



Table of Contents

Acknowledgement	i
Mission Composition.....	i
Acronyms	ii
Table of Contents	iii
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Methodology	11
3. Hypothesis 1: The design, scale, timing, and scope of the EMOP and changes in it were proportionate to the changing levels of needs.	15
4. Hypothesis 2: The way in which the EMOP was implemented was appropriate for the needs of the affected population.....	19
5. Hypothesis 3: The addition of sugar and additional cereal acted as an income transfer, met milling costs, and supported private markets in remote areas.	23
6. Hypothesis 4: WFP’s food distribution complemented the interventions of other actors, including affected households, and was sufficiently coordinated with them.	27
7. Hypothesis 5: WFP interventions reached those who needed them and minimised leakage to those who did not.	31
8. Hypothesis 6: WFP’s food basket met the food needs of those affected by the crisis including the principal vulnerable groups.....	37
9. Hypothesis 7: The provision of food by WFP had a positive impact on the protection of the affected population.	45
10. Hypothesis 8: The various measures adopted by WFP reduced the food-aid pull factor.....	47
11. Hypothesis 9: WFP took effective steps in its programme to take account of gender and of the risks of gender-based violence or exploitation.....	49
12. Hypothesis 10: WFP took innovative approaches to maximise coverage in the face of severe constraints.	53
13. Hypothesis 11: The logistics system established by WFP, and the approach taken (airlift and own fleet) met the needs of the programme in a timely manner.....	57
14. Hypothesis 12: The FLAs and distribution strategies adopted by WFP and its Cooperating Partners were appropriate and maximised the impact of food aid.....	61
15. Hypothesis 13: The distribution of food items as an additional income transfer was more efficient than a mixture of food and cash would have been.	65
16. Hypothesis 14: Donor’s funding policies were coherent with WFP mission.....	69
17. Hypothesis 15: WFP’s food operations were coherent with agreements with other UN agencies, with standards, and with WFP policy.....	73
18. Hypothesis 16: WFP was able to monitor the effectiveness of its programme and inform managers in good time when changes were needed.	77



19. Hypothesis 17: WFP demonstrated learning in its Darfur operations.....	79
20. Hypothesis 18: WFP structured the management of the Darfur emergency response to enable a rapid scale up and adequate support.....	81
21. Hypothesis 19: WFP food prevented widespread nutritional distress and mortality in Darfur.....	83
22. Hypothesis 20: Beneficiaries were reasonably satisfied with the assistance that they got from WFP.....	87
23. General Conclusion.....	89
Annexes.....	93
Annex 1: Terms of Reference.....	95
Annex 2: Persons met.....	103
Annex 3: Consultants' itineraries.....	111
Annex 4: Chronology of WFP Darfur emergency operations.....	113
Annex 5: Erection of Wiik Wiiking II storage structures.....	123
Annex 6: Stacking Practice.....	127
Annex 7: Bibliography.....	131
Annex 8: Note to the File.....	141

List of tables

Table 1: Details of EMOP 10048.2 budget revisions with elements for Darfur.....	2
Table 2: Main details of the 2004 EMOP (10339.0) and its two budget revisions.....	3
Table 3: Main details of the 2005 EMOP (10339.1) and its two budget revisions.....	3
Table 4: Special Operations in support of the 2004 and 2005 EMOPs (10339.0/1).....	4
Table 5: Types of security incidents logged by WFP security officers in Darfur in 2005.....	8
Table 6: Hypotheses tested by the evaluation.....	12
Table 7: Objectives for the 2004 and 2005 EMOPs.....	16
Table 8: Distribution Modality for WFP by percentage of tonnage planned or distributed.....	19
Table 9: Resources handled per staff member for Sudan compared with the rest of the World.....	20
Table 10: Amount of sorghum that can be bought by selling 25gm of sugar.....	23
Table 11: Milling costs in Darfur in September 2005: Source EFSNA 2005 price data.....	25
Table 12: Ration scales from the 2004 EMOP.....	37
Table 13: Ration scales for the 2005 EMOP.....	38
Table 14: Nutritional analysis of the EMOP 2004 and EMOP 2005 food baskets.....	38
Table 15: The impact of milling costs and losses on the 2004 and 2005 rations.....	39



Table 16: Guidelines for substituting missing commodities	41
Table 17: WFP's GFD cooperating partners in Darfur.	62
Table 18: WFP expenditure for the Darfur Operation and the resulting calculated costs per tonne	65
Table 19: Relative cost and value of three food commodities in Darfur	66
Table 20: Monetary implication of differences between food cost to WFP and value on local market	66
Table 21: Timeline for donation to distribution in Darfur.....	70
Table 22: The operational impact of common donor conditionalities.....	71
Table 23: Change in nutritional indicators from 2004 to 2005.....	83

List of figures

Figure 1: Number of documents about Darfur on the Relief-Web website	2
Figure 2: Darfur and other WFP operations in Sudan	4
Figure 3: Map showing the position of Darfur within Sudan	6
Figure 4: Security incidents in the first 46 weeks of 2005 (remainder of year excluded due to lack of data).....	7
Figure 5: WFP planning figures compared with the numbers of affected people reported by OCHA	15
Figure 6: Actual distributions compared with the level planned in the EMOP	31
Figure 7: Actual beneficiaries reached compared with the number planned in the EMOP	32
Figure 8: Impact of milling cost and losses on the cereal ration	39
Figure 9: Kilocalories per beneficiary assisted in Darfur (based on distribution returns)	40
Figure 10: Shortfalls in different commodities in 2004 to 2005 (based on distribution data	41
Figure 11: Number of non-camp population needing assistance.....	48
Figure 12: Two Darfur emergency food operations compared.....	57
Figure 13: WFP expenditure for Sudan 2002 to 2005.....	69
Figure 14: Funding support for the Darfur EMOPs.....	69
Figure 15: Changes in key performance indicators between 2004 and 2005	79

