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Executive Summary

In 2017, in response to the one of the world's worst manmade crises, a consortium of CARE and Action Contra La Faim (ACF) implemented a EU-Funded Multi-Purpose Cash program in Abyan and Amran governorates with a mean aim of enhancing food security (FS) as well as supporting livelihood activities, savings groups and the resilience of communities with the rehabilitation of critical community-identified shared assets. The program design was aligned to the Humanitarian Development Nexus framework, which focuses on a shift from supplying humanitarian assistance to those who need it, to reducing the demand for humanitarian assistance by addressing the root causes.

The major program activities were multipurpose cash (MPC) transfers over 10 cycles to 2010 of the most vulnerable and food insecure households in 36 selected villages within the targeted 4 districts across the two governorates and the rehabilitation of community assets (CAs). The MPC transfer aimed to contribute to increasing food security and resilience of vulnerable households while stimulating local markets while the complementary asset rehabilitation and livelihoods efforts were designed to support resilience at both the community and household level.

Many of the asset rehabilitation projects were implemented through a Cash for Work (CFW) modality. These included rehabilitation of water sources and facilities, market access roads improvements, formation of village Savings and Loans Association groups (VSLA), trainings on best practices in certain livelihoods.

This report presents the evaluation findings from the project during over its full implementation period (October 2017-February 2019) in the targeted areas. It uses the DAC Evaluation Criteria: Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact and Sustainability. It also provides insight on the internal and external factors influencing the achievement (or non-achievement) of the project objectives. The analysis should inform decisions about replicating interventions, draw conclusions about the effectiveness of the implementation strategies, highlight lessons learned and lead to recommendations to inform future programming and policymaking.

The evaluation employed a mixed methodology: Desk Review, Quantitative and Qualitative fieldwork using structured and semi-structured data collection instruments.

- **Quantitative data** came from questionnaires administered to 323 HHs (45% female headed) across the project area. This survey tool also measured the HH's 4 key Food Security indicators that has been tracked from baseline.
- **Qualitative data** included 47 key informants' interviews (KII's) with project main stakeholders including IPs’ teams, banks, market figures, local figures and governmental figures, beside implementing 16 focus group discussions (FGDs), 50% female, for HHs

---

1 Referring to the last transfer cycle as per the end-line report.
beneficiaries and local communities, in addition to check list, HHs case study and CAs documentation protocols.

Findings
The project delivered all the planned activities and achieved its stated outputs. While there were delays\(^2\) and adjustments made for contextual challenges, and improvements made in response to learning, the main results were achieved with MPC delivered to the targeted beneficiaries in a timely and appropriate manner, community and livelihood projects completed as defined, and implementation milestones and quality standards met. (see Annex 4, Result Sheet).

Findings against evaluation OECD/DAC criteria
Relevance: The project’s objectives and components are in line with Yemen Human response plans (YHRP) 2018-2019 that identified both targeted areas has in acute needs (up to level IPC 4).

The project provided “life-saving assistance to the most vulnerable people” through MPC and in promoting “access to resilient livelihood opportunities” by rehabilitating community assets and with the data showing over 32% of the MPC spent of food items, they addressed the FSAC objectives of improving “access to food for the most vulnerable”.

90% of the respondents believed that the project objectives and design was relevant to their own and their communities’ needs. Based on the KII, the project was in line with the governmental plan, as well as considering the community tradition and culture.

Efficiency: The project efforts to improve cost efficiency included using existing platforms for target area’s market monitoring, delivering the MPCs through banks with outreach targeted communities, and making use of the YER exchange rate decrease to expand the project’s reach and transfer cycles. As a piloted modality, cost associated with human resources, MEAL, learning events and consultations, where higher at the outset, but might not be the case in future scaling up.

91% of the beneficiaries expressed high satisfaction of MPC distribution timing, location and regularity, adding that the time needed to reach to distribution points ranged between less than 30 – 60 minutes, and the same time for waiting at the distribution points. KII and FGDs also revealed high satisfaction of the MPC distribution logistics and procedures.

\(^2\) The project delivery experienced some delay due to the lengthy (3+ months) security clearance procedures at start-up.
Effectiveness: The consortium established a highly productive MEAL system, which produced several strong assessments and learning sessions’ reports and minutes. In addition, the Complaints and Feedback Mechanism (CFM) was in place from the outset and as the learning on its use and effectiveness was analyzed, the project made adjustments to improve its accessibility.

Over 80% of beneficiaries confirmed their awareness of the CFM, but only 11% revealed that they had used the CFMs. Of users, over half (59% n=28) reported satisfaction with the responsiveness. The remaining users, predominantly those using the locally placed ‘suggestion boxes’ reported slow reaction times for their reported concerns, indicating a need to move away from suggestions boxes and investment in other more effective CFM pathways.

