704	75.1%
C&V: Total food equivalent of commodity vouchers distributed	mt	7,559	7,522	99.5%
Hectares (ha) of cultivated land treated and conserved with physical soil and water conservation measures only	Ha	74,500	73,657	98.9%
Hectares (ha) of cultivated land treated with biological stabilization or agro forestry techniques only (including multi-storey gardening, green fences, and various tree belts)	Ha	53,000	52,259	98.6%
Hectares (ha) of forest planted and established	Ha	2,460	2,395	97.4%
Number of assisted communities with improved physical infrastructures to mitigate the impact of shocks, in place as a result of project assistance	community	3,125	2,727	87.3%
Number of farmers who have adopted fertility management measures (e.g. compost making, green manuring, mulching, etc) in their homestead and cultivated fields	Individual	75,000	72,847	97.1%
Number of latrines constructed/rehabilitated	latrine	2,000	2,088	104.4%
Number of new nurseries established	nursery	600	457	76.2%
<b>SO 1: GFD</b>				
Energy content of food distributed (kcal/person/day)	kcal/person/day	1,974	903	45.7%
<b>Honduras</b>				
<b>SO 1: FFA</b>				
C&V: Number of beneficiaries receiving a combination of cash transfers and food	Individual	304,200	206,360	67.8%
C&V: Number of beneficiaries receiving a combination of cash transfers and vouchers	Individual	222,880	168,515	75.6%
C&V: Number of beneficiaries receiving cash transfers	Individual	216,194	163,760	75.7%
C&V: Number of beneficiaries receiving vouchers	Individual	6,686	4,755	71.1%
C&V: Number of men collecting cash or vouchers	Individual	22,770	13,173	57.9%
C&V: Number of women collecting cash or vouchers	Individual	27,830	20,530	73.8%
C&V: Total amount of cash transferred to beneficiaries	US\$	6,724,559	444,600	6.6%

Output	Unit	Planned	Actual	% Actual vs. Planned
C&V: Total monetary value of cash vouchers distributed	US\$	7,807,200	6,719,168	86.1%
Hectares (ha) of cultivated land treated and conserved with physical soil and water conservation measures only	Ha	14,000	8,800	62.9%
Kilometres (km) of feeder roads rehabilitated (FFA) and maintained (self-help)	km	3,400	3,126	91.9%
Number of assets built, restored or maintained by targeted communities and individuals	Asset	4,500	1,275	28.3%
Number of assisted communities with improved physical infrastructures to mitigate the impact of shocks, in place as a result of project assistance	community	540	540	100.0%
Number of latrines constructed/rehabilitated	latrine	900	568	63.1%
Number of new nurseries established	nursery	7,380	6,395	86.7%
Number of water springs developed	water spring	620	278	44.8%
<b>El Salvador</b>				
<b>SO 1: FFA</b>				
C&V: Number of beneficiaries receiving vouchers	Individual	60,800	51,058	84.0%
C&V: Number of men collecting cash or vouchers	Individual	5,837	4,468	76.5%
C&V: Number of women collecting cash or vouchers	Individual	6,323	5,755	91.0%
C&V: Total monetary value of cash vouchers distributed	US\$	5,476,139	1,332,477	24.3%
Hectares (ha) of degraded hillsides and marginal areas rehabilitated with physical and biological soil and water conservation measures, planted with trees and protected (e.g. closure, etc)	Ha	355	491	138.3%
Hectares (ha) of forest planted and established	Ha	39	39	100.0%
Kilometres (km) of feeder roads rehabilitated (FFA) and maintained (self-help)	km	84	102	121.4%
Number of farmers who have adopted fertility management measures (e.g. compost making, green manuring, mulching, etc) in their homestead and cultivated fields	Individual	644	578	89.8%
Number of latrines constructed/rehabilitated	latrine	187	204	109.1%
Number of new nurseries established	nursery	2,086	2,139	102.5%
Number of people engaged in income diversification strategies to reduce risks and vulnerability of food security to climate	Individual	114	138	121.1%
Number of tree seedlings produced	tree seedling	165,762	162,656	98.1%
Number of water springs developed	water spring	85	81	95.3%
Quantity of agricultural tools distributed	tool	3,600	3,600	100.0%

## Outcomes

In 2015, country offices in Central America participated in the design and implementation of a harmonized monitoring toolkit that allowed them to measure the efficiency and impact of interventions. This toolkit was complemented by training in the skills and knowledge required for representative sampling, focus group discussions for project monitoring, and the use of mobile devices in conducting household level surveys. WFP developed GRASP, a mobile application for monitoring that improved cost-and time-efficiency, data quality and cross-national comparability. Technical coordination of M&E activities for the regional project ensured the use of the same set of indicators across geographic areas.

WFP relied on various partners for measuring project impact through baselines and follow-up surveys. Several government institutions as well as NGOs collaborated in carrying out EFSAAs, which then served as project baselines in Honduras and El Salvador. Cooperating partners provided support to the logistics and implementation of household-level surveys and focus group discussions, which were used as a follow-up to measure project impacts. Government counterparts highly appreciated the transfer of skills and knowledge on how to collect and analyze food security data. The acquired skills informed their own programmes, enabling them to provide an efficient and well-targeted drought response, and facilitated measuring the impact of interventions.

The prolonged drought had impaired livelihoods. Food security of the most vulnerable groups could only be guaranteed by extending the period of food assistance and seeking collaboration with governments and development partners in providing complementary support. Monitoring results confirmed a drop in the proportion of beneficiaries relying on negative coping strategies such as the reduction of the number and size of meals consumed or entering into debt in order to afford food. Follow-up surveys showed a clear increase in the proportion of households with acceptable food consumption. Poor food consumption among beneficiaries was virtually reduced to zero. The provision of cash-based transfers undoubtedly impacted beneficiary diets in all assisted countries improving dietary diversity, including more fruits and vegetables.

The number of productive assets improving food security and resilience in the population increased in all assisted communities. Interviews with beneficiaries pointed out the positive effect cash based transfers had on local markets. They also revealed certain unintended effects of asset creation activities, such as the reduction of chikungunya infections in communities where the number of water-filled container habitats was cut back or the better access of PLW to health check-ups in areas where communities chose to repair tertiary roads.

In Guatemala, food consumption and dietary diversity of the targeted communities substantially improved from April to August in this year. The proportion of households with acceptable food consumption increased by 27 percent. Households receiving cash-based transfers, especially cash, could diversify their diets by accessing a variety of fresh foods such as fruits and vegetables, meat and dairy products. The proportion of severely or moderately food insecure households decreased by 31 percent as measured by the food security index. While food consumption had been expected to improve equally in female- and male-headed households, monitoring data confirmed that female-headed households recovered at a slower pace due to less job opportunities and lower salaries compared to men. While negative coping strategies to access food like the use of savings, borrowing money or selling domestic assets or small livestock became less frequent, households continued to use them because of the second consecutive year of crop losses.

In Honduras, food consumption and dietary diversity of the targeted communities improved as a result of the intervention without an increased use of negative coping strategies. More frequent consumption of animal protein and vegetables increased dietary diversity among beneficiaries. Negative coping strategies were clearly becoming less frequent in most areas of project implementation, but not in the most vulnerable regions in the highlands and indigenous areas where interventions thus far could achieve no more than stop further deterioration concerning food insecurity. The creation of reservoirs and assets for water harvesting significantly reduced the daily burden on women. The government has provided matching funds for material costs and technical support, while WFP contributed to labor-intensive activities through the assets creation programme. Cash based transfers had a positive effect on the local economy, the increase in demand revitalized rural markets and production. The rehabilitation of basic service infrastructure, such as schools and health centers, led to important secondary benefits of the programme.

