



WFP EVALUATION



World Food Programme

SAVING
LIVES
CHANGING
LIVES

Evaluation of the Food Assistance for Assets (FFA) in the Context of Malawi 2015-2019

Decentralized Evaluation Report

DE/MWCO/2019/017

WFP Malawi Country Office

June 2021

Key personnel for the evaluation

WFP MALAWI COUNTRY OFFICE

Evaluation Manager, Maribeth Black

PREPARED BY

Absolom Masendeke, Team Leader

Jennifer Leavy, Interim Team Leader

Sam Dumble, Statistical Advisor / RIMA Data Analyst

James Chirombo, Data Manager

Ben Murphy, Deputy Team Leader

Acknowledgements

The evaluation team is very grateful for all the support and assistance provided during the evaluation by the WFP Malawi Country Office and the support of their helpful and efficient colleagues in the Country Office, field offices and sub-offices. We thank them for their guidance and hard work in overseeing logistical arrangements to make site visits possible, as well as providing documentation and data. Thanks also to the Resilience Unit and Evaluation Manager Maribeth Black for invaluable advice and support throughout the evaluation process. We also thank the community members (FFA participants and non-participants) who gave generously of their time, information, and opinions.

Disclaimer

The opinions expressed in this report are those of the evaluation team, and do not necessarily reflect those of the World Food Programme. Responsibility for the opinions expressed in this report rests solely with the authors. Publication of this document does not imply endorsement by WFP of the opinions expressed.

The designation employed and the presentation of material in maps do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of WFP concerning the legal or constitutional status of any country, territory or sea area, or concerning the delimitation of frontiers.

Contents

List of Figures	iii
List of Tables	iv
Executive Summary	i
Introduction.....	1
1.1 Evaluation FEATURES	1
1.2 Context.....	2
1.3 Subject of the evaluation.....	4
1.4 Evaluation methodology, limitations and ethical considerations	8
1. Evaluation findings.....	13
2.1 Relevance: How relevant is FFA as the foundation for WFP resilience programming in Malawi? [EQ1].....	13
2.2 Effectiveness: To what extent have the targeted outputs, outcomes, and strategic results been achieved? [EQ2]	20
2.3 Efficiency: To what extent was FFA implemented efficiently? [EQ3]	31
2.4 Impact: To what degree have the project outputs and outcomes contributed to progress towards resilience? [EQ4].....	34
2.5 Sustainability: To what extent does FFA support sustained resilience beyond the lifetime of WFP intervention? [EQ5]	43
2. Conclusions and Recommendations	48
3.1 overall assessment/Conclusions	48
3.2 LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES	52
3.3 Recommendations	54
3. Annexes	61
Annex 1. Summary Terms of Reference.....	61
Annex 2. Stakeholder Matrix	69
Annex 3. Evaluation Approach - Pillars of Assessment and FFA.....	75
Annex 3.1: Theory of Change	75
Annex 4. Resources and Outputs	78
Annex 4.1: Resource requirements and funding realization	79
Annex 4.2: Planned versus Actual Outputs FFA.....	80
Annex 5. Logical Framework.....	84
Annex 6. Evaluation Matrix.....	89
Annex 7. Methodology and Data Collection Tools	105
Annex 7.1: Primary Data Collection.....	105

Annex 7.2: RIMA Model Methodology.....	107
Annex 7.3: Interview Protocol	124
Annex 7.4: Participatory Rural Appraisal Tools.....	127
Annex 7.5: Household Survey	131
Annex 8. Stakeholders Interviewed	132
Annex 9.1. Documents Gathered.....	138
Annex 9.2: Documents Reviewed	149
Annex 10. Qualitative Data Analysis Process.....	152
Annex 10.1: Analytical Approach	152
Annex 10.2: Qualitative Coverage	154
Annex 10.3: Timeline, Field Mission Schedule and PRA Site Selection.....	155
Annex 11. Itad’s Approach to Quality Assurance.....	159
Annex 12. Integration of Gender in Evaluation.....	161
Annex 13. Ethical Procedures and Potential Limitations of the Evaluation	162
Annex 13.1: Ethical Procedures	162
Annex 13.2: Potential Limitations and Mitigation	163
Annex 14. Data Analysis Supplement	165
Annex 14.1: Household Demographics and Descriptive Statistics	165
Annex 14.2: Supplementary Tables and Figures	171
Annex 15. Bibliography.....	175
Acronyms	177