The project was adaptive and flexible, and response to the learning and feedback from its MEAL systems. Based on the feedback loops in place, implementer changed distribution points based on the beneficiary’s preference, raised the amount of cash during the last 4 cycles, modified the community asset rehabilitation projects based on the community requirements.

In addition to that, around 95% of the consulted beneficiaries were highly satisfied with the ease of registering and access to support as well the helpfulness of project team members.

Comparing Modalities:
In comparing the MPC modality, combined with the CAs, to other forms of humanitarian transfer delivered in Yemen, taking the Yemeni context into account, the MPC modality seems the best alternative in terms of relevance to the beneficiaries’ various needs, cost efficiency, flexibility of adjustment, easiness and safety for beneficiaries, impact and extent of sustainability.

Impact: There was a very high level of perceived impact by beneficiaries. 96% reported ‘high benefits and positive impact’ during and immediately after the project period.

Main highlights were:

- Cash distribution increased HHs food security and decreased the burdens on families, especially females, in locating water and firewood,
- Some HHs (14%) reported saving and/or investing money for future use, especially in Amran where VSLA and livelihood training were delivered.
- Community Asset rehabilitation were reported in both KIs and FDGs as increasing access to water, food markets and expanding the reach of assistance through CFW.

Sustainability: Sustainability is a real challenge in urgent humanitarian responses in general. However, the diversity of the project’s activities could enhance sustainability to some extent. The cash assistance gave a chance to a few beneficiaries to save and/or invest some cash for future

---

3 See elaborated comparison among different modalities in Annex ....
needs. Additionally, making cash available in the area supported the local market and allowed the SMEs who had over extended credit to suffering household to recoup their working capital with debt repayment and continues serving their clients and market. This also might continue and might develop with longer-term benefit from the community asset rehabilitation projects, as most of the community assets were of a sustainable nature, such as water tanks, wells, and market feeder roads.

\textbf{In the village of Amha-Sara in Abyan province, when the community shared the costs of the community rehabilitation projects, they also shared the responsibility of maintaining the assets. Amha-Sarar was the only reported case of a community planning for the maintenance of their assets, and where a local community committee was formed maintain the asset in future.}

However, \textbf{3-4 months} after the last MPC transfer, key indicators, such as the CSI, show many of these gains eroding. As the acute status of need in these community and households have not changed sufficiently in the 10 months period, nor was the MPC (designed to cover 80% of basic household needs) set to be sufficient to allow substantial investments in income earning or savings after addressing basic need, these declines in CSI months after MCPs end is not unusual. These findings will be discussed in more detail throughout the report and are key in using this data to plan for future activities\textsuperscript{4}.

\textbf{Access and Inclusivity}

The project ensured access and engagement with marginalized groups by targeting a wide range of vulnerabilities (as in chart No.10). The project’s design included protection elements that resulted in almost no single case of abuse, teasing or harm reported. \textbf{91\% of surveyed beneficiaries thought that women, children and people with disabilities had received the appropriate accommodations during the activities.}

The project target women beneficiaries, with about 50\% (N=12871) female beneficiaries for MPCs within the targeted 2010 HHs, in addition to engaging women in the community asset rehabilitation selection process. However, in relation to the targeted HHs heads gender, there is a wide gender gap especially in Abyan (where 12\% of total households were female headed) as opposed to higher percentages (34\%) in Amran.

Preserving \textbf{‘Doing No Harm’} (DNH) principles supported the project’s conflict sensitivity, and reduced risk or harm due to the intervention. Moreover, according to the authority officials and community figures, the project objectives were in line with the governmental priorities of addressing food insecurity, and acceptable in terms of community tradition and culture. While it was important to ensure continued access and security to keep low levels of donor visibility within the targeted areas and with other stakeholders, if there is to be increased awareness of the project

\textsuperscript{4} These findings are concurrent with the report \textit{The Gendered Dimension of Multi-Purpose Cash Supporting Disaster Resilience} (2019) Sarah Ward and Afcar Consulting for CARE Yemen
and its process, there might need to be more visible activities in future. This is an important balance that the project will need to strike.

Empowerment
There were some reports in the KIIs and FDGs of empowering women within the targeted female headed HHs in making decisions, increasing the rate of females shopping according to market figures, and re-joining the schools due to the availability of cash for some HHs.

“Before the project, women suffered a lot from fetching water from far areas, which is not the case now”. A female participant in Khanfar district FGD pointed out.

Supporting Markets and Community Resilience
The MPC and CFW enhanced local market stability and increased local sales (up to 50% higher than previously). The MPC and CFW enabled HHs to clear their debts to businesses and made cash available. In KIIs with market traders, some revealed expanding their businesses as well.

Other positive social and household dynamics included reducing pressure due to starving fear, reducing family conflict due to reducing pressure, and increasing community harmony through supporting each other within some communities. In conversations, communities thