

## OVERVIEW - CONTEXT

**Partner:**  
WFP-IT

**Partner type:**  
UN

**Funding threshold:**

**FPA number:**  
2014|FAFA|Y

**Name and title of the legal representative signing the Agreement (eSF 12.1):**

[REDACTED] - [REDACTED]

**Name, telephone, e-mail and title of the contact person(s) (eSF 12.2):**

| Name       | Office location | Phone             | E-mail           |
|------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|
| [REDACTED] | Brussels        | +32250 [REDACTED] | wfp.echo@wfp.org |

**Action title:**  
Emergency Food Assistance to People Affected by Unrest in Syria

**Action type:**  
Non-emergency action

**This action runs under the remote management:**  
-

**Initial request reference number:**  
2016/01021/RQ/01/01

**Initial request submission date:**  
22/04/2016

**Final request reference number:**  
2016/01021/RQ/01/02

**Final request submission date:**  
04/05/2016

**Agreement number:**  
ECHO-ME/BUD/2016/01001

**Agreement ARES number:**  
2422005

**Agreement signed by ECHO on:**  
25/05/2016

**Agreement transmitted on:**  
25/05/2016

## OVERVIEW - ECHO ACTORS

[REDACTED] :

[REDACTED] :

[REDACTED] :

[REDACTED] :

**ECHO Unit:** ECHO B/4

## OVERVIEW - ACTION DATA

## Specific objective (eSF 4.2.1):

To increase enrolment, attendance and retention rates in targeted schools.

## Number of beneficiaries (eSF 3.2.1):

| Stage | Individuals | Organisations |
|-------|-------------|---------------|
| RQ    | 500.000     | -             |
| FR    | -           | -             |

## Area of intervention (eSF 1.4)

| World area | Country              | Region   | Location    |
|------------|----------------------|--|-------------|
| Asia       | SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC | Aleppo, Homs, Rural Damascus, Damascus, Tartous, Al-Hasakeh, Hama, Lattakia. [MR2] | See Annex I |

## List of sectors targeted by the Action (eSF 4.3):

Food security and livelihoods

Education in emergencies

## Dates and duration of the Action (eSF 1.5):

| Stage | Start date | End date   | Months | Days | Eligibility date |
|-------|------------|------------|--------|------|------------------|
| RQ    | 01/06/2016 | 31/05/2018 | 24     |      | 01/06/2016       |
| MR    | 01/06/2016 | 31/05/2018 | 24     | -    | 01/06/2016       |

## OVERVIEW - CONTRACT DATA

## Main decision / HIP

**Decision number / HIP:**  
ECHO-ME/BUD/2016/01000

**Total amount of the decision / HIP:**  
30.000.000,00 €

**Type of the decision / HIP:**  
Urgence

**Start date of the decision / HIP:**  
30/03/2016

**End date of the decision / HIP:**  
30/03/2018

## Budgetary details

## OVERVIEW - FINANCIAL DATA

## Estimated expenditures (eSF 10.1)

| Category                    | Initial budget | Revised budget | Interim report incurred costs | Final report incurred costs | Final report final update |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Total direct eligible costs | 49.814.332,68  | 49.814.332,68  | 7.915.963,50                  | -                           | -                         |
| Indirect costs              | 3.487.003,28   | 3.487.003,28   | 554.117,45                    | -                           | -                         |
| Total costs                 | 53.301.335,96  | 53.301.335,96  | 8.470.080,95                  | 0,00                        | 0,00                      |

## Funding of the Action (eSF 10.3)

| Category                         | Initial budget | Revised budget | Final budget | Final report final update |
|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Direct revenue of the Action     | 0,00           | 0,00           | -            | -                         |
| Contribution by applicant        | 0,00           | 0,00           | -            | -                         |
| Contribution by other donors     | 23.301.335,96  | 23.301.335,96  | -            | -                         |
| Contribution by beneficiaries    | -              | -              | -            | -                         |
| Contribution requested from ECHO | 30.000.000,00  | 30.000.000,00  | -            | -                         |
| % of total funding               | 56,29 %        | 56,29 %        | - %          | - %                       |
| Total funding                    | 53.301.335,96  | 53.301.335,96  | 0,00         | 0,00                      |

## OVERVIEW - PRE-FINANCING

## Contract amount:

30.000.000,00 €

## Pre-financing percentage:

- %

## Pre-financing amounts:

| # | Date | Amount | Percentage |
|---|------|--------|------------|
| - | -    | - €    | - %        |

## Final payment:

| Date | Amount | Percentage |
|------|--------|------------|
| -    | - €    | - %        |

## OVERVIEW - MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGREEMENT

| ECHO reference      | Submission date | Type of modification | Status   |
|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------|
| 2016/01021/MR/02/01 | 20/06/2017      | Operational          | Accepted |
| 2016/01021/MR/01/01 | 09/03/2017      | Operational          | Accepted |

## OVERVIEW - LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

## Action title:

Emergency Food Assistance to People Affected by Unrest in Syria

## Principal objective:

The FSSP in Syria aims at improving regular access to education, while increasing micronutrient intake of children through the regular provision of fortified school snacks. The program also directly contributes to the local economy through the local purchase of date bars. At present, WFP locally buys 10 percent of its annual requirements for the programme. [MR ]With reference to Annex VII, the milk may on an exception basis also be reallocated to children aged 5-12 years in families that are currently assisted under the emergency food assistance programme, contributing to stabilize or improve food consumption among assisted beneficiaries. Awareness raising labels will be placed on

the packed milk cartons to avoid any misuse of the commodity.

**Country(ies):** Syrian Arab Republic

**Start date:** 01/06/2016

**End date:** 31/05/2018

**EC amount:** 30.000.000,00 €

**Total funding:** 53.301.335,96 €

#### Implementing Partners:

**Sectors:**

- Food security and livelihoods
- Education in emergencies

**Specific objective:** To increase enrolment, attendance and retention rates in targeted schools.

| Beneficiaries | Proposal / Amendment stage | Final report stage |
|---------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Individuals   | 500.000                    | -                  |
| Organisations | -                          | -                  |

#### Specific objective indicators:

1.

| Indicator type/name | Indicator definition   |
|---------------------|--|
| Custom              | Number of children (disaggregated by gender and age) provided with fortified date bars and UHT milk on school days |

| Baseline | Target value | Progress value | Achieved value |
|----------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| 0        | 500,000      | 584500         | -              |

2.

| Indicator type/name | Indicator definition                       |
|---------------------|--|
| Custom              | Attendance rate (boys) in assisted schools |

| Baseline | Target value | Progress value | Achieved value |
|----------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| 82       | > 80         | 91             | -              |

3.

| Indicator type/name | Indicator definition                        |
|---------------------|---|
| Custom              | Attendance rate (girls) in assisted schools |

| Baseline | Target value | Progress value | Achieved value |
|----------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| 81       | > 80         | 90             | -              |

4.

| Indicator type/name | Indicator definition                           |
|---------------------|--|
| Custom              | Average Kcal transfer per child per school day |

| Baseline | Target value | Progress value | Achieved value |
|----------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| 0        | 460          | 388            | -              |

5.

| Indicator type/name |        | Indicator definition   |
|---------------------|--------|--|
|                     | Custom | [MR] % of the population assisted through general food assistance with poor Food Consumption Score (FCS) |

| Baseline | Target value | Progress value | Achieved value |
|----------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| 12       | 12           | 13             | -              |

6.

| Indicator type/name |        | Indicator definition   |
|---------------------|--------|--|
|                     | Custom | [MR] Average Coping Strategies Index (CSI) among population assisted through general food assistance |

| Baseline | Target value | Progress value | Achieved value |
|----------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| 15       | 15           | 12,4           | -              |

**Result (1)**                      Nutritious foods (fortified date bars and UHT milk) distributed in sufficient quantity, quality and timely to targeted school children

**Sector:**                              Education in emergencies  
**Sub-sectors:**                      • Formal education  
    • Safe and accessible learning environments

Estimated total amount:

| Proposal / Amendment stage | Final report stage |
|----------------------------|--------------------|
| 40.659.844,00 €            | - €                |

| Beneficiaries             | Proposal / Amendment stage | Final report stage |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Individuals               | 500.000                    | -                  |
| Organisations             | -                          | -                  |
| Households                | -                          | -                  |
| Individuals per household | -                          | -                  |

Result (1) - Indicators

1.

| Indicator type/name |        | Indicator definition  |
|---------------------|--------|---|
|                     | Custom | Number of days in which UHT milk was distributed (as percentage of school days) |
|                     | -      |   |

| Baseline | Target value | Progress value | Achieved value |
|----------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| 0,00     | 100,00       | 64,00          | -              |

2.

| Indicator type/name | Indicator definition |
|---------------------|----------------------|
|---------------------|----------------------|

|        |   |
|--------|---|
| Custom | Tonnage of fortified foods distributed (as percentage of planned) |
| -      |   |

| Baseline | Target value | Progress value | Achieved value |
|----------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| 0,00     | 100,00       | 96,00          | -              |

**Result (1) - Activities**

1. Procurement and delivery of commodities to targeted schools
2. Storage and handling of commodities
3. Daily distribution of nutritious foods (fortified date bars and UHT milk) to pre and primary school children in the targeted schools
4. Distribution and post-distribution monitoring in targeted schools by WFP monitors or designated third-parties

**Result (2)** [MR] Stabilized or improved food consumption over assistance period for targeted households and/or individuals

**Sector:** Food security and livelihoods  
**Sub-sectors:**

- Conditional or unconditional in-kind food assistance

**Estimated total amount:**

| Proposal / Amendment stage | Final report stage |
|----------------------------|--------------------|
| 0,00 €                     | - €                |

| Beneficiaries             | Proposal / Amendment stage | Final report stage |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Individuals               | 600.000                    | -                  |
| Organisations             | -                          | -                  |
| Households                | -                          | -                  |
| Individuals per household | -                          | -                  |

**Result (2) - Indicators**

1.

| Indicator type/name | Indicator definition                                       |
|---------------------|--|
| Custom              | [MR] Quantity of milk distributed as percentage of planned |
| -                   |  |

| Baseline | Target value | Progress value | Achieved value |
|----------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| 0,00     | 100,00       | 55,00          | -              |

**Result (2) - Activities**

1. [MR] Procurement, delivery and distribution of milk along with GFA monthly food rations to the most vulnerable conflict-affected Syrian families
2. [MR] Monitoring and Post Distribution Monitoring

**Pre-conditions:**

- Access to functioning education facilities is provided by the responsible authorities in Syria and humanitarian actors.
- Continuing conflict will not further impede access to assess needs and deliver food commodities to targeted beneficiaries.
- No pipeline breaks of food commodities or disruptions to the supply chain are encountered, enabling the timely and regular provision of food items
- Regular monitoring is ensured to project sites through field visits to participating schools.

#### Assumptions and Risks (including risk of occurrence of fraudulent activities):

1. Deterioration of security conditions. Security incidents including mortars and rocket attacks and clashes continued to increase during 2015. Risk to staff safety continue and represent the greatest threat to sustaining WFP operations in Syria. Further deterioration of the security environment may force WFP to reduce its footprint inside the country by deploying both national and international staff to work from alternative locations. 2. Diversification of service providers. The conflict has heavily affected the Syrian public and private sectors' capacity and disrupted the previously existing supply-chain network, leading to a scarcity of service providers needed by WFP in order to carry out its operations. 3. Delays in procurement, delivery and import procedures. Delays in tendering, contracting suppliers and delivery to Syrian ports by the EU milk producer may result in delays in the implementation of the milk distributions. Additionally, delays in customs clearance procedures may result in the commodity to be held at the port, reducing the permissible shelf life of the commodity for import into Syria [MR] and deliveries to schools. 4. Deterioration of the commodity during transport and storage. Due to the sensitivity of milk as a commodity, losses might occur while transporting and handling the commodities from ports to WFP warehouses and then to recipient schools. While in storage there is a risk of spoilage since most schools have inadequate storage conditions and milk may be susceptible to direct sunlight, moisture or a humid environment. 5. Unstable, irregular and insufficient funding. Late and insufficient resources might compromise WFP's ability to implement the activities at planned levels. 6. Manipulation of aid for political, military or financial gain. Aid manipulation or diversion by parties to the conflict for political, military or financial gain continues to represent a significant risk in Syria operational environment. 7. Constraints to humanitarian access. Access restrictions continue to affect the ability to assess humanitarian needs, as well as to deliver assistance through available modalities (cross line, cross border and regular) in many areas. In particular, deliveries through the Nusaybin border crossing have been severely compromised since September 2015, affecting WFP's ability to implement planned activities in Al-Hasakeh governorate. 8. Limited capacity of Cooperating Partners. The implementation and diversification of WFP's portfolio of assistance under this EMOP may be constrained by limited technical and other capacities of its partners. 9. Looting or misappropriation of WFP food. A deterioration in the security situation and fragmentation of conflict may further shrink humanitarian space and increase attacks on humanitarian convoys, heightening the risk of food losses. 10. Negative media portrayal of WFP and its cooperating partners. The risk of any part of the United Nations system being perceived to direct humanitarian assistance to either side of the conflict due to propaganda or negative media coverage may discredit the reputation of the United Nations in Syria and increase threats against assets and staff.

## REQUEST - CONTEXT

[REDACTED]:  
[REDACTED]

**Date of the final comment:**  
19/05/2016

[REDACTED]:  
[REDACTED]

**Date of the final comment:**  
19/05/2016

**RO:**  
-

**Date of the final comment:**  
-

## REQUEST - PROPOSAL VERIFICATION

**Decision number / HIP:**  
ECHO/-ME/BUD/2016/01000

**Specific objective number of the Decision / HIP:**  
1 - Man-made crises

**Financial year:**  
2016

**Checklist:**



Is the project purpose in line with DG ECHO strategy? Yes

Does the request come from a consortium? No

Can this proposal be accepted for appraisal? Yes

Provide internal reasons for refusal:

Text to be included into a refusal letter:

Refusal letter ARES number:

Refusal letter issued on:

Refusal letter transmitted on:

-

-

-

Appraisal acceptance comments:

First version received, to appraise it for first round of comments

## REQUEST - REGIONAL OFFICE APPRAISAL

Comments of RO on the policy coherence:

## REQUEST - [REDACTED] APPRAISAL

**Context, needs assessment:**

The Syria crisis is described as the worst humanitarian and protection crisis in the world. Since its start, more than 250,000 people have lost their lives and over 11 million have been forced to flee from their homes. Of these, over 4.8 million have become refugees outside of the country, while 6.5 million are displaced internally. A consequence of the conflict, the massive level of displacement is one of the main drivers of household food insecurity.

Five years of conflict have resulted in economic recession, damage to vital infrastructure, and increased poverty levels, which eroded the development of sustainable livelihoods and caused costly losses for both current and future generations. One third of the Syrian population now lives in poverty and over half the working age population is now unemployed.

Insufficient food production, combined with reduced government subsidies and currency depreciation, led to steady and sharp food prices increases. Since the onset of the crisis the prices of the main food commodities have increased substantially both in nominal and in real terms. The average prices of wheat flour, lentils and sugar have more than tripled since 2011. The prices of fresh products such as milk have witnessed even more dramatic increases, up to 500 percent when compared to pre-crisis levels.

On average, the cost of a standard food basket is now three times higher compared to pre-crisis levels, while income levels have remained stagnant, further reducing the purchasing power of Syria families and their ability of poor households to meet their food needs.

Accordingly, food insecurity in Syria has deteriorated over recent years and has now reached worrying levels. According to results of the 2015 Food Security Assessment (FSA), one third of the Syrian population is acutely food insecure and do not have adequate access to food. In addition, more than half of the population is at risk of becoming food insecure.

In all governorates surveyed, the overwhelming majority of people are either already food insecure or at risk of becoming food insecure. Across the country, people living in rural areas are more food insecure in comparison to urban areas. Internally displaced persons (IDPs) give rise to the greatest concern because they are the most vulnerable and the most food insecure. More than 40 percent of IDPs and returnees are food insecure. That compares to about 30 percent of the resident population. The protracted crisis has further eroded household resilience and capacities to cope with food deprivation. A significant proportion of these were found using extreme coping strategies leading to long-term and irreversible consequences, including reducing the quantity and quality of food consumed, selling assets, going into debt and withdrawing children from school.

These observations are confirmed by findings from WFP monitoring activities. In the last quarter of 2015, monitoring data indicated that about 11 percent of female and 5 percent of male headed household had poor food consumption score, due to low frequency in consumption of vitamin and protein-rich food such as meat and dairy food items. Data analysis for the first quarter of 2016 show the same trend, with 10 percent of female and 7 percent male headed households showing poor food consumptions core. This is mainly due to limited income to complement food assistance, as the majority of the households were noted to be relying on unsustainable income sources including petty trading and casual labour.

Food consumption-related coping strategies include limiting portion sizes at meals times and reducing the number of meals. According to the FSA, approximately 35 percent of the surveyed households had either low or medium dietary diversity, with their diet consisting mainly of cereal, sugar and oil, whereas vegetables are consumed a maximum of three days per week. Consumption of dairy products is also limited, with households with low dietary diversity indicators consuming them only one or two times a week. WFP programme monitoring findings confirm the low consumption of dairy products, including milk, among WFP assisted beneficiaries, with the majority of interviewed households consuming these food items less than three days per week.

On education, the 2014 Human Development Index ranks Syria at 118, a considerable fall from 2005 in which the country held the rank of 106. A particularly notable consequence has been a dramatic degradation of the social service infrastructure, with a specific decline in educational services. According to the 2015 Humanitarian Needs Overview, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) reports an acute paucity of functioning learning spaces, citing more than 4,000 schools across the country as either damaged, destroyed, used as IDP shelters or occupied by various parties to the conflict. Reportedly, of 22,000 schools pre-crisis, only 17,480 schools remain functional, and these facilities operate on multiple shifts to accommodate the significant need for learning space.

All the above considerations are line with DG ECHO evaluation of the Food Security situation in country, and is based on first-hand information collected by WFP through the Food security assessment and Crop and Food security assessment mission conducted in 2015 and monitoring visits of early 2016. Although lack of dairy product is actually highlighted by WFP and therefore could justify the intervention as proposed, the rational of intervention remain thin (in terms of local consumption and production of milk prior/during the crisis...) and could possibly have been developed further.

#### **Operational:**

**Overall.** The action comes as complement to the Fortified School Snacks Program (FSSP) in Syria for crisis affected children attending schools established in 2014. WFP will provide to children by including fortified milk, enriched with essential minerals and vitamins, in addition to date bar (80g for 240 Kcal). The contribution would allow WFP to procure 17,500 mt of milk produced in the EU (at a commodity cost of USD 1,500 per mt) , to be delivered to schools across the country in support of 500,000 pre-primary and primary school children during the 2016-17 and 2017-18 academic years. Each academic year starts in mid-September and ends in early May, with a total of 140 school days. In addition to the fortified date bars currently provided to school children in assisted schools, each child will receive a 200 ml of UHT milk, which will provides a caloric transfer of 120 kcal.

**Duration.** The duration covers a period of 24 months, which has been agreed at HQ level.

**Locations.** WFP interventions is covering Aleppo, Homs, Rural Damascus, Tartous, Al Hassakieh, Hama,

Lattakia within pre-identified schools where the FSSP is ongoing (sub-districts with high food insecurity indicators or high presence of IDPs). The issue of access to Al Hassakieh, rendered complicated by the closure of Nussaybin, is however, not clarified. Indicative list of schools have been provided, including some in Hard to reach areas.

**Beneficiaries.** The Fortified School Snack Programme (FSSP) aims to provide fortified school snacks to a maximum of 500,000 boys and girls of the pre-primary and primary school children (aged 4-12 years).

Importantly, WFP and UNICEF included a protection component in order to mitigate risks over the safety of children in School facilities (which have been targeted on multiple occurrences)

**Indicators.** The indicators combine quantitative and some qualitative (attendance of pupils) indicators. There is no indicator that will actually evaluate the nutritional impact of the intervention. This will be discussed with WFP at later stage in terms of review of the operations.

**Activities.** As per ECHO request, only 1 result has been provided in regards to the distribution of the FSSP in targeted schools, including the supply chain (procurement, storage), distribution and post-distribution monitoring. WFP plans to distribute 32,400 mt of fortified foods to a maximum of 500,000

pre-primary and primary school children. This includes 14,550 mt of fortified date bars and 17,457 mt of UHT milk.

As for the supply chain, WFP stated that Food commodities, procured by WFP or received as in-kind donations, are imported into Syria through the primary supply corridors of Beirut, Tartous and Lattakia. In addition, since 2014 commodities are shipped also through the Nusaybin crossing point on the border with Turkey, as well as through three crossing points on the Turkish and Jordanian borders approved with the passing of UN Security Council Resolution 2165.

Upon arrival in Syria, food commodities are stored in WFP facilities located in Tartous, Lattakia, Homs,

Rural Damascus and Al-Hasakeh and subsequently dispatched to governorates allocated to each centre according to respective strategic advantages. For cross-border deliveries, commodities are transported directly at handover points to partners within Syria, due to the lack of WFP storage facilities in the areas covered through cross-border operations.

Commodities are delivered to WFP partners for distribution to beneficiaries on the basis of monthly allocation plans (which have been provided by WFP as indicative planning). For transport inside Syria, WFP uses existing commercial transport settings. Distributions are carried out by WFP implementing partners on the basis of agreed plans.

Finally regarding the distribution in schools, Technical coordination with the Ministry of Education ensures that trained school administrators, as well as staff from the relevant NGO partners, support programme implementation - daily handling and distribution of school snacks to children, as well as provide quantitative reports to WFP on distribution figures and daily attendance of children.

Information provided remains quite general. Additional information will be required at a later stage (especially related to X-border activities and access to Hassakieh governorates). However, the operations remain quite standard based on the existing massive programmes of in-kind distribution implemented by WFP inside Syria. Extensive additional information on contingency measures (ie. security, delays in procurement, diversification of service providers, deterioration of commodity. Aid diversion. Constraints on humanitarian access, looting or misappropriation of WFP food, etc...) have been provided, highlighting a clear awareness of WFP on the difficulties inherent to the context of intervention

**Communication.** WFP strategy is focusing around three main points through a detailed communication plan based on press releases social media photo gallery and field visits organization targeting (1) General EU public (2) Children inside Syria (focus on objectives of the programs and awareness on education/ FSSP) (3) Media. However, WFP highlighted that no branding will be possible in the specific context of intervention of inside Syria.

**Monitoring.** WFP staff will conduct monitoring visits to school to verify school snack distributions as well as random checks of enrolment and attendance records. In high risk areas where WFP staff cannot access, contracted and vetted third-party monitors, trained by WFP, will carry out monitoring activities on behalf of WFP. Also continuous market assessments will be implemented ([LINK](#))

The monitoring system is based on third party monitoring and is relatively satisfying. Elements related to the functioning and details of the system established shall be further investigated at later stage.

The element of response to the note on remote management is satisfying. Remote-management tools and procedures in place are beyond minimal requirements and up to standards.

**Capacity of the Partner (and of implementing Partners - if applicable):**

WFP is the main FS partner for Damascus led operations, and a major FS actor at regional level. The UN agency has established field presence hubs in affected governorates and is able to access directly (national staff and to a lesser extent expatriate) field operations, on the contrary of INGOs present in Damascus. In addition, WFP developed strong relations central and local Syrian authorities and other relevant UN agencies (UNICEF).

**Financial:**

Total budget is 53,301,335.97 EU. The project is co-funded (ECHO contribution: 56% for a total of 30,000,000 EU). It is important to consider that EU contribution will be exclusively dedicated to purchase of UHT milk (and affiliated costs). Total budget dedicated to milk purchase is 23,122,319.97 EU (corresponding to 17,457MT) for a total of 77% of total ECHO contribution (remaining 23% are allocated to direct operating costs and direct support costs).

The ratio is satisfying and reflects the priorities given on the activities (mainly supplies).

**Policy coherence (including comments of RO - if applicable):**

NTR

**Issues for action / for follow-up:**

- Review of the details of the supply chain (including tendering process, procurement of milk and transportation to Syria) and transportation inside Syria
- Clarifications on locations reached by X-border or Regular programming (X-Damascus)
- Clarification on issues of access to Al Hassakieh governorate (Nussaybin crossing point closed)
- Additional information on IPs capacity and list of areas not accessible by WFP staff (and reached by IPs)
- Further clarification on the component of the budget.
- Review/update of the distribution plan / review of the locations planned (after the first months of implementation)
- Inclusion of a reporting element stating on two months basis: Number of beneficiaries reached / Amounts distributed (overview of distribution) / Areas reached / Any issues etc.

**GENDER AND AGE**

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| Is the marker applicable?  | Yes              |
| Does the proposal contain an adequate and brief gender and age analysis?   | Yes              |
| Is the assistance adapted to the specific needs and capacities of different gender and age groups?                   | Not sufficiently |
| Does the action prevent/mitigate negative effects?   | Yes              |
| Do relevant gender and age groups adequately participate in the design, implementation and evaluation of the Action? | Not sufficiently |

initial mark:

1

comments:

In line with ECHO standards. However, due to the constraints of access, it is difficult to have a strong implication of beneficiaries in the design of the project.

**RESILIENCE**

|                           |     |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Is the marker applicable? | Yes |
|---------------------------|-----|

Does the proposal include an adequate analysis of shocks, stresses and vulnerabilities? Yes

Is the project risk informed? Does the project include adequate measures to ensure it does not aggravate risks or undermine capacities? Yes

Does the project include measures to build local capacities (beneficiaries and local institutions)? Yes

Does the project take opportunities to support long term strategies to reduce humanitarian needs, underlying vulnerability and risks? Not sufficiently

initial mark:

1

comments:

NTR

Is this a follow-up action?

No

Details (reference number, project period etc.):

Are there any risk that might potentially affect the implementation of the Action (including the risk of occurrence of fraudulent activities)?

No

Details (from chapter 4.5 and 4.6 of Single Form) on how Partner will address those risks:

Should this Action be funded by DG ECHO?

Yes

#### Justification:

At this stage, the proposal as presented is meeting basic requirement in terms of information provided and operational standards. WFP remains a strategic partner for interventions inside Syria (and ECHO is supporting actions in line with emergency response in the country) with one of the largest operation in the country (that the present project would complement).

Still, the partner was not in position, at this level of development for the program, to provide additional details (as requested by ECHO). Therefore, official request for further clarifications in the coming months will be addressed (as per actions for follow-up).

Having said that, it is important to highlight, the current project has neither been initiated by the partner or by the ECHO field team. There was no interaction at field level (except through comments and feedback on the presented fichop). In this context, and although it is clear that the needs in terms of food security are extremely high inside Syria (as presented by WFP and in line with ECHO assessments of the situation), it is highly difficult to evaluate the relevance and appropriateness of the proposed project (nutritional support in schools through milk provision). The set pre-conditions (ie. origin and type of milk to be procured) are as well not taking into consideration the most cost-efficient approach. [REDACTED] voiced already his concerns about the rational of the project which put in question the basic principles of humanitarian interventions.

## REQUEST - [REDACTED] APPRAISAL

## Executive summary of the Action

**Narrative summary (coming from the last submitted version of eSF - RQ/MR):**

The Syria crisis is described as the worst humanitarian and protection crisis in the world. Since its start, over 11 million have been forced to flee from their homes. A consequence of the conflict, displacement is one of the main drivers of household food insecurity.

Over five years of conflict have resulted in economic recession, damage to vital infrastructure, and increased poverty levels, which eroded the development of sustainable livelihoods and caused costly losses for both current and future generations. One third of the Syrian population now lives in poverty and over half the working age population is unemployed. Human development gains have witnessed a dramatic reversal, as infrastructural damage and economic recession have left healthcare facilities, schools and other essential services unable to meet the population's needs.

In response to the conflict in Syria, in 2011 WFP launched an emergency operation in October 2011 to provide life-saving food assistance to the conflict affected population. Initially targeting 50,000 people, WFP progressively scaled-up its response to a rapidly deteriorating humanitarian crisis. Currently, WFP is targeting up to 4.5 million vulnerable conflict-affected people on a monthly basis, through a combination of general food assistance, livelihoods recovery interventions, specialised nutrition programmes and education support.

Under this action, ECHO's contribution would allow WFP procure 17,500 mt of milk produced in the EU, to be delivered to schools across the country in support of 500,000 pre-primary and primary school children during the 2016-17 and 2017-18 academic years, along with the fortified date bars, as part of the existing Fortified School Snacks Programme [MR] or as part of the emergency food assistance when operational conditions require reallocation.

[MR2] Please see **Annex I**.

**Narrative summary (with [REDACTED] input):**

*The Syria crisis is described as the worst humanitarian and protection crisis in the world. Since its start, over 11 million have been forced to flee from their homes. A consequence of the conflict, displacement is one of the main drivers of household food insecurity.*

*Over five years of conflict have resulted in economic recession, damage to vital infrastructure, and increased poverty levels, which eroded the development of sustainable livelihoods and caused costly losses for both current and future generations. One third of the Syrian population now lives in poverty and over half the working age population is unemployed. Human development gains have witnessed a dramatic reversal, as infrastructural damage and economic recession have left healthcare facilities, schools and other essential services unable to meet the population's needs.*

*In response to the conflict in Syria, in 2011 WFP launched an emergency operation in October 2011 to provide life-saving food assistance to the conflict affected population. Initially targeting 50,000 people, WFP progressively scaled-up its response to a rapidly deteriorating humanitarian crisis. Currently, WFP is targeting up to 4.5 million vulnerable conflict-affected people on a monthly basis, through a combination of general food assistance, livelihoods recovery interventions, specialised nutrition programmes and education support.*

*Under this action, ECHO's contribution would allow WFP procure 17,500 mt of milk produced in the EU, to be delivered to schools across the country in support of 500,000 pre-primary and primary school children during the 2016-17 and 2017-18 academic years, along with the fortified date bars, as part of the existing Fortified School Snacks Programme.*



**Comments on the request and the [REDACTED] analysis:**

[REDACTED] appraisal provides a clear, coherent and detailed assessment of the proposed action. [REDACTED] underlines the current food insecurity situation in Syria and the strengths of WFP, which has been present in Syria for almost 50 years and benefits from a unique experience and capacity in implementing school feeding programmes. Since August 2014, WFP has been implementing a Fortified School Snacks Program (FSSP) in Syria to support crisis-affected children in attaining educational goals. The FSSP contributes to the overall objective of the No Lost Generation Initiative, an inter-agency response strategy led by UNICEF to ensure the education and protection rights of children and youth are not compromised by the conflict. The proposed Action plans to start on 01/06/2016 for a duration of 24 months and aims to provide 500,000 pre-primary and primary school children with UHT milk of EU origin as complement to the dates bars distribution: 200 ml of UHT milk will be distributed to each kid which will provide a caloric transfer of 120 kcal, bringing the total kcal delivery to almost 500 kcal (or 30% of the daily energy requirement for school children). WFP is planning to deliver 17,457 mt of milk produced in the EU to schools in the governorates of Aleppo, Homs, Rural Damascus, Damascus, Tartous, Al-Hasakeh, Hama and Lattakia during the 2016-17 and 2017-18 academic years. WFP requests EUR 30.000.000 from ECHO that represents 56,29% of the total budget of the Action (EUR 53.301.335,96). ECHO funding would complement NEAR existing FSSP grants (date bars component) financed by DG NEAR. All the schools targeted by the Action are UNICEF-assisted and the implementation of this action is coordinated on a technical level with the Ministry of Education. The Aga Khan Foundation and the local NGO Al-Tamayuz will be the IP for Damascus and additional NGOs will be identified during the implementation. The action was designed in line with observations from two significant food security assessments carried out in cooperation with FAO, the Government of Syria, and NGOs in 2015. It is worth noting that WFP conducted a Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Assessment between May and June 2015, which was in effect the first household food security survey ever conducted in Syria. WFP has a strong Monitoring and Evaluation system in place to evaluate progress and to identify risks of aid diversion. The partner will conduct regular visits to schools to verify distribution as well as random checks of enrolment and attendance records. In areas where WFP staff cannot access, third party monitors trained by WFP will carry out monitoring activities on its behalf. Remote management plans have been developed, including the use of cross-border Iraq and cross-border Lebanon, should a further deterioration of the security condition force WFP to reduce its footprint within the country. The Partner completed the answers to the DG ECHO remote management instruction note with satisfying standards and replied satisfactorily to the 7 questions of the checklist related to remote management modalities. The project being implemented inside Syria, the Partner requests the derogation to the standard visibility requirements on the ground in order to limit security incidents for its staff and beneficiaries

**Issues for action / for follow-up:**

As in the second version of the action the partner was not capable to provide the requested information also due to the tender to procure UHT milk of EU origin to be launched shortly, detailed information will have to be provided as soon as available. An article will be included in the agreement with detailed elements to be addressed.

Follow up need:

- Follow up on access restrictions, in particular regarding deliveries through the Nusaybin border crossing point and implementation of activities in Al-Hasakeh governorate.
- A follow-up survey is to be conducted by WFP to measure the nutritional impact of the Action.
- Detailed info on location reached through XB and from Damascus.
- Review of details of the supply chain.
- Information on additional IP to be selected during the implementation.
- Budget ( detailed on how much for commodities, logistics, HR,etc)

**GENDER AND AGE**

[REDACTED] initial mark:

1

**comments:**

The FSSP answers some of the specific food and educational needs of boys and girls.

- In addition, the FSSP aims at encouraging school enrolment and attendance, thus reducing the exposure of children and adolescents to serious protection concerns.
- Data gathered through internal reporting procedures will be sex and age disaggregated.

---

**RESILIENCE**

---

**initial mark:**

1

**comments:**

While the ECHO-funded component of the Action is limited to the provision of EU-produced milk, the overall programme co-financed by DG NEAR directly contributes to the local economy through the local purchase of date bars, which is a component of WFP livelihoods and resilience strategy.

- Ensuring children's continued education through efforts to maintain high school enrolment and attendance rates is also essential for the resilience of a population.

---

**Is this action strategically relevant?**

Yes

**Comments on the strategic relevance of this action:**

The FSSP is a strategic component of the overall effort towards supporting children's return to learning and encourage classroom attendance, thereby contributing to improving the condition of young Syrians. Despite the operational challenges and significant costs linked to milk delivery as well as the debated efficiency of school-based feeding programmes, funding of this Action is deemed legitimate by ECHO in light of the documented efficiency of this specific programme. Results highlighted by monitoring data collected by WFP in 2015 illustrate the positive impact of the FSSP, which contributed to an increase in enrolment rates and a reduction in absenteeism. When compared to baseline data collected in 2014, attendance rates among boys in assisted schools showed an increase from 82 to 87%. Among girls the improvement is even more significant, with an increase from 81 to 91 %. Similarly, retention rates were recorded at high levels (96%). It is expected that improving the quantity, variety and nutritional value of the school snacks through the provision of milk in addition to date bars will further the positive impact observed until now.

More generally, the Action will contribute to reducing vulnerabilities at the household and community levels, as the programme focuses on vulnerable individuals by targeting children in areas with a high concentration of IDPs, high levels of food insecurity and low education performance.

While targeted schools will be identified *in coordination with UNICEF / schools supported by UNICEF* WFP's technical coordination with the Ministry of Education will ensure that school administrators and staff from WFP's implementing partners support programme implementation.

Financing of the proposed Action is in line and in complementarity with other EU-funded initiatives as WFP is also a recipient of NEAR funding in the context of the FSSP.

WFP actively coordinates with other agencies on the ground, including other food assistance organizations and UN agencies sharing common coordination and response mechanisms. WFP also leads or co-leads of several strategic clusters/sectors.

**Should this Action be funded by DG ECHO?**

Yes



**Justification:**

Food security in Syria has deteriorated over recent years. According to results of the 2015 WFP Food Security Assessment, one third of the Syrian population is acutely food insecure and more than half of the population is at risk of becoming food insecure. The protracted crisis has further eroded household resilience and capacities to cope with food deprivation. A significant proportion of these were found using extreme coping strategies, including withdrawing children from school.

At the same time, aggregate enrolment and attendance rates of Syrian children in school have declined by 33% since the onset of the crisis, with the most significant negative trends occurring in Rural Damascus, Damascus, Aleppo, Dar'a, Quneitra and Homs which are governorates targeted by this Action. Over two million children inside Syria are either out of school or attending classes irregularly.

WFP has a unique and much sought-after technical expertise in school feeding activities and a valuable partnership UNICEF in the context of the FSSP. In addition, WFP is familiar with the complex operating environment, having been responding to the crisis since its onset (WFP's first emergency operation dates back to October 2011). WFP progressively scaled-up its response and is currently targeting up to 4.5 million vulnerable conflict-affected people.

WFP is also a key partner for ECHO given its ability to conduct direct interventions. It has a widespread presence and reach capacity in strategic locations such as Aleppo, Homs, Tartous, Latakia and Qamishli and a workforce of 323 staff inside Syria (based in Damascus and in four sub-offices) as well as in Jordan and Turkey to manage cross-border operations. WFP has also developed wide networks of logistics, contracted transporters and NGOs partners in order to improve its knowledge of and access to strategic locations, to adapt to the fluid security and to build acceptance in the target areas. WFP has also established a solid reputation thanks to a continuous engagement with local authorities and community leaders.

In light of the added-value of WFP's technical expertise with regard to school feeding, its disposition and unique capacity to undertake the proposed assignment despite the challenges associated with milk distribution and the key value of its technical collaboration with the Ministry of Education and partnership UNICEF, funding of the proposed Action is deemed acceptable. Worth underlying that such action was neither put forward by WFP, nor requested by ECHO Syria Team as the relevance of the proposal and the nutritional support in school through milk distribution are under discussion.

As mentioned in the issues to follow up, further to the submission of the second version of the proposal and as per agreement with WFP, additional information will be provided by the partner as soon the tender is launched and the implementation is started. As per request of Member States (MS) and as agreed with WFP, bimonthly the partner will provide ECHO with detailed information to be shared with MS in order to inform on progress and challenges faced during implementation.

ECHO is currently looking into the possibility to launch a proper external evaluation whose results will be shared with MS. Internal discussions are ongoing.

**Provide internal reasons for refusal:****Text to be included into a refusal letter:**

Refusal letter ARES number:

-

Refusal letter issued on:

-

Refusal letter transmitted on:

-

**REQUEST - COMPLETE APPRAISAL**

Proposed pre-financing percentage(s):

80

## Comment on the proposed pre-financing:

## Are specific monitoring needs applicable for this Action?

No

## Comments on specific monitoring needs:

Article 6 of the Agreement

---

## Article 6.1 Yes

Without prejudice to the provisions of the General Conditions, an amount of up to EUR 6 000 from the amount indicated in Article 3.2 of this Agreement may be used within a central visibility fund commonly established by the International Organisation and the Commission for visibility activities targeting the European public and highlighting the partnership of the International Organisation and the Commission in the field of humanitarian aid. In such a case, with the Final Report, the International Organisation shall also submit an annual report on the use of the central visibility fund. In view of the limited humanitarian access in Syria caused by security concerns, the International Organisation commits to provide the Commission a quarterly report on its monitoring/assessment visits of the Action. These monitoring/assessment visits shall be conducted with a view to ensuring accountability towards final beneficiaries and donors by identifying and addressing any circumstances likely to hamper or delay the implementation of the Action, including instances of aid diversion or other misuse of humanitarian aid. To this end the monitoring/assessment shall be conducted, to the extent possible, with the participation of staff from the International Organisation who are ultimately responsible for the management and the quality of the action. The quarterly report shall be presented in the standard format provided by the Commission and shall summarise the main findings and observations of the monitoring/assessment visits. The quarterly report shall provide the Commission with information on: (i) the dates and locations of the activities monitored; (ii) the aid delivery method/s being used; (iii) the circumstances likely to hamper or delay the implementation of the Action, if any, identified on the occasion of the monitoring/assessment visits, and, if so, the steps taken by the International Organisation to address the latter; (iv) the number and level of senior/management/expatriate staff and the number of national staff under contract present in the affected area/s; (v) difficulties encountered in conducting adequate monitoring/assessment visits during the reporting period, and (vi) the type and level of personnel participating in the monitoring/assessment visits. The International Organisation commits to report on a bi-monthly basis to the Commission on the implementation of the Action. These reports shall provide the Commission with information on (i) the number of beneficiaries reached, (ii) the geographic location of distribution activities, (iii) the quantities distributed and (iv) where need be, any possible challenges or difficulties that could adversely impact the proper implementation of the Action. The International Organisation commits to provide additional information to the Commission within two months after the start date of the Action. The complementary information includes (i) the details of the supply chain and transportation inside Syria, (ii) clarifications on the locations reached by cross border operations or through regular programming from Damascus, (iii) clarification on issue of access to Al Hassakieh governorate and (iv) information on the Implementing partners' reaching capacity. The partners also commits to provide the review/ updated distribution plan and the list of target locations.

## Article 6.2 Not applicable

-

## Article 6.3 Not applicable

-

ARES number for note on exceeding the funding threshold: -

Specific comments

---

Desk Officer's instructions for action by Desk Assistant:

For follow-up by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] during the implementation:

[REDACTED] instructions for the Finance Unit:

Financial Officer's instructions for Desk Assistant at Agreement Procedure stage:

## MODIFICATION REQUEST Nr 1 - CONTEXT

[REDACTED]:  
[REDACTED]

Date of final comment:

21/03/2017

[REDACTED]:  
[REDACTED]

Date of final comment:

21/03/2017

RO:

-

Date of final comment:

-

---

ECHO reference nr of first modification request:

2016/01021/MR/01/01

First modification request submission date:

09/03/2017

ECHO reference nr of last modification request:

2016/01021/MR/01/01

Last modification request submission date:

09/03/2017

## MODIFICATION REQUEST Nr 1 - MODIFIED ELEMENTS

### Elements to be modified with Partner's justification:

The original objective for the project was to distribute the milk in the WFP supported schools together with the fortified date bars across two academic years (2016-2017 and 2017-2018). However, late arrival of some shipments in the fall of 2016, and lengthier than expected customs clearance procedures meant that by the time some commodities were ready for dispatch, WFP had a very short window of opportunity to distribute them ahead of their expiry date. These quantities could not be absorbed by the school meals programme within such a short time as public schools were closed for several weeks for the winter break between December and January. Therefore, to avoid having to dispose of the concerned quantities, WFP made a decision to include them into its general food assistance (GFA), and distribute the milk along with the monthly food rations. The decision was made in consultation with the Nutrition Sector, and the milk was distributed to families with children between the ages of 5 and 12 years of age and in areas with a high percentage of IDPs. As of early March 2017, the amount of milk reallocated to GFA amounts to 483 mt and reached approximately 167,000 vulnerable children aged 5-12 years. Please see Annexes VII and VIII for additional details.

### Scope of requested modification:

Budget: No

Timeframe: No

Operational: Yes

**MODIFICATION REQUEST Nr 1 - [REDACTED] ACCEPTANCE**

The modification request is in agreement with DG ECHO procedures? Yes

The modification request is in line with the relevant decision? Yes

The modification request is complete? Yes

The modification request is acceptable for appraisal? Yes

**[REDACTED] decision justification:**

Milk for the refugees programme: MR to add the distribution through GFD of some quantities of the milk of European origin distributed inside Syria. Operationally challenging activities to complement an existing school feeding programme. The MR has been extensively discussed both at field and HQ level. No other changes (apart from the adaptation of the indicators commonly used for the GFD) are foreseen.

**MODIFICATION REQUEST Nr 1 - REGIONAL OFFICE APPRAISAL**

Comments of RO on the policy coherence:

**MODIFICATION REQUEST Nr 1 - [REDACTED] APPRAISAL****Comments on the elements to be modified:**

The modification request is mainly related to the inclusion of GFD in addition to the initial school snack support, following administrative – legal constraints in terms of importation.

The main additions are as follow (as per Annex “additions into MR form”):

- Beneficiaries (Section 3.2.4). As per reference to additions, “milk may on exceptional basis be reallocated to children 5 to 12 years in families that are currently under the emergency food assistance programme”. In addition, WFP mentioned that, in order to avoid any misuse of commodity awareness raising labels will be placed on the packed milk cartons. Number of beneficiaries remains the same, as per MT of milk procured.
- Specific Indicators (section 4.2.3): two indicators have added in regards to the inclusion of general food distribution (R2.). There are two standard indicators on GDF including the Food Consumption Score (FCS) and Coping strategy Index (CSI) .
- Result 2. MR is including the addition of 1 result R2. Stabilized or improved food consumption over assistance period for targeted HH and/or individuals. The inclusion of R2. GFD is to be considered as a contingency measure in case milk could not be allocated to school under R1. (see annex VII and below comments). It is clearly specified that, as school students remains the primary target, the total of milk potentially reallocated would not exceed 10%(or 5% by each academic year) of the planned 17,500 MT.

- Beneficiaries amount to 600,000 individuals. As per calculation (maximum of 10% of the full MT of milk to be allocated to GFD, or 5% by academic year), 1,750MT of milk could allow to reach a maximum of 600,000 individuals on one off intervention (and not monthly). A similar rational is used for the indicator used : quantity of milk distributed as percentage of planned (100%).
- Activities include A1. Procurement, delivery and distribution of milk along with GFD monthly Food rations to the most vulnerable conflict affected Syrian families and A2. Monitoring and Post distribution monitoring. These two activities are standards activities (see previous actions and R1).
- Contingency measures (Section 4.6). WFP added the mention of potential delays due to transportation or customs issue with an impact on shelf life, and possibility for reallocation to GFD, considering that **“any reallocation will be discussed with ECHO”**. It is also important to mention that no item of Food rations distributed is covered under this action, which is exclusively dedicated to milk supply.
- The modification has no impact on the budget or duration / work plan of the project.

In annex VII and VIII, as requested by DG ECHO, WFP provide detailed information on:

- **The situation regarding the project as of 1st February.** This document has been shared with ECHO prior to the MR as an extensive update on the constraints faced by WFP regarding the milk procurement / customs clearance (which impacted the shelf life of the milk), and necessity of inclusion of milk into GFD (in order to avoid destruction of milk) as well as modalities of distribution within GFD (ie, Label). As of Early March 2017, WFP reported that 483MT (out of the 4,484,889 MT received in January 2017) have been included under GFD for a total of 167,000 children aged 5 to 12 years.
- **The rationale for inclusion of milk into GFD and methodology for future implementation.** The document outlines 1) background of project 2) future inclusion of EU milk into WFP GF assistance 3) mitigations measures. 4) Reporting.

The main elements are as follow:

- Reallocation will only be considered in case of inability to distribute FFS due to administrative, legal and logistics obstacles (which should be justified), and when the only alternative (in case no inclusion in GFD is agreed) is destruction of the items. Any other case of potential reason for reallocation should be discussed with ECHO prior.
- The overall amount of reallocation will not exceed 10% of the total MT planned under this action.
- Mitigations measures have been already identified and negotiations started with both MOFA and suppliers (standard shelf life, common expiry date...)
- Reporting will be ensured on monthly basis (basic information including allocation to GFD or any challenges observed).

#### **Assessment of Partner's justification of the modifications:**

The “milk” project has been initiated under the European Commission’s Implementing Decision (ECHO/-ME/BUD/2016/01000), *Financing the distribution of dairy products as part of the response to humanitarian crises from the general budget of the European Union*, which stated that “The humanitarian actions financed under this Decision shall be implemented in order to address food and nutrition needs of internally displaced persons, refugees and other vulnerable people affected by humanitarian crises” (article 2(1)). As per comment on initial Fichop, concerns have been voiced on alignment of the EU initiative with humanitarian framework.

Still, according to Syrian regulations, it is not permitted to import liquid milk into Syria from non-Arab countries. In order to allow implementation of the project as per EU decision, WFP had to work extensively

with all relevant authorities to obtain an exemption. In parallel, WFP faced multiple obstacles (logistics / legal) due to the very specificity of the intervention (bringing liquid milk from EU into Syria) and the heavily administrative centralized process (up to six ministries involved on the issue), as well as extensive customs obligations (including lab testing, and shelf life standard). All this was rendered more complicated by late arrival of milk in Lattakia port (mid-October 2016). These constraints led WFP to make a decision to include milk in GFD or to destroy it.

ECHO was informed about the challenges by 1st February 2017, and actual reallocation of milk to GFD. The MR was initiated at this stage (with a retroactive component)

From [REDACTED] perspective, the MR is justified considering that:

1. The alternative to inclusion in GFD is destruction of milk, and within the GFD, milk is still targeting children among vulnerable communities
2. The first phase of the program had a "pilot component" which would explain some of the initial delays, but allowed an in-depth insight of obstacles and increased awareness among stakeholders in order to facilitate future implementation. WFP and ECHO have been continuously exchange on this matter at field level.
3. Complexity of the intervention from a procurement / logistics perspective, considering the conditions sets by the EC.
4. WFP management has been heavily involved in the solving of the problem (especially at Ministry level), and WFP was quite transparent on the communication as of February 2017.
5. WFP took into considerations all of the ECHO requirement for the MR (including reporting)
6. It allows more flexibility to the partner under specific conditions (and close exchange with ECHO at field level).

Form an operational perspective, the MR (and WFP reallocation) is sound, and should be considered retroactively. All standards, criteria of selection for beneficiaries (Section 2.1), modalities of allocations and conditions are clearly outlined (and aligned on ECHO recommendations) in Annex VII and VIII. Also, the additional documents provided by WFP are quite complete.

**Policy coherence (including comments from the RO - if applicable):**

MR is in line with EC priorities outlined under Implementing Decision (ECHO/-ME/BUD/2016/01000)

**Issues for action / for follow-up:**

- Follow- up on procurement / distribution of next batch (monthly report) and potential reallocation
- Issue of vulnerability of population targeted by GFD (including milk), ie. areas of high concentration of IDPS will be followed closely (see Section 2.1)
- Follow up on mitigations measures outlined in Annex VII section 3. (negotiations with GoS and suppliers)
- Follow up on investigation on other locations of activities (XB) or alternative modalities (which is not mentioned in the MR, but included in initial Fichop)
- Regular communication on milk operation at field level (ongoing)

**Should ECHO agree on this modification request?**

Yes

**Justification of the recommendation:**

As mentioned above, MR is justified (including the retrospective aspects, ie. first quarter 2017). Despite massive challenges and WFP gaps in logistics , the initial phase of the operation has been implemented since last quarter 2016, through an extensive and complex learning process (pilot phase). The proposal for the alternative allocation would allow more flexibility to the partner, although it is clearly stated (including with mention of maximum %) that the school students remains the priority.

As ECHO strategic partner inside Syria, WFP showed a great level of understanding and compliance with ECHO requirement.

## MODIFICATION REQUEST Nr 1 - [REDACTED] APPRAISAL

### Instructions for Desk Assistant for the amendment (Article 6, Interim Reports)

n/a

### Issues for action / for follow-up:

Going on engaging with WFP to understand the expectations for the coming months for the program (mitigation measures and negotiations outcomes).

Continue requiring constant updates on ongoing distributions.

Should ECHO agree on this modification request?