In El Salvador, in face of multiple shocks, beneficiaries of the operation had resorted to a wide array of coping strategies prior to the WFP intervention. Since by the end of the intervention the severity of strategies employed had shifted from emergency and crisis levels to stress level, it is assumed that acceptable food consumption and food diversity among assisted families was a result of their continued reliance on various food based coping strategies. These strategies included lowering the frequency and size of meals and limiting food consumption by adults. Reliance on livelihood-based coping strategies persisted with families turning to their extended family and friends for help, borrowing money and/or selling smaller domestic animals to ensure food consumption. Stress or crisis level coping strategies are still in use in certain geographically specific regions that are either structurally poor areas with a single harvest only or affected by the double shock of drought and coffee rust. In coffee growing areas, opportunities of day labor and the level of paid wages gravely decreased this year. The geographical and livelihood conditions as well as the duration of assistance provided to various beneficiary groups were reflected by the outcomes achieved. The community asset score for this project shows only the new assets constructed during 2015.



Outcome	Project end Target	Base Value <i>(at start of project or benchmark)</i>	Previous Follow-up <i>(penultimate follow-up)</i>	Latest Follow-up <i>(latest value measured)</i>
<b>Guatemala</b>				
<b>Strategic Objective 1: Save lives and protect livelihoods in emergencies</b>				
<b>CAS: percentage of assets damaged or destroyed during emergency which were restored</b> Base value: Apr-2015, Focus Group. Sample of 30 communities., Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, Focus Group. Sample of 30 communities., Programme monitoring.	50	0		65.4
<b>CSI: Coping Strategy Index (average)</b> Base value: Apr-2015, CSI (Food) PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring.	3.64	18.2		6.79
<b>CSI: Coping Strategy Index (average)</b> Base value: Apr-2015, CSI (Livelihoods) PDM Outcome M. Sample 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring.	7	7.38		3.65
<b>Diet Diversity Score</b> Base value: Apr-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring.	6	5.67		6.37
<b>Diet Diversity Score (female-headed households)</b> Base value: Apr-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring.	6	5.75		6.32
<b>Diet Diversity Score (male-headed households)</b> Base value: Apr-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring.	6	5.61		6.41
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score</b> Base value: Apr-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring.	100	66		94
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b> Base value: Apr-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring.	100	63.3		91.2
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b> Base value: Apr-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring.	100	68.2		96.1
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score</b> Base value: Apr-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring.	0	23		6
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b> Base value: Apr-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring.	0	23.3		8.8
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b> Base value: Apr-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring.	0	23.6		3.9
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score</b> Base value: Apr-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring.	0	11		0
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b> Base value: Apr-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring.	0	13.3		0
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b> Base value: Apr-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample of 400 households of 40 communities., Programme monitoring.	0	8.2		0