List of Figures

Figure 1: Map of Malawi and implementation districts.....	4
Figure 2: Pillars of assessment in the evaluation of FFA Malawi.....	9
Figure 3: Malawi food security indicators (source: WFP monitoring data)	24
Figure 4: Resilience pillars by sex of household head.....	25
Figure 5: Resilience outcomes by sex of household head	25
Figure 6: Likelihood of respondents being in top resilience quintile.....	28
Figure 7: Extent to which PICSA training relates to improved ability to make livelihoods-related budgetary and investment decisions: households headed by men and households headed by women	29
Figure 8: Extent to which PICSA training relates to better household understanding of probability of crop survival/damage: households headed by men and households headed by women.....	29
Figure 10: Projected resilience quintile by additional project support	35
Figure 11: Distribution of food deficit months categorised by normal, bad and good months before and after FFA intervention.....	37
Figure 12: Households' perceived ability to cope with another shock in the future by district	41
Figure 13: Households' extent of returning to former level of well-being after last shock under SAMS	42
Figure 14: Pillars of Assessment in the Evaluation of FFA Malawi	75
Figure 15: High-level Theory of Change for enhancing resilience, adapted to WFP Malawi43F	76
Figure 16: General form of RIMA-II resilience model.....	107
Figure 17: Correlation between formative pillars and reflective outcomes	113
Figure 18: RIMA model coefficients	114
Figure 19: Reflective indicators across resilience score quintiles	116
Figure 20: Formative pillars by resilience quintile	117
Figure 21: Analytical processes	152
Figure 22: Data sources and evidence tools examples	152
Figure 23: Weighing the strength of evidence.....	153

List of Tables

Table 1: Households targeted under WFP Malawi's integrated resilience programming approach	5
Table 2 Summary budget data	6
Table 3: FFA intended impact, outcomes and outputs.....	6
Table 4: Weighing the strength of evidence	10
Table 5: Meeting men and women's needs in TA Chiwalo, Phalombe District.....	14
Table 6: WFP integrated resilience programming – related interventions	17
Table 7: Planned versus actual beneficiaries for FFA (2015–19)	20
Table 8: Planned vs actual transfers of food and cash (2016–18).....	22
Table 9: Project support activities association with resilience pillars.....	36
Table 10: Project support activities and resilience outcomes	36
Table 11: Formative pillar variable definitions	109
Table 12: Variable loadings from factor analysis	111
Table 13: Correlation between pillars	111
Table 14: Summary statistics for resilience outcome variables	112
Table 15: Correlation between resilience outcome variables	113
Table 16: RIMA MIMIC model coefficients (link from resilience to outcomes)	114
Table 17: RIMA MIMIC model coefficients (link from pillars to resilience).....	116
Table 18: Reflective indicator outcomes by quintiles of resilience score.....	117
Table 19: Model 1 p-values	118
Table 20: Resilience quintiles by district	118
Table 21: Resilience quintiles by head of household.....	118
Table 22: Model 2 coefficients.....	119
Table 23: Likelihood of achieving high or low relative resilience based on increased project activities.....	120
Table 24: Significance of interventions in relation to resilience pillars	121
Table 25: Significance of interventions in relation to resilience outcomes	122
Table 26: Modelset 3 coefficients and p-values	122
Table 27 Qualitative interview summary	154
Table 28 Household characteristics.....	165
Table 29: Household characteristics across the five districts.....	168
Table 30: Reports of shocks by year from qualitative interviews	172

Executive Summary

1. This activity evaluation focuses on the World Food Programme (WFP) Malawi's Food Assistance for Assets (FFA) implementation under its Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO) (implemented 2014–19) and the current Country Strategic Plan (CSP) (2019–23). FFA has been a core intervention in WFP support for those recovering from, or at risk of, dry spells, flooding and natural resource deterioration, to build resilience and support graduation from food insecurity. The evaluation was commissioned by WFP Country Office (CO) Malawi and covers the period December 2014–June 2019. The objective of the evaluation is to contribute to identifying inclusive and effective scaling-up strategies to inform implementation of the CSP and ensure strategic shifts in programming where necessary. The results will also help refine WFP programming and enable donors, development and international partners to be better informed and more supportive of integrated approaches to resilience programming, including within the context of COVID-19. The main internal (WFP) stakeholders and users of the evaluation include: Malawi Country Office; Regional Bureau (RB), Johannesburg; WFP Headquarters (HQ); Office of Evaluation (OEV); and WFP Executive Board. The main external users and stakeholders are: individual beneficiaries (women, men, girls and boys) and communities; Malawi government; district-based stakeholders; the United Nations (UN) Country Team; non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other partners; main FFA donors – United States (US) Agency for International Development (USAID), Japan, Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO), Germany; and donors to other complementary activities.

Methodology

2. The evaluation was designed to assess FFA against the following Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC) evaluation criteria: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability. The evaluation answers five main evaluation questions, as indicated in the Terms of Reference (ToR).
3. In order to respond to these questions, the evaluation team (ET) conducted quantitative survey data collection across five FFA implementation districts and qualitative data collection in a subset of three districts. Limitations included time constraints imposed on data collection due to COVID-19 restrictions and a lack of control group in the quantitative survey, but measures were taken to mitigate against these as far as possible, including scaling back districts covered in the qualitative fieldwork and prioritising key sub-evaluation questions (SEQs) to ensure adequate depth of coverage. The survey comprised recall questions and in-sample comparative analysis of programme participants engaging in different activity areas. This was further mitigated in the qualitative sample and analysis, which included consideration of non-participants as well as spillover effects.

Key Findings

4. The key findings of the evaluation team are summarised below, structured according to the main evaluation questions (EQs). There is strong evidence to support each finding, with FFA making significant, important, or critical contributions to the outcomes, based on a synthesis of qualitative and quantitative

预览已结束，完整报告链接和二维码如下：

https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5_908