Yes

**decision justification:**

According to the programme, milk is to be delivered to schools across Syria as part of WFP's existing Fortified School Snacks Programme (FSSP). WFP is providing fortified date bars and UHT milk to over 500,000 vulnerable school children in areas affected by forced displacement. The programme covers 2 academic years (2016-2018).

The first batch of milk has arrived in Syria at the Lattakia port around 15 October 2016, followed by several batches arrived in the following months. As of 31 January, 4.484.889 metric tonnes of milk reached Syria. Out of this quantity, 33% was already distributed, the rest will be distributed in the coming weeks and months, depending on the expiring dates and other factors. This is a satisfactory performance so far.

However, during this period, WFP faced several issues and obstacles to the distribution, due to bureaucracy and lengthy negotiations with Syria authorities (please note that 6 ministers are involved and have to grant permissions).

In particular, to avoid the destruction of a quantity due to expire in less than 2 week-time and that would not be allowed in the schools according to the Syrian regulations, WFP decided to distribute some milk through the General Food Distribution (GFD instead of through the School Feeding programme). As a matter of fact, 9% of the milk arrived in Syria so far has been distributed through GFD (for a volume of more than 405 metric tonnes). Milk, although through GFA, targeted children aged 5 to 12, mainly in Aleppo.

The MR is to permanently allow transfer of milk distribution to Fortified School Snacks Program (FSSP) to General Food distribution (GFD) under specific conditions (conditions deemed relevant for the partner to justify inability to distribute through schools; transparent and frequent reporting; target children; description of mitigation measures, etc.) if need arises.

endorses the Modification request for the following reasons: Motivations: (1) the actual regulatory difficulties in the implementation of the action, as outlined in a report shared by WFP and in annex; (2) to avoid incurring in risks related to the (rather short) shelf life of the commodities (3) and related reputational risks associated with possible damages; (4) to avoid destruction of the product (5) to keep operational flexibility and adaptability (based on an open and sustained operational communication) vis a vis the partner

On strict operational grounds, we believe the approach taken is justified as the distribution through GFD by addressing needs of children was way better than the alternative solution, which would have been the destruction of the milk. We also consider that this action is a "premiere" for WFP (UHT procurement - shipment - clearance and distribution) and that the logistics/legal constraints are even more complex for the nature of the products (UHT as per EC requests instead of powder milk, for instance), therefore such operational challenges were potential risks.

The MR has been extensively discussed at field and HQ level and it only concern the possible use of GFD as modality and the consequent adaptation of the indicators to the ones required for the general food distribution.

ECHO acknowledges the difficulty of implementation due to administrative / logistics impediments, and therefore DO agrees with the request.

**Amendment ARES number:**  
Ares(2017)1918138

**Amendment issued on:**  
11/04/2017

**Amendment transmitted on:**  
11/04/2017

## MODIFICATION REQUEST Nr 2 - CONTEXT

:

**Date of final comment:**  
05/07/2017

:

**Date of final comment:**  
05/07/2017

RO:

**Date of final comment:**

-

-



ECHO reference nr of first modification request:  
2016/01021/MR/02/01

First modification request submission date:  
20/06/2017

ECHO reference nr of last modification request:  
2016/01021/MR/02/01

Last modification request submission date:  
20/06/2017

## MODIFICATION REQUEST Nr 2 - MODIFIED ELEMENTS

### Elements to be modified with Partner's justification:

[MR2] During the planning phase, WFP estimated to procure 17,500 mt of milk over the course of the action, with an annual requirement of almost 9,000 mt. However, the price of milk was lower than initially anticipated, which resulted in a revised projection of a total of almost 23,000 mt of milk to be procured over the course of the action. In addition, significant challenges faced in the supply and customs clearance procedures experienced since the beginning of the action, meant that WFP could only distribute approximately 50 percent of the planned milk quantities during the 2016-17 school year, leaving a greater quantity to be distributed over the next school year. Of these quantities, 4,800 mt have already been procured and distributed during the 2016-17 academic year, leaving approximately 18,000 mt of milk to be distributed during the 2017-18 academic year.

This, combined with the overall increase of milk quantities to be procured and distributed under this action, prompted WFP to adjust its distribution plans for the 2017-18 school year and increase the number of governorates in order to be able to absorb the additional milk supplies. Accordingly, during the 2017-18 school year WFP will double the milk ration provided to school children during school days, targeting 500,000 children across ten of the 14 Syrian governorates. Each child will receive two packs of milk (for a total of 400 ml) on each school day. Combined with the fortified date bar ration, this will ensure a caloric transfer of 588 Kcal per child, covering approximately one third of the child's requirement and approximately 70 percent of the Calcium requirements. This modification is in line with the World Health Organisation's (WHO) dietary guidelines for school-age children, which recommend the consumption of two to four servings of milk per day.

As indicated in the first Modification Request, a portion of the milk procured under this action will be reallocated to General Food Assistance if operational conditions require reallocation. During the 2016-17 school year, 482 mt of milk were reallocated to GFA, reaching approximately 167,000 children. During the 2017-18 school year, around 9,000 mt may be reallocated to GFA. The quantity of milk to be distributed under GFA will vary depending on operational conditions that will determine the extent and timeframe of reallocations (Please see Annex VII for additional details)

### Scope of requested modification:

Budget: No

Timeframe: No

Operational: Yes

## MODIFICATION REQUEST Nr 2 - [REDACTED] ACCEPTANCE

The modification request is in agreement with DG ECHO procedures? Yes

The modification request is in line with the relevant decision? Yes

The modification request is complete? Yes

The modification request is acceptable for appraisal? Yes

### [REDACTED] decision justification:

Extensively discussed at HQ and Field level

## MODIFICATION REQUEST Nr 2 - REGIONAL OFFICE APPRAISAL

## Comments of RO on the policy coherence:

## MODIFICATION REQUEST Nr 2 - [REDACTED] APPRAISAL

**Comments on the elements to be modified:**

The modification request is including 1) increase of the quantity distributed to each child in school 2) increase number of locations and 3) the inclusion of GFD in addition to the initial school snack support. This modification is required since 1) the overall quantity of milk available under the funding is higher than expected due to lower costs (23,800MT vs 17,500MT; +31%) 2) limited quantity distributed during the school year 2016-2017 (4,830MT amounting to 50% of the initial MT planned) due to legal and administrative (customs clearance related detailed in MR01) and 3) Administrative internal complication (special decision) in order to extend the duration of the action beyond the original duration of 24 months.

The main modifications are as follow (as per Annex I, VII, and IX):

**Locations:** As per annex I and IX, WFP planned to include, in addition to existing governorates (Aleppo, Homs, RD/Damascus, Tartous, and Hama), the following locations have been included: Lattakia, Quneitra, Da'ra, Suweida. The locations are relevant according to the initial GFD plan and vulnerabilities identified (section 3.1.3 and other ECHO supported action under the reference 2017/00629/RQ/01/02). AL Hassakieh have been removed due to protracted access issues (ie. Raqqa offensive, and requirement for airlift and un-clarity on road access).

**Beneficiaries:** Overall beneficiaries of 500,000 children per month remain unchanged. However, if considering Annex IX, it is clear that 4 months (out of the 6 planned for the overall school year) will not be reached, due to stocking limitations, consideration regarding high temperature and school holidays (all justified elements). Therefore, the total of children should be complement by inclusion in GFD (target of 600,000 beneficiaries). The target value is justified as the planned MT (see below) will allow a distribution of monthlies supplies to up to of 600,000 children "for a maximum of three monthly cycles".

**Result 1.** As mentioned above, due to the change of rate, the overall quantity distributed amounts to 22,800 MT. As far, as R1 is concerned (distribution to school), the amount planned for 2017-2018 year is 18,000MT (22,800 minus the 4,800MT distributed over the year 2016-2017), which will be render possible by doubling the overall daily milk ration for each pupil (See section for 3.1.4 for reference to WHO guidelines). However, partner is mentioning that "the amount of milk to be distributed under R1 might vary depending on the operational conditions (shelf life, logistics timeline, security) and the quantities to be reallocated to GFA (annex VII). As mention in section 3.4.1, the partner is also referring to the fact that the estimates are based on current rates and could undergo modifications upon results of next tender, which could impact on the initial distribution plan for R1 and R2.

**Result 2.** As per comments on beneficiaries, maximum amount potentially allocated under GFD is 9,000 MT (1/2 of 18,000MT to be distributed). This could allow coverage for 600,000 children for a maximum of three monthly cycles. It is understood that focus on school remains the main objective (section 3.1.4 and Annex I), and that inclusion within GFA is only the alternative (if no other solution is possible an under specific conditions outlined in as per Annex VII, and see also comments MR01). As per partner feedback, it part of the milk procured under this action might be reallocated to General Food Assistance if required by the operational conditions described and the maximum percentage of 5% of milk to be reallocated as agreed in MR1 will be lifted.

**Budget:** The overall budget of the operation increased from 53,031,335 to 54,421,308 (+1,389,973 / +2.62%), while contribution of ECHO remains unchanged ta 30MEU (55%). It is important to note that the increase is mainly related to support costs (HR, logistics), while the contribution for milk remains unchanged (23,122,319.97, ie. 77% of total ECHO contribution). For note, the total budget has been

updated within the eSF (see action for follow-up).

#### **Assessment of Partner's justification of the modifications:**

All modifications required are in line with meeting and discussion which took place in Brussels (see mail on 02.06.2017 Re: Update on the Milk Scheme - inside Syria - developments - readout meeting WFP 01/06) on June 2017, upon request by WFP after recognition of impossibility to deliver the amount within the timeframe and operational framework agreed (MR01). It includes: 1) doubling (400ml) per child per day in school 2) flexibility to allocate to GFA based on operational / logistics necessities identified (without the previous limit of 5%, which was justified within the MR01 but not relevant anymore under MR02, in order to allow more flexibility for the partner).

As per partner feedback, during the planning phase, WFP estimated to procure 17,500 mt of milk over the course of the action, with an annual requirement of almost 9,000 mt. However, the price of milk was lower than initially anticipated, which resulted in a revised projection of a total of almost 22,800 mt of milk to be procured over the course of the action. In addition, significant bureaucratic and logistics hurdles meant that WFP could only distribute 4,830MT during the 2016-17 school year, leaving around 18,000MT to be distributed over the next school year. Importantly and under MR01, 4,346.993 mt were distributed in schools under the School Meals programme reaching almost 260,000 school children during the 2016-17 academic year. The remaining 482.697 mt were distributed under the GFA programme reaching approximately 167,000 children aged 5-12 years old once. This was approved under MR01 in order to avoid the destruction of the milk.

MR02 will effectively allow WFP to maintain the option to reallocate part of the milk quantities to the GFA programme when the operational conditions, outlined under MR01 and updated in MR02 (annex VII), require. Should delays in the receipt and/or delivery of the milk to schools require a swift distribution of milk quantities in a limited timeframe (subject to the shelf life), WFP will distribute the concerned quantities as part of the general food assistance, along with the family monthly food rations, when operational conditions require. As per WFP commitment, the tonnage allocated to GFA will not exceed the quantities distributed in schools during the action period.

From a technical perspective, WFP mentioned that the World Health Organization (WHO) dietary guidelines for school-age children recommend the consumption of two to four servings of milk per day, where one serving is a 200 ml portion, amounting to a caloric transfer of 588 Kcal per child, approximately one-third of the child's daily caloric requirement, as well as around 70 percent of the Calcium requirements. On the other hand, the partner highlights that beneficiaries outreach and awareness raising efforts will be in place to avoid a negative impact of milk provision on breastfeeding practices. Finally, the variation of total budget is minimal (considering the overall amount) and does not affect the overall action.

Overall, the MR02 is recommended as it will allow the action to be completed within the 24 months' timeframe. The results are well articulated and offer a certain level of operational flexibility (School/ GFA). Mitigations measures and mechanisms of decision are clearly identified in WFP. Within the logic of this action (which has been extensively commented by [REDACTED]), modifications are relevant and necessary (considering also that they are in line with final discussions which took place at HQ level). Important to note that the partner asserted on many occasions the fact that the action remains subject to changes as the overall quantity of milk might change based on the coming tender process for the remaining milk.

Finally, the two MRs highlight the administrative, legal and logistics constraints inherent to this type of programming (imported liquid milk originating from EU), which originally did not respond to a need identified on the ground by the partner (but was initiated by EU). Such changes in the action could be expected due to the "pilot" dimension of the project for WFP (and ECHO).

#### **Policy coherence (including comments from the RO - if applicable):**

MR is in line with EC priorities outlined under Implementing Decision (ECHO/-ME/BUD/2016/01000)

#### **Issues for action / for follow-up:**

- Follow up in ESF – Budget update
- Follow- up on procurement next batch (tender process)
- Follow-up of distribution plan implementation (monthly reporting)
- Follow up on mitigations measures implemented
- Follow up on investigation on other locations of activities or alternative modalities (although partners highlighted clear constraints on this matter)

Should ECHO agree on this modification request?