Outcome	Project end Target	Base Value <i>(at start of project or benchmark)</i>	Previous Follow-up <i>(penultimate follow-up)</i>	Latest Follow-up <i>(latest value measured)</i>
<b>Honduras</b>				
<b>Strategic Objective 1: Save lives and protect livelihoods in emergencies</b>				
<b>CAS: Community Asset Score (average)</b> Base value: May-2015, CAS - Focus Group - 30 communities, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, CAS - Focus Group - 30 communities, Programme monitoring.	50	0		50
<b>CSI: Coping Strategy Index (average)</b> Base value: May-2015, CSI (Food) EFSA. Sample Size 675 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Jul-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample Size 397 HH, Programme monitoring.	10.6	10.7		7.7
<b>CSI: Coping Strategy Index (average)</b> Base value: May-2015, CSI (Livelihoods) EFSA. Sample Size 675 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Jul-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample Size 397 HH, Programme monitoring.	7.8	7.88		7.98
<b>Diet Diversity Score</b> Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample Size 675 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Jul-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample Size 397 HH, Programme monitoring.	5.8	5.7		6.1
<b>Diet Diversity Score (female-headed households)</b> Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample Size 675 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Jul-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample Size 397 HH, Programme monitoring.	5.7	5.6		6
<b>Diet Diversity Score (male-headed households)</b> Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample Size 675 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Jul-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample Size 397 HH, Programme monitoring.	6.2	6.1		6.2
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score</b> Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample Size 675 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Jul-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample Size 397 HH, Programme monitoring.	95	79		90
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b> Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample Size 675 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Jul-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample Size 397 HH, Programme monitoring.	95	78.4		92
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b> Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample Size 675 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Jul-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample Size 397 HH, Programme monitoring.	95	83.4		90
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score</b> Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample Size 675 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Jul-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample Size 397 HH, Programme monitoring.	5	13		9
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b> Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample Size 675 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Jul-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample Size 397 HH, Programme monitoring.	5	14.4		8
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b> Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample Size 675 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Jul-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample Size 397 HH, Programme monitoring.	5	9.6		9
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score</b> Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample Size 675 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Jul-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample Size 397 HH, Programme monitoring.	0	8		1
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b> Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample Size 675 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Jul-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample Size 397 HH, Programme monitoring.	0	7.2		0
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b> Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample Size 675 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Jul-2015, PDM Outcome Monitoring. Sample Size 397 HH, Programme monitoring.	0	7		1
<b>El Salvador</b>				
<b>Strategic Objective 1: Save lives and protect livelihoods in emergencies</b>				
<b>CAS: percentage of communities with an increased Asset Score</b> Base value: May-2015, Focus group discussion. 30 communities, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, Focus group discussion. 30 communities, Programme monitoring.	50	0		82
<b>CSI: Coping Strategy Index (average)</b> Base value: May-2015, CSI (Food) EFSA. Sample size 1024 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring, Sample size 266 HH, Programme monitoring.	10	11.06		8.16
<b>CSI: Coping Strategy Index (average)</b> Base value: May-2015, CSI (Livelihood) EFSA. Sample Size 1024 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring. Sample Size 266 HH, Programme monitoring.	4	6.51		1.8
<b>Diet Diversity Score</b> Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample size 1024 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring. Sample Size 266 HH, Programme monitoring.	6.3	6.28		6.7
<b>Diet Diversity Score (female-headed households)</b>				

Outcome	Project end Target	Base Value <i>(at start of project or benchmark)</i>	Previous Follow-up <i>(penultimate follow-up)</i>	Latest Follow-up <i>(latest value measured)</i>
Base value: May-2015, EFSA, Sample size 1024 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring. Sample Size 266 HH, Programme monitoring.	6.6	6.5		6.7
<b>Diet Diversity Score (male-headed households)</b>				
Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample size 1024 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring. Sample Size 266 HH, Programme monitoring.	6	4.5		6.7
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score</b>				
Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample size 1024 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring. Sample Size 266 HH, Programme monitoring.	98	96		99
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b>				
Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample size 1024 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring. Sample Size 266 HH, Programme monitoring.	98	95		99
<b>FCS: percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b>				
Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample size 1024 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring. Sample Size 266 HH, Programme monitoring.	98	96		100
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score</b>				
Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample size 1024 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring. Sample Size 266 HH, Programme monitoring.	2	3		1
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b>				
Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample size 1024 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring. Sample Size 266 HH, Programme monitoring.	2	4		1
<b>FCS: percentage of households with borderline Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b>				
Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample size 1024 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring. Sample Size 266 HH, Programme monitoring.	2	3		0
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score</b>				
Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample size 1024 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring. Sample Size 266 HH, Programme monitoring.	0	1		0
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (female-headed)</b>				
Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample size 1024 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring. Sample Size 266 HH, Programme monitoring.	0	1		0
<b>FCS: percentage of households with poor Food Consumption Score (male-headed)</b>				
Base value: May-2015, EFSA. Sample size 1024 HH, WFP survey. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, PDM Outcome monitoring. Sample Size 266 HH, Programme monitoring.	0	1		0

## Sustainability, Capacity Development and Handover

PRRO 200490 complements and supports government response to emergencies in El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua. Improved local capacities in preparedness, relief and recovery interventions to address food insecurity have reduced the need for emergency interventions.

In Guatemala, the Government adopted the WFP methodology of seasonal livelihood planning (SLP) consultations and asset creation guidelines: MAGA incorporated them in its local level planning procedures. The SLP aimed at determining seasonal risks, availability of populations, planting and harvesting cycles, expenditures, and defined levels of vulnerability to food and nutritional insecurity at departmental level. Consultations informed community development plans that included concrete activities to reduce identified vulnerabilities at local level. In departments where CBT modalities were implemented, WFP offered trainings to beneficiaries on the optimal use of these transfers for providing a nutritious and balanced diet for their families. The joint EFSA conducted by WFP and SESAN led to the transfer of know-how to government entities and the use of assessment results in national drought response. In addition, the government requested WFP assistance in targeting its programmes.