Yes

#### Justification of the recommendation:

As mentioned above, MR is recommended in order to allow WFP to complete the activity (since process of extension of duration, which was originally proposed by WFP, reveals to be lengthy and uncertain under the implementing decision ECHO/-ME/BUD/2016/01000). The proposal for the alternative allocation would allow more flexibility to the partner. Also, WFP clearly stated that the school students remain the priority, which is in line with the original intent. Importantly enough, WFP showed a great deal of compliance and flexibility with ECHO requirement, and ensure formal and informal communication on the project.

Finally, it would be also recommended for DG ECHO to conduct an internal evaluation of the project over its implementation (ECHO requirement / operational reality), from the original initiative (EU based) to the implications of various MRs (and constraints identified) and impact of the action (within the overall frame of the overall Syria humanitarian response and ECHO principles of intervention ).

## MODIFICATION REQUEST Nr 2 - [REDACTED] APPRAISAL

#### Instructions for Desk Assistant for the amendment (Article 6, Interim Reports)

N/A

#### Issues for action / for follow-up:

- WFP to provide the update for June, mentioning the issues that made this MR necessary
- follow up with state of procurement and distributions in the coming months, including the ratio for GFA and the mitigation measures for breastfeeding/market disruption etc, as highlighted by TA.

Should ECHO agree on this modification request?

Yes

**decision justification:**

The project aims at distributing at least 17 500 metric tonnes of UHT liquid milk of European Origin to 500 000 school children inside Syria. The milk is complementing an existing school feeding programme carried out by UNICEF and WFP and covers 400 schools in GoS controlled area in Homs, Damascus, Rural Damascus, Tartous, Quneitra and Latakia governorates. The project is at its half way now, it started in June 2016 and will end in June 2018, encompassing 2 school years. The project is encoded under a special HIP, and has been approved by MSs with a written procedure. WFP approached [REDACTED] in Damascus to flag issues with the quantities to be distributed and to find an agreed solution. Under a legal perspective an extension was not deemed possible and advisable (this is a one-off operation, as clarified by MSs that were involved in negotiating its approval). A meeting took place on 30/05 in Damascus on this topic with WFP and [REDACTED], followed by a meeting in BXL between ECHO HQ and WFP BXL. During the meetings, the following information was disclosed: WFP, at procurement stage, negotiated a lower than expected price per litre: this is due to price fluctuations in the milk market. This would allow WFP to buy at least 24 000 metric tons of milk (instead of 17 500, as per initial proposal), equal to an increase of around 37% of quantity to distribute. As of end of May, WFP distributed 5 000 metric tonnes of milk to 250 000 children (1/3 of the total quantity in 1/2 of the time). In addition, 4000 metric tonnes are already procured and will be shipped to Syria in September/October. On timing, there is one school-year left to perform distributions. Distributions are not ongoing during summer, because with high temperatures the risks of bad storage and conservation for such a delicate product are too high (this was understood and is justified according to HQ and field assessment). It will be not feasible to distribute 24 000 metric tonnes instead, in the same timeframe. Among the various options looked at, several presented unsurmountable issues (legal/administrative/access), also considering that any change in the operation should be done in consultation with 6 ministries involved in giving clearances. Therefore, the following line has been agreed at HQ and field level, including senior management and cabinet level, which is reflected in the present MR:

1. Modify the quantity of milk distributed *per child* : up to 400 ml, instead of 200 ml. This will not have an impact on the number of total beneficiaries for the following point 3. This is in line with nutrition policies as stressed by [REDACTED] assessment.
2. WFP will look at the logistics/administrative possibilities to expand the school network in the short term and come back to us should this possibility ever realizes. This should not be considered a commitment but just an attempt to ensure that all options were taken into account, since adding new schools to the programme would imply administrative/bureaucratic issues in relations with GoS, that has to agree upon.
3. Increase the flexibility to use GFA (General food distribution), "whenever needed". Since the first aim of the project has to remain to feed school children, WFP will provide indicative projections on which share this could represent. WFP will perform accurate market and nutrition analysis when using milk in GFA.

All the above considered, the DO endorses the MR and recommends its approval as soon as possible.

**Amendment ARES number:**  
Ares(2017)3534173

**Amendment issued on:**  
13/07/2017

**Amendment transmitted on:**  
13/07/2017

**INTERIM REPORT Nr 1 - CONTEXT**

[REDACTED]:

**Date of final comment:**  
17/10/2017

[REDACTED]:

**Date of final comment:**  
17/10/2017

**RO:**  
-

**Date of final comment:**  
-

**Due date:** 01/08/2017

**Submission date:** 08/09/2017

**Delay (in days):** 38

## INTERIM REPORT Nr 1 - REGIONAL OFFICE COMMENTS

Comments of RO on the policy coherence:

## INTERIM REPORT Nr 1 - [REDACTED] COMMENTS

### Comment on the need for interim report:

As the project duration is of 24 months, an intermediate report 10 months before the end day is recommended.

### Main highlights from the interim report:

#### Location

- During the reporting period, and in line with MR2, activities took place in 7 initial governorates and additional 3 in southern part of the country (Quneitra, Suweida and Da'ra). Also, Hassakieh governorate has to be removed due to access constraints, as the area has been difficult to reach by road (Aleppo road opened only in past two-three months and only by airlift before). In section 4.2.3.1, it is mentioned that 11 governorates have been reached, including DeZ. This includes only date bars (high altitude airdrops), and therefore is not supported by ECHO.

### Assessment

- WFP reported on the launch of new food Security assessment (July 2017) and CFSAM (May 2017). Preliminary feedback from CFSAM reported a slight improvement of wheat production (which remains 47% less than pre-war level). Coming to livestock, the following reduction has been mentioned: Cattle (40%), sheep (45%), goats (30%), and poultry (56%). Subsequently, livestock production (milk and cheese) have doubled compared to previous year and increased 600% compared to pre-war level. This led to proliferation of dairy product based on powder milk. In addition WFP PDM had shown that 59% of HHs surveyed has low or medium dietary diversity (especially in HTR and BSG). Also 2/3 of low dietary diversity HH do not consume dairy products.

### Beneficiaries/ Specific indicator

- Total number of beneficiaries reached amounts to 584,500 (116% of target value) from December 2016 to May 2017 in 1,671 schools in sub-districts with high prevalence of food insecurity. As for the fortified snack School program (date bars), the total # of beneficiaries reached 650,000 (vs. 750,000) pupils in pre-primary and primary schools (86% of planned beneficiaries), from 5 to 12 years old. It is important to note that ECHO is not supporting the date bars, but milk exclusively which has been added as a complement of date bars within the frame of FSSP. The total beneficiaries of UHT milk are including 298,094 (51%) boys and 286,406 girls (49%). It is to be considered that the figure of 585,500 reflects the monthly distribution (the highest month); the average children reached through UHT is at 281,000. The discrepancy can be explained by problem of access which WFP has faced over the action (section 4.2.3.1), including: access problem to Hassakieh (only reachable by costly airlift), late FSSP approval by GoS (in Dar'a and Suweida governorate), quality issue in Hama (November 2016 – January 2017), and overall delay of the supply of milk (due to administrative burden – see below) which started in December (vs. original plan in October). As a result, the distribution could take place only over 90 days of the school days of the academic year (vs 135 for date bars), although it covered 97% of the 93 remaining days.
- As per indicator of attendance SO2 and SO3, attendance reported is overachieved by 11% and 10%, although WFP noted that in first quarter 2017, the attendance dropped drastically due to harsh

winter conditions and security situation in Aleppo. As for the Kcal transfer, WFP reported a total of 388 (vs 460). This is mainly due to delay in launch of UHT milk distribution since the indicator is an average over the action (basically from February 2017, kcal transfer reached more than 440 with a highest of 454Kcal). The justification on SO5 (13 vs 12 as target value) is unclear as repeating the SO4, while SO6 is reporting a 12.4 as average Coping strategy index (CSI) among population assisted through GFA. SO5 and 6 have been added as per inclusion of UHT milk under the GFA (R2).

## **Result 1. Nutrition food (fortified date bars and UHT milk) distributed in sufficient quantity, quality and**

### **Timely to targeted school children**

WFP planned to distribute a total 16,275 mt of FSSP, including 7,272 mt of date bars and 9,000 UHT milk. At the end of the action, 8,106 mt were distributed, including 4,505 UHT milk (around 50% of the total amount planned) and 3,601 fortified bars (for note, in R1 Transfer modalities, partner reported 7,623mt of fortified snacks, including 3,601mt of date bar), out of which 477 mt of milk were included in GFA (included under MR02 (for note under R1 Transfer modalities, partner reported more specifically 4,024 mt of UHT milk distributed in school)).

The low implementation rate is mainly due to lengthy administrative procedures, which are extensively informed in the ESF and annex, as well as late approvals and deterioration of security situation (ie. regular constraints identified in Syria operations). For note, the delays in the launch of the operation have been extensively discussed with WFP at Field and HQ level over the MR01 (march 2017).

## **Result 2. Stabilized or improved food consumption over assistance period for targeted HH and/or individuals**

This result was added in order to avoid large quantities of milk due to important unforeseen delays in customs approval. The rationale for inclusion of milk under GFA has been extensively covered in MR01. For information, it has been agreed to keep inclusion in GFA under specific conditions detailed in MR01.

Over the academic year 2016-17, WFP distributed 477mt of milk through the GFA programme., representing 55% of the planned tonnage reallocation for the year. It benefited 160,000 (as 167,000 previously reported was erroneous). The milk was distributed in one round as one-off monthly transfers in January (96% distributed) and February (4% distributed) to families in Aleppo (43%), Latakia (32%) and Tartous/Homs (25%) with children between 5 and 12 years old. In order to avoid any negative impact on breast feeding, information, defined by nutrition sector, was provided with the GFA package (leaflet) and was also given on distribution site. 52% of distribution site (including UHT milk) have been monitored, while PDM showed that 59% of the surveyed HH had low or medium dietary diversity, including limited consumption of dairy products.

### **Operational (quality and progress of implementation):**

Although low compared to initial proposal, the reported achievements are in line with WFP indications of MR02 and discussion which took place at field level over the first half of 2017. It is essential to consider the "piloting" dimension of the action, as none of the UN agency (or INGO) did attempt to import fresh products to that extent inside Syria. This can explain the delay due to the complexity of negotiations with GoS, and the multiple layers of procedures indeed required for import of fresh milk (which is a condition requested by EU on WFP for this action) as well as the involvement of more than 4 line ministries on this matter. The issues mentioned are extensively covered in narrative of MR01/02 as well as IR and annex I (section 6.3.1). In addition, it has to be considered that "usual" constraints witness inside Syria (Security, authorization from GoS for all movements of items inside the country) as well as specific limitations to milk supply (storage, limited shelf life, etc...). However, despite the constraints, WFP managed to actually launch the action (indeed with delay). And if considering the reported results, the action actually reached the intended beneficiaries and impact positively on the nutrition status of the most vulnerable (see indicator results). The inclusion of GFA is implemented under strict conditions (agreed by ECHO). In addition, WFP actually managed to negotiate two waivers with Syrian authorities, on shelf life requirement (2 instead of 3 months)



and possibility to uplift milk immediately after the collection of lab test in order to ensure storage in WFP warehouse (rather than lower quality storage conditions at the port). This shows the pro-activeness of WFP to ensure a smooth supply chain and implementation of the planned action.

As agreed, for the academic year 2017-18, WFP will increase the number of governorates and double the ration provided to children to ensure the distribution as planned. WFP also consider inclusion in GFA (while total amount should not go over the quantities provided in schools). Following extensive discussions over the summer 2017 (especially regarding the storage conditions or packaging requirement), the tender for 11,800mt has been initiated. WFP highlighted that the packaging requirement (200ml) added another layer of complexity to the operation (as it reduces the number of supplier able to produce the quantities required on time).

As a conclusion, the results reported, although low, are in line with expected outcomes after both MRs. A close monitoring of the action for academic year 2017-2018 is in place.

#### **Capacity of the Partner (and of implementing Partners - if applicable):**

WFP is the main FS partner for Damascus led operations and a major FS actor at regional level. The UN agency has established field presence hubs in affected governorates and is able to access directly (national staff and to a lesser extent expatriate) and indirectly (via a extensive third party monitoring system) field operations. In addition, WFP developed strong relations central and local Syrian authorities and other relevant UN agencies (UNICEF/UNFPA/UNHCR). For note, there are very few UN agencies, but WFP, which actually has the capacity for such level of advocacy (at ministry level) done in order to facilitate the procurement / arrival / distribution of milk of EU origin. In this regard, it is important to highlight that WFP contributed almost exclusively to the opening of the axis Damascus – Aleppo – Mambij – Hassakieh due to bi lateral negotiation with GoS (and which benefited to all Damascus based humanitarian operators).

#### **Financial (budget execution):**

Budget execution is amounting to 8,470,080EU (85% of the initial total budget of 53,301,355 EU, for a total contribution of 30,000,000 – 56.29%). The rate is in line with reported implementation level and identified constraints.

#### **Policy coherence (including RO comments - if applicable):**

All comments related to policy coherence have been highlighted in previous RQ/MR by [REDACTED]. The overall recommendations remain valid.

#### **Issues for action / for follow-up:**

- Review of monthly distribution plan
- Review of Map of interventions
- Clarifications on figures / indicators on reported discrepancies over the IR
- Close monitoring of action 2017-2018, including agreed formal reporting / informal monthly meeting.

## **INTERIM REPORT Nr 1 - [REDACTED] COMMENTS**

#### **Comment on the need for interim report:**

As the project duration is of 24 months, an intermediate report 10 months before the end day is recommended.

Action on track? Yes

Minor problems? Yes

Major problems? Yes



**Issues for action / for follow-up:**

WFP is doing its best to implement this challenging operation inside Syria. On the bright side, targets in terms of beneficiaries are reached in a satisfactory way: in fact the maximum number of beneficiaries reached per month is 584 500 children, which amounts to 116% of the target. However, the average reach is 281 000.

According to the field debrief on the ongoing operation, beneficiaries are satisfied with the milk ratios received and milk continues to be a very rare and expensive product in the markets. Through the life of the operation, 2 MR allowed also to increase the dose per child (in accordance with WHO guidelines, who fix the maximum to a ration of 800 ml per day per child) and allows WFP to distribute the milk through GFA.

While stressing the bright sides of the operation, nonetheless the activities require a lot of effort from WFP in terms of negotiations with the authorities, implement in accordance with changing technical specification for stockage, distribution, conservation etc. and with lack of access in several areas of the country.

Furthermore, after a decrease in milk prices in 2017, the quantity of milk to be purchased will be higher, which is a good element in terms of cost efficiency, but an obstacle in terms of timely distribution of a quantity of milk higher than originally planned. This aspect has been extensively discussed at MR stage.

Further delays after the 2 MR are expected due to a change from Syrian side of milk specifications. This is likely to have an impact on distribution timing. According to information shared by WFP in October 2017, the distributions in schools will restart for academic year 2017/2018 not earlier than in November. The packaging will have to be reviewed because of the changes in specifications. Hopefully the use of GFA and the new ration of milk per student will allow to consume the expected quantities within the lifetime of the product according to the Syrian regulatory environment, which limits the life of milk to a timeframe of 2 months (while the UHT milk is drinkable for at least one more month).

The communication channel is opened with the partner, that is making significant efforts to respect the contract deadlines.

The partner has been requested to restart sending monthly report, as even if distributions will only take place again in November, procurement according to the new Syrian technical specification for milk have already started. The review of map of intervention is helpful should access become possible in new areas in the course of next month.

Among follow up points, [REDACTED] will seek for clarification on indicators. In fact, in R1 (***Nutrition food - fortified date bars and UHT milk) distributed in sufficient quantity, quality and Timely to targeted school children***) is it mentioned that WFP planned to distribute a total 16,275 mt of FSSP, including 7,272 mt of date bars and 9,000 UHT milk. At the end of the action, 8,106 mt were distributed, including 4,505 UHT milk (around 50% of the total amount planned) and 3,601 fortified bars (for note, in R1 Transfer modalities, partner reported 7,623mt of fortified snacks, including 3,601mt of date bar), out of which 477 mt of milk were included in GFA (included under MR02 (for note under R1 Transfer modalities, partner reported more specifically 4,024 mt of UHT milk distributed in school)).

All the issues related to this contract are well known to WFP, [REDACTED], ECHO HQ, and there are constant updates. Therefore, no need to send emails to any interlocutor.

**Text to be included into the official letter to Partner:**

Official letter ARES number:

-

Official letter issued on:

-

Official letter transmitted on:

-

E-mail sent by [REDACTED] ?

No

E-mail sent by [REDACTED] ?

No

**REQUEST - REPORTS MANAGEMENT**

End date of the action:

31/05/2018

Interim reports schedule:

| # | Number of months before the end of the Action | Interim reports due dates |
|---|---|---------------------------|
| 1 | 10  | 31/07/2017                |

**Comments on the need for Interim reporting:**  
As the project duration is of 24 months, an intermediate report 10 months before the end day is recommended.

OVERVIEW - REPORTS & REMINDERS

Interim reports

| # | Due date   | ECHO reference      | Submission date | Delay (in days) |
|---|------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1 | 31/07/2017 | 2016/01021/IR/01/01 | 08/09/2017      | 39              |

Interim reports reminders

|   |                       |
|---|-----------------------|
| 1 | Reminder ARES number: |
|   | -                     |

Final report

| # | Due date   | ECHO reference | Submission date | Delay (in days) |
|---|------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1 | 31/08/2018 | -              | -               | -               |

Final report reminder

|                       |
|-----------------------|
| Reminder ARES number: |
| -                     |

OVERVIEW - QUALITY MARKERS

The markers are not applicable for actions of "complementary activities" type.  
**GENDER AND AGE**

|         | Proposal | Monitoring Report | Final Report |
|---------|----------|-------------------|--------------|
| Partner | 2        | -                 | -            |
|         | 1        | -                 | -            |
| :       | 1        | -                 | -            |

**comments at the proposal stage:**

In line with ECHO standards. However, due to the constraints of access, it is difficult to have a strong implication of beneficiaries in the design of the project.

**comments at the proposal stage:**

The FSSP answers some of the specific food and educational needs of boys and girls.

- In addition, the FSSP aims at encouraging school enrolment and attendance, thus reducing the exposure of children and adolescents to serious protection concerns.
- Data gathered through internal reporting procedures will be sex and age disaggregated.

**comments at the monitoring report stage:**

-

**comments at the final report stage:**

-

**comments at the final report stage:**

-

## RESILIENCE

---

|         | Proposal | Monitoring Report | Final Report |
|---------|----------|-------------------|--------------|
| Partner | 2        | -                 | -            |
|         | 1        | -                 | -            |
| :       | 1        | -                 | -            |

**comments at the proposal stage:**

NTR

**comments at the proposal stage:**

While the ECHO-funded component of the Action is limited to the provision of EU-produced milk, the overall programme co-financed by DG NEAR directly contributes to the local economy through the local purchase of date bars, which is a component of WFP livelihoods and resilience strategy.

- Ensuring children's continued education through efforts to maintain high school enrolment and attendance rates is also essential for the resilience of a population.

**comments at the monitoring report stage:**

-

**comments at the final report stage:**

-

**comments at the final report stage:**

-

## ISSUES FOR ACTION / FOR FOLLOW-UP

### PROPOSAL STAGE

---

Encoded by the [REDACTED] :

---

- Review of the details of the supply chain (including tendering process, procurement of milk and transportation to Syria) and transportation inside Syria
- Clarifications on locations reached by X-border or Regular programming (X-Damascus)
- Clarification on issues of access to Al Hassakieh governorate (Nussaybin crossing point closed)
- Additional information on IPs capacity and list of areas not accessible by WFP staff (and reached by IPs)
- Further clarification on the component of the budget.
- Review/update of the distribution plan / review of the locations planned (after the first months of implementation)
- Inclusion of a reporting element stating on two months basis: Number of beneficiaries reached / Amounts distributed (overview of distribution) / Areas reached / Any issues etc.

Encoded by the [REDACTED] :

---

As in the second version of the action the partner was not capable to provide the requested information also due to the tender to procure UHT milk of EU origin to be launched shortly, detailed information will have to be provided as soon as available. An article will be included in the agreement with detailed elements to be addressed.

Follow up need:

- Follow up on access restrictions, in particular regarding deliveries through the Nusaybin border crossing point and implementation of activities in Al-Hasakeh governorate.
- A follow-up survey is to be conducted by WFP to measure the nutritional impact of the Action.
- Detailed info on location reached through XB and from Damascus.
- Review of details of the supply chain.
- Information on additional IP to be selected during the implementation.
- Budget ( detailed on how much for commodities, logistics, HR,etc)

#### AMENDMENT STAGE

---

Encoded by the [REDACTED] :

---

**MR/01**

- Follow- up on procurement / distribution of next batch (monthly report) and potential reallocation
- Issue of vulnerability of population targeted by GFD (including milk), ie. areas of high concentration of IDPS will be followed closely (see Section 2.1
- Follow up on mitigations measures outlined in Annex VII section 3. (negotiations with GoS and suppliers)
- Follow up on investigation on other locations of activities (XB) or alternative modalities (which is not mentioned in the MR, but included in initial Fichop)
- Regular communication on milk operation at field level (ongoing)

**MR/02**

- Follow up in ESF – Budget update
- Follow- up on procurement next batch (tender process)
- Follow-up of distribution plan implementation (monthly reporting)
- Follow up on mitigations measures implemented
- Follow up on investigation on other locations of activities or alternative modalities (although partners highlighted clear constraints on this matter)

Encoded by the [REDACTED] :

---

**MR/01**

Going on engaging with WFP to understand the expectations for the coming months for the program (mitigation measures and negotiations outcomes).

Continue requiring constant updates on ongoing distributions.

**MR/02**

- WFP to provide the update for June, mentioning the issues that made this MR necessary
- follow up with state of procurement and distributions in the coming months, including the ratio for GFA and the mitigation measures for breastfeeding/market disruption etc, as highlighted by TA.

**MONITORING REPORT STAGE**

---

Encoded by the [REDACTED] :

---

Encoded by the [REDACTED] :

---

**INTERIM REPORT STAGE**

---

Encoded by the [REDACTED] :

#### IR/01

- Review of monthly distribution plan
- Review of Map of interventions
- Clarifications on figures / indicators on reported discrepancies over the IR
- Close monitoring of action 2017-2018, including agreed formal reporting / informal monthly meeting.

Encoded by the [REDACTED] :

#### IR/01

WFP is doing its best to implement this challenging operation inside Syria. On the bright side, targets in terms of beneficiaries are reached in a satisfactory way: in fact the maximum number of beneficiaries reached per month is 584 500 children, which amounts to 116% of the target. However, the average reach is 281 000.

According to the field debrief on the ongoing operation, beneficiaries are satisfied with the milk ratios received and milk continues to be a very rare and expensive product in the markets. Through the life of the operation, 2 MR allowed also to increase the dose per child (in accordance with WHO guidelines, who fix the maximum to a ration of 800 ml per day per child) and allows WFP to distribute the milk through GFA.

While stressing the bright sides of the operation, nonetheless the activities require a lot of effort from WFP in terms of negotiations with the authorities, implement in accordance with changing technical specification for stockage, distribution, conservation etc. and with lack of access in several areas of the country.

Furthermore, after a decrease in milk prices in 2017, the quantity of milk to be purchased will be higher, which is a good element in terms of cost efficiency, but an obstacle in terms of timely distribution of a quantity of milk higher than originally planned. This aspect has been extensively discussed at MR stage.

Further delays after the 2 MR are expected due to a change from Syrian side of milk specifications. This is likely to have an impact on distribution timing. According to information shared by WFP in October 2017, the distributions in schools will restart for academic year 2017/2018 not earlier than in November. The packaging will have to be reviewed because of the changes in specifications. Hopefully the use of GFA and the new ration of milk per student will allow to consume the expected quantities within the lifetime of the product according to the Syrian regulatory environment, which limits the life of milk to a timeframe of 2 months (while the UHT milk is drinkable for at least one more month).

The communication channel is opened with the partner, that is making significant efforts to respect the contract deadlines.

The partner has been requested to restart sending monthly report, as even if distributions will only take place again in November, procurement according to the new Syrian technical specification for milk have already started. The review of map of intervention is helpful should access become possible in new areas in the course of next month.

Among follow up points, [REDACTED] will seek for clarification on indicators. In fact, in R1 (**Nutrition food - fortified date bars and UHT milk) distributed in sufficient quantity, quality and Timely to targeted school children**) is it mentioned that WFP planned to distribute a total 16,275 mt of FSSP, including 7,272 mt of date bars and 9,000 UHT milk. At the end of the action, 8,106 mt were distributed, including 4,505 UHT milk (around 50% of the total amount planned) and 3,601 fortified bars (for note, in R1 Transfer modalities, partner reported 7,623mt of fortified snacks, including 3,601mt of date bar), out of which 477 mt of milk were included in GFA (included under MR02 (for note under R1 Transfer modalities, partner reported more specifically 4,024 mt of UHT milk distributed in school)).

All the issues related to this contract are well known to WFP, field expert, ECHO HQ, and there are constant updates. Therefore, no need to send emails to any interlocutor.