In Honduras, WFP relied on its expertise in Vulnerability Assessment and Mapping and supported the Government by implementing EFSA. The results of this assessments informed the Government decision to declare a state of emergency in the drought-affected areas, to allocate national funds for the drought response. They also influenced national policies related to response to slow-onset emergencies. WFP's EFSA methodology is now being used by FLACSO (Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences) and the government's Technical Unit for Food and Nutrition Security (UTSAN), entities that are now conducting both EFSA and post-distribution monitoring for WFP operations. EFSA results were critical in shaping government drought response and its increased national focus on food security and health issues. The Government, through the Dry Corridor Alliance, prioritized 141 municipalities affected by recurrent droughts and requiring long-term assistance. Moreover, the government drought response relied on the transfer type and infrastructure implemented by WFP: beneficiaries participating in asset creation activities received paper-based commodity vouchers that could be redeemed against 22 different food and non-food products in Banasupro, a network shops supplying basic products at government mandated minimum prices. The Government requested WFP assistance in beneficiary targeting and the use of the voucher transfer infrastructure. This contributed to the national recognition of WFP's technical assistance in drought response and to government ability to assume responsibility for food assistance. Through the Dry Corridor Alliance and in collaboration with governmental institutions and the humanitarian network, a linkage between relief assistance and resiliency-based activities could be established. For WFP, this meant a stronger integration of PRRO and CP activities.

In El Salvador, WFP is playing an important role in enhancing interinstitutional coordination at government level, especially in regards to its current partners, the Ministry of Interior (MIGOB) and CONASAN. WFP has an agreement with MIGOB to support government response in slow onset emergencies. Recognizing the role of CONASAN in bringing together the various government institutions involved in the food security and nutrition sector, WFP focuses on enhanced collaboration and capacity building of this new entity that also includes the Ministry of Health. The latter has a strong network of health promoters at community level that can be instrumental in a quick and efficient targeting of shock-affected families. The introduction of value vouchers for the drought response proved an important learning experience for both WFP and the Government and led to the creation of further opportunities for the provision of technical assistance and handover of this transfer modality. In 2015, WFP collaborated extensively with national entities to sensitize the government to the use and advantages of value vouchers by demonstrating their cost-effectiveness. The government strongly relies on WFP's EFSA for its own drought response and the coordination of various actors. Using EFSA results, the government invests USD 1.3 million for drought assistance using a ration similar to WFP's. The EFSA facilitated the programming of assistance by other actors and led to an extended coverage of the drought-affected population. Now WFP plans to share with the government further tools that improve the efficiency of assistance allocation, including seasonal livelihood planning consultations in various regions.

## INPUTS

### Resource Inputs

Continued support from donors enabled WFP to support government efforts to assist through CBT and in-kind transfers food-insecure families that had been affected by the drought. In 2015, approximately half of the planned requirements were resourced. In view of the protracted drought, budget revisions were approved to align requirements and implementation modalities to increased needs.

Guatemala's CBT interventions increased significantly in comparison to 2014, the year when this modality had been introduced. In 2015, an in-kind donation was complemented by the government with maize and super cereal. Honduras provided food assistance mainly in form of CBT using mobile phones. In addition, pre-paid bank cards were procured to respond to sudden-onset emergencies. Nicaragua had 375 metric tons in stock for sudden-onset emergencies. Stocks were rotated with other operations to ensure proper quality. El Salvador only received 42 percent of its 2015 requirements.

Donor	Resourced in 2015 (mt)		Shipped/Purchased in 2015 (mt)
	In-Kind	Cash	
Brazil	4,000		3,238
Canada		486	472
Guatemala		4,623	1,375
Japan			124
MULTILATERAL		135	904
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies		1,727	1,727
USA	2,840		1,072
<b>Total:</b>	<b>6,840</b>	<b>6,972</b>	<b>8,913</b>

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

### Food Purchases and in-kind Receipts

Procurement strategy favors local and regional purchases when possible: the PRRO complied with this strategy based on import parity and competitive tenders, including purchases from farmers who were assisted in the framework of P4P activities. At the request of the government of Guatemala, WFP procured maize and Super Cereal in the local market to complement in-kind contribution; in line with the new national legislation, fortified rice was procured regionally in Nicaragua.

Commodity	Local (mt)	Developing Country (mt)	Other International (mt)	GCMF (mt)
Beans	230	126	2,994	
Corn Soya Blend	1,335	0	575	
Maize	1,955	0	0	
Rice	0	125	1,000	
Vegetable Oil	75	0	497	
<b>Sum:</b>	<b>3,596</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>5,066</b>	

## Food Transport, Delivery and Handling

Neither major logistics challenges nor significant variations in the average rates were reported. High transportation costs were attributed to difficult road conditions. Government counterparts were trained on food conservation and storage management. In Honduras, commodities were stored in WFP warehouses, in Nicaragua, in government warehouses. In El Salvador, WFP staff worked in the government warehouse.

## Post-Delivery Losses

All four country offices reported less than 2 percent of food loss after delivery. Technical assistance and training provided to government staff on food conservation and storage management in the warehouse minimized loss of commodities.

## MANAGEMENT

### Partnerships

The key driver of partnerships under the PRRO is the shared commitment by governments and other stakeholders to the PRRO's objective to provide effective food assistance to the most vulnerable and affected households in face of recurrent disasters and shocks and restore their livelihoods. Given the middle-income country (MIC) context of Central America, WFP has an extensive network of partners at regional and national levels that include United Nations agencies; regional intergovernmental organizations; international, national and local NGOs; private sector and civil society organizations. WFP's main partners are national governments and their institutions, including ministries of agriculture, national disaster management authorities (NDMAs), specialized food security institutions, as well as sub-national and local government organizations. These partnerships played key roles at all stages of planning and implementing the PRRO. In addition, WFP leads the United Nations Emergency Technical Team (UNETT) in these four countries. At the regional level, PRRO activities benefit from the coordination among the regional organizations based in Panama.

In Guatemala, WFP works with various government counterparts through the PRRO: MAGA for FFA food distributions and technical assistance; the Ministry of Social Development (MIDES) for FFA using CBT; the Food Security and Nutrition Secretariat (SESAN) and the National Coordinator for Disasters Reduction (CONRED) for overall national emergency food assistance coordination. WFP worked closely with SESAN in publishing periodic food and nutrition security monitoring bulletins. As co-leader of the Food Security, Agriculture and Livelihoods Cluster, WFP conducted an EFSA in collaboration with MAGA and SESAN. WFP signed field level agreements with international and national NGOs, as well as with government and private sector organizations for the distribution and monitoring of food assistance and the provision of technical assistance and training. In September, MAGA and SESAN launched an integrated assistance model to mitigate the impact of the drought on vulnerable households located in the Dry Corridor. MAGA, SESAN, UN agencies and municipal authorities partnered for the implementation of this model. WFP also coordinated actions with the Humanitarian Network for the Humanitarian Response Plan. WFP successfully worked with UNICEF, PAHO/WHO and UNFPA on the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) proposal.

In Honduras, the implementation of activities is coordinated at national level by the interinstitutional committee for the drought. Central and municipal level government authorities work in this committee to synchronize drought response and geographic targeting. At community level, WFP activities were embedded into community development plans and already running NGO rural development activities. Under the CERF, WFP collaborated with UNICEF in the area of nutrition and FAO for the promotion of household level vegetable gardens. WFP coordinated its activities with OCHA and UNICEF, and had a lead role in the United Nations Emergency Technical Team.