### SUSPENSION STAGE

Encoded by [REDACTED] :

Encoded by [REDACTED] :

### FINAL REPORT STAGE - MEASURES TAKEN TO ADDRESS PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED ISSUES

Encoded by [REDACTED] :

Encoded by [REDACTED] :

FINAL REPORT STAGE - LESSONS LEARNT FOR FUTURE ACTIONS

Encoded by [REDACTED] :

-

Encoded by [REDACTED] :

-

ARES DOCUMENTS

PROPOSAL STAGE

Agreement ARES number:

2422005

-

AMENDMENT STAGE

MR/01 - Amendment ARES number:

Ares(2017)1918138

11/04/2017

MR/02 - Amendment ARES number:

Ares(2017)3534173

13/07/2017

MONITORING REPORT STAGE

INTERIM REPORT STAGE

SUSPENSION STAGE

FINAL REPORT STAGE

EXCEPTIONAL TERMINATION

EVENTS HISTORY

PROPOSAL STAGE

1. Wait on Partner (new version)
- 2016/01021/RQ/01/01
- 27/04/2016 08:24:21 – 04/05/2016 14:20:44
- [REDACTED]

Dear WFP colleagues,

Thank you for submitting the proposal titled *Emergency Food Assistance to People Affected by Unrest in Syria*, reference **2016/01021**, following the financing decision ECHO/-ME/BUD/2016/01000 for the distribution of dairy products as part of the response to humanitarian crises from the general budget of the European Union.

After a first assessment, we would like to consider your proposal further for funding for a total amount of **€30M**.

However, before we can appraise it positively, we would like you discuss with you several elements. Kindly find below our general and specific comments/remarks that should be reflected in the new version of the Single Form that **has to be re-submitted by 09/05/2016**.

- *General comments:*

- Please consider that DG ECHO is intending to support **exclusively** the drinking milk of EU origin action within the frame of the FSSP. Dates bars are not included under the ECHO supported activities. Please revise some numerical inconsistencies (*the figures of milk in Section 3.1.4 / 1.3 and synergies with other actions (2.2) or Result or activity? (4) are different: 17,500MT vs 10,000MT vs 17,457MT*).
- < > Please provide more budgetary evidence/information (transportation, HR, distribution, etc...) in relation to such ECHO supported operation. Please explain how you plan to use the difference between EUR 30 million and the costs related to the procured amount of the commodity (some EUR 23 million).< > if possible, please provide more information on the duration of the school year (approximate number of school days planned).< > It is stated that the schools will be selected "in sub-districts with high food security indicators" in "coordination with UNICEF". Please provide an indicative list of schools and map of targeted areas, and clarify challenges in areas of interventions such as Hassakieh (Nussaybin border crossing point closed). Please ensure that **protection** dimension is integrated in the selection of the schools targeted.< > Please clarify if the action includes Cross-border component (although most unlikely considering areas of intervention and coordination with the MoE).

**Implementing partner:** please provide additional information on local partners, including areas of interventions and capacity.

- < > Please provide additional information on coordination with MoE / UNICEF.  
*Specific comments:*

- Specific indicators: please review Indicators 1-5 as follow:

- # of Children (disaggregated by gender and age) having receiving the fortified snack every school day in the last month (based on PDM monthly and school year basis)
- Average Kcal / benef / day (based on PDM)
- Please keep one indicator on attendance rate (disaggregated by gender and age) in assisted schools (please mention baseline in section "Source of verification")

- **Please consider only one result (R1) as follow:**

- < >

Please keep indicator 2

- Please add: # of days of shortages of UHT milk (based on PDM)

- < >

A1 / A2 / A3: In order to have an overview of the system in place regarding the milk procurement – transportation - distribution system, please provide additional information (in section detailed description) including:

- Where the milk will be purchased? In or out of the country?



- How the milk will be transported inside Syria?
  - What are the necessary storage conditions (central warehouse / school level)?
  - What is the original distribution plan?
  - On which basis, the milk will be delivered (monthly, weekly, daily)?
  - How and on which basis the milk will be distributed to beneficiaries?
  - What are the potential risks and mitigations measures in place for procurement, transportation, storage and delivery of milk?
- Please add an activity 4 (similar to R2.A1) on distribution - post distribution **monitoring** / satisfactory survey including:
    - Details on the monitoring system in place
    - Details on “internal monitoring and reporting framework” specifically for this project (including third party monitoring)
    - Review of the action on monthly / quarterly basis
- **External evaluation:** Please include an external evaluation of this drinking milk action.

### **Reporting:**

Considering the current operational conditions in Syria, no later than 10 days after each quarter (i.e. every three months), the Partner is requested to submit to the Commission a report summarizing findings and observations of its monitoring/assessment missions, including instances of misuse of humanitarian aid. The Commission will provide a standard format to fill for this report. With due consideration to the confidentiality of information provided in the quarterly monitoring reports, the Commission will only use the information at aggregate level (ECHO note dated 02/09/2014).

In addition to this specific condition on reporting requirements of ECHO for operations inside Syria, DG ECHO would require **monthly feedback at field level** as well as **bimonthly reports on the progress of implementation and its challenges** in order to ensure timely, efficient and transparent flow of information in this particular challenging context. More information on the format of the bimonthly report will be provided at later stage.

### **Remote management:**

As highlighted during the HIP presentation in Brussels, Amman, Beirut and Damascus, all single form submissions proposing to use a **remote management modality are required to specifically include answers to the seven questions listed in the DG ECHO instruction note**. Please provide your **response in the specific sessions mentioned in the Remote Management Note** ( available at [http://dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu/actions\\_implementation/remote\\_management/start](http://dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu/actions_implementation/remote_management/start))

### **Visibility:**

DG ECHO does understand the restriction in Syria to carry visibility banners or stickers indicating the donors, reason why the Commission will agree to forego visibility actions **in the field** related to the implementation of the Action where it would endanger the Organisation's staff safety or harm the Organisation's interests.

However, the Partner will still have to comply with the visibility requirements elsewhere as described in the General Conditions. For instance:

- Press Releases at the beginning and end of the project cycle, mentioning ECHO's role as a donor whenever possible;
- some web-based stories (text, photo, or both) about the project, to be published on the Partner website/ social media;
- Photos of impact of aid /short video max 2min throughout the project cycle with ECHO's Regional Information

ECHO communication team encourages activities targeting European audiences.

Please don't hesitate to come back to DG ECHO if you have questions on the above. We would appreciate it if you could submit a new version of the Single Form, with the same reference by **09/05/2016**.

As I will be on leave next week, should you need any clarification, kindly contact my colleague [REDACTED].

Thanks you and best regards,

[REDACTED]

AMENDMENT STAGE

MONITORING REPORT STAGE

INTERIM REPORT STAGE

SUSPENSION STAGE

FINAL REPORT STAGE

NOTES

| # | Creation | Subject |
|---|----------|---------|
|---|----------|---------|

## Logframe

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Title of the Action :</b>            | Emergency Food Assistance to People Affected by Unrest in Syria   |
| <b>Principal objective :</b>            | <p>The FSSP in Syria aims at improving regular access to education, while increasing micronutrient intake of children through the regular provision of fortified school snacks. The program also directly contributes to the local economy through the local purchase of date bars. At present, WFP locally buys 10 percent of its annual requirements for the programme.</p> <p>[MR ]With reference to Annex VII, the milk may on an exception basis also be reallocated to children aged 5-12 years in families that are currently assisted under the emergency food assistance programme, contributing to stabilize or improve food consumption among assisted beneficiaries. Awareness raising labels will be placed on the packed milk cartons to avoid any misuse of the commodity.</p> |
| <b>Sector and related sub-sectors :</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food security and livelihoods             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conditional or unconditional in-kind food assistance</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Education in emergencies             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal education</li> <li>• Safe and accessible learning environments</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  |

| Intervention logic  | Objectively verifiable indicators   | Sources of verification   |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Specific objective</b><br>To increase enrolment, attendance and retention rates in targeted schools. | <b>Indicator (1)</b><br>Number of children (disaggregated by gender and age) provided with fortified date bars and UHT milk on school days<br><b>target value :</b> 500,000 | <b>Sources of verification (1)</b><br>Implementing partners' monthly distribution reports |
|   | <b>Indicator (2)</b><br>Attendance rate (boys) in assisted schools<br><b>target value :</b> > 80  | <b>Sources of verification (2)</b><br>WFP monitoring reports (baseline 82)                |
|   | <b>Indicator (3)</b><br>Attendance rate (girls) in assisted schools<br><b>target value :</b> > 80   | <b>Sources of verification (3)</b><br>WFP monitoring reports (baseline 81)                |
|   | <b>Indicator (4)</b><br>Average Kcal transfer per child per school day<br><b>target value :</b> 460   | <b>Sources of verification (4)</b><br>Implementing partners' monthly distribution reports |

**Indicator (5)**

[MR] % of the population assisted through general food assistance with poor Food Consumption Score (FCS)

target value :

**Sources of verification (5)**

[MR] Post Distribution Monitoring

**Indicator (6)**

[MR] Average Coping Strategies Index (CSI) among population assisted through general food assistance

target value :

**Sources of verification (6)**

[MR] Post Distribution Monitoring

**Result (1)**

Nutritious foods (fortified date bars and UHT milk) distributed in sufficient quantity, quality and timely to targeted school children

Global cost :

**Estimated total number of direct beneficiaries targeted by the result :**

Individuals :

Organisations :

Households :

Individuals per household :

**Indicator (1)**

Number of days in which UHT milk was distributed (as percentage of school days)

Target value :

**Sources of verification (1)**

Implementing partners' monthly distribution reports

**Indicator (2)**

Tonnage of fortified foods distributed (as percentage of planned)

Target value :

**Sources of verification (2)**

Implementing partners' monthly distribution reports

**Result (2)**

[MR] Stabilized or improved food consumption over assistance period for targeted households and/or individuals

Global cost :

**Estimated total number of direct beneficiaries targeted by the result :**

Individuals :

Organisations :

Households :

Individuals per household :

**Indicator (1)**

[MR] Quantity of milk distributed as percentage of planned

**Target value :**

100,00

**Sources of verification (1)**

[MR] WFP Partners monthly distribution reports

**Activity (1-1)**

Procurement and delivery of commodities to targeted schools

**Activity (1-2)**

Storage and handling of commodities

**Activity (1-3)**

Daily distribution of nutritious foods (fortified date bars and UHT milk) to pre and primary school children in the targeted schools

**Activity (1-4)**

Distribution and post-distribution monitoring in targeted schools by WFP monitors or designated third-parties

**Activity (2-1)**

[MR] Procurement, delivery and distribution of milk along with GFA monthly food rations to the most vulnerable conflict-affected Syrian families

**Activity (2-2)**

[MR] Monitoring and Post Distribution Monitoring

**Pre-conditions :**

- " Access to functioning education facilities is provided by the responsible authorities in Syria and humanitarian actors.
- " Continuing conflict will not further impede access to assess needs and deliver food commodities to targeted beneficiaries.
- " No pipeline breaks of food commodities or disruptions to the supply chain are encountered, enabling the timely and regular provision of food items
- " Regular monitoring is ensured to project sites through field visits to participating schools.

**Assumptions and Risks :**

1. Deterioration of security conditions. Security incidents including mortars and rocket attacks and clashes continued to increase during 2015. Risk to staff safety continue and represent the greatest threat to sustaining WFP operations in Syria. Further deterioration of the security environment may force WFP to reduce its footprint inside the country by deploying both national and international staff to work from alternative locations.
2. Diversification of service providers. The conflict has heavily affected the Syrian public and private sectors' capacity and disrupted the previously existing supply-chain network, leading to a scarcity of service providers needed by WFP in order to carry out its operations.
3. Delays in procurement, delivery and import procedures. Delays in tendering, contracting suppliers and delivery to Syrian ports by the EU milk producer may result in delays in the implementation of the milk distributions. Additionally, delays in customs clearance procedures may result in the commodity to be held at the port, reducing the permissible shelf life of the commodity for import into Syria [MR] and deliveries to schools.
4. Deterioration of the commodity during transport and storage. Due to the sensitivity of milk as a commodity, losses might occur while transporting and handling the commodities from ports to WFP warehouses and then to recipient schools. While in storage there is a risk of spoilage since most schools have inadequate storage conditions and milk may be susceptible to direct sunlight, moisture or a humid environment.
5. Unstable, irregular and insufficient funding. Late and insufficient resources might compromise WFP's ability to implement the activities at planned levels.
6. Manipulation of aid for political, military or financial gain. Aid manipulation or diversion by parties to the conflict for political, military or financial gain continues to represent a significant risk in Syria operational environment.
7. Constraints to humanitarian access. Access restrictions continue to affect the ability to assess humanitarian needs, as well as to deliver assistance through available modalities (cross line, cross border and regular) in many areas. In particular, deliveries through the Nusaybin border crossing have been severely compromised since September 2015, affecting WFP's ability to implement planned activities in Al-Hasakeh governorate.
8. Limited capacity of Cooperating Partners. The implementation and diversification of WFP's portfolio of assistance under this EMOP may be constrained by limited technical and other capacities of its partners.
9. Looting or misappropriation of WFP food. A deterioration in the security situation and fragmentation of conflict may further shrink humanitarian space and increase attacks on humanitarian convoys, heightening the risk of food losses.
10. Negative media portrayal of WFP and its cooperating partners. The risk of any part of the United Nations system being perceived to direct humanitarian assistance to either side of the conflict due to propaganda or negative media coverage may discredit the reputation of the United Nations in Syria and increase threats against assets and staff.