In El Salvador, WFP relies on six NGOs and various government entities as cooperating partners. Government entities include the ministries of Interior, Agriculture, Health and CONASAN. In 2015 new actors, including universities, got involved in targeting and training activities. As a result of a strategic shift concerning partners WFP is strengthening national and local government capacities to achieve the sustainable implementation of hunger solutions. Partnerships expanded with major donors both at strategy and programme levels - including the adoption of training modules developed under the PROGRESANDO trust fund for the PRRO. WFP also strengthened its partnerships with the private sector. Beside the transfer infrastructure for the redemption of its value vouchers, WFP also partnered with a national provider for seeds and agricultural inputs in providing technical assistance to targeted communities. Asset creation activities were facilitated by WFP technical experts, the staff of the Ministry of Interior and the universities.

Partnerships	NGO		Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement	UN/IO
	National	International		
<b>Total</b>	1	10		5

Cross-cutting Indicators	Project end Target <i>Target Val</i>	Base Value <i>(at start of project or benchmark)</i>	Previous Follow-up <i>(penultimate follow-up)</i>	Latest Follow-up <i>(latest value measured)</i>
<b>Guatemala</b>				
<b>Amount of complementary funds provided to the project by partners (including NGOs, INGOs, Civil Society, Private Sector organizations, International Financial Institutions, Regional development banks)</b>				
Base value: Jan-2015, Programme monitoring, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, Programme monitoring, Programme monitoring.	2,000,000	0		2,053,983
<b>Number of partner organizations that provide complementary inputs and services</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, SPR 2014, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, Programme monitoring, Programme monitoring.	8	8		6
<b>Proportion of project activities implemented with the engagement of complementary partners</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, SPR 2014, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, Programme monitoring, Programme monitoring.	99	99		100
<b>Honduras</b>				
<b>Amount of complementary funds provided to the project by partners (including NGOs, INGOs, Civil Society, Private Sector organizations, International Financial Institutions, Regional development banks)</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, SPR 2014, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, Programme monitoring, Programme monitoring.	200,000	200,000		464,800
<b>Number of partner organizations that provide complementary inputs and services</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, SPR 2014, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Dec-2015, Programme monitoring, Programme monitoring.	18	18		7
<b>Proportion of project activities implemented with the engagement of complementary partners</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, SPR 2014, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Aug-2015, Programme monitoring, Programme monitoring.	100	100		100
<b>El Salvador</b>				
<b>Amount of complementary funds provided to the project by partners (including NGOs, INGOs, Civil Society, Private Sector organizations, International Financial Institutions, Regional development banks)</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, SPR 2014, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, Programme monitoring, Programme monitoring.	137,922	137,922		68,970
<b>Number of partner organizations that provide complementary inputs and services</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, SPR 2014, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, Programme Monitoring, Programme monitoring.	6	5		7
<b>Proportion of project activities implemented with the engagement of complementary partners</b>				
Base value: Dec-2014, SPR 2014, Programme monitoring. Latest Follow-up: Oct-2015, Programme monitoring, Programme monitoring.	100	68		100

## Lessons Learned

WFP has been providing uninterrupted support to these four Central American countries under regional PRROs since 1999. During these nearly sixteen years, WFP kept learning how to serve beneficiaries and support government emergency response efforts best. This learning process continued in 2015. Most of the recommendations of the 2013 Regional Portfolio Evaluation continued to be valid and were implemented in 2015.

The 2015 PRRO external evaluation and the 2015 CBT reviews for Guatemala and El Salvador showed that the operation had adequately addressed immediate hunger among affected populations and protected their livelihoods, the programme had adapted to the changing needs of beneficiaries, issues had been rightly positioned and resources mobilized at regional and international levels, and the relations with international organizations had improved.

More specifically, the following lessons were learned in 2015:

- a. The PRRO has demonstrated its advantages as a regional operation, yet further efforts are required to address particular country-specific issues.
- b. The PRRO provided a flexible response to beneficiary needs and continued to adapt to changing requirements. Different CBT approaches were introduced that addressed beneficiary needs and preferences better. Cash transfers proved to be an effective modality, resulting in a timely response, reducing logistical challenges, supporting local economies, increasing participatory approaches and strengthening social protection systems. Communication strategies and beneficiary trainings prior to distributions were appropriate. It was recognized how important the integration all CO units was for the cash-based transfer business process and the updating of transfer values on the basis of local food prices.
- c. The rapid upscaling of CBT under the PRRO demonstrated the adaptive capacity of country offices in incorporating new transfer modalities and innovative programming, in analyzing response options and using different transfer types. Country offices have also acquired knowledge and skills to identify issues that need to be addressed to ensure a more effective programming of food assistance.
- d. CBT are appropriate to addressing beneficiary needs. WFP will continue reviewing lessons learned from its implementation in each country, on how to best deal with service providers, establish links with national social safety nets, and plan assistance based on seasonal livelihood planning consultations.
- e. Beneficiary targeting and needs assessments have improved, yet further efforts are required to adequately address the needs of the most vulnerable. Improved data collection will allow for harmonized approaches in terms of gender and age disaggregation of data, synchronization of data collection between countries, and efficient information flow from community levels. A renewed focus on gender aspects needs to ensure an increased participation of men in the design and planning of activities and appropriate tasks for women participating in asset creation.
- f. In light of the increased frequency of natural hazards that affect the food security of populations in Central America, WFP remained the partner of choice for all governments. WFP's comparative advantages include its good working relations with national and subnational government authorities, sustained standard preparedness and response approaches, and strong field presence.
- g. In order to enhance the impact of FFA activities, WFP has to strengthen the use of its three-pronged approach (3PA) in project planning and the coordination of activities. In light of limited water availability, WFP will need to enlarge the current menu of assets linked to soil and water conservation and possibly include income generation activities.
- h. WFP has to strengthen links between the short-term activities of the PRRO and development programmes to enhance sustainability. This requires closer coordination with partners and due consideration of the specific livelihoods of beneficiary populations. More attention needs to be paid to government ownership, hand-over strategies and the linkages with capacity strengthening efforts.



## OPERATIONAL STATISTICS

## Annex: Resource Inputs from Donors

Donor	Cont. Ref. No	Commodity	Resourced in 2015 (mt)		Shipped/ Purchased in 2015 (mt)
			In-Kind	Cash	
Brazil	BRA-C-00111-01	Beans	3,000		2,238
Brazil	BRA-C-00111-01	Rice	1,000		1,000
Canada	CAN-C-00483-01	Rice		14	0
Canada	CAN-C-00505-01	Beans		72	72
Canada	CAN-C-00505-01	Corn Soya Blend		53	53
Canada	CAN-C-00505-01	Maize		311	311
Canada	CAN-C-00505-01	Rice		36	36
Guatemala	GUA-C-00019-01	Maize		276	276
Guatemala	GUA-C-00022-01	Corn Soya Blend		1,731	800
Guatemala	GUA-C-00022-01	Maize		2,616	299
Japan	JPN-C-00344-01	Beans			82
Japan	JPN-C-00344-01	Maize			42
MULTILATERAL	MULTILATERAL	Beans		6	761
MULTILATERAL	MULTILATERAL	Corn Soya Blend		33	33
MULTILATERAL	MULTILATERAL	Maize		22	22
MULTILATERAL	MULTILATERAL	Rice		75	89
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01174-01	Beans		196	196
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01174-01	Corn Soya Blend		450	450
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01174-01	Maize		1,006	1,006
UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies	001-C-01174-01	Vegetable Oil		75	75
USA	USA-C-01157-01	Corn Soya Blend	170		170
USA	USA-C-01158-01	Corn Soya Blend	40		40
USA	USA-C-01160-01	Corn Soya Blend	390		365
USA	USA-C-01189-01	Beans	350		
USA	USA-C-01189-01	Corn Soya Blend	360		
USA	USA-C-01189-01	Vegetable Oil	250		250
USA	USA-C-01189-02	Rice	600		
USA	USA-C-01189-02	Vegetable Oil	200		198
USA	USA-C-01189-03	Beans	60		
USA	USA-C-01189-03	Corn Soya Blend	60		
USA	USA-C-01189-03	Rice	310		
USA	USA-C-01189-03	Vegetable Oil	50		50
<b>Total:</b>			<b>6,840</b>	<b>6,972</b>	<b>8,913</b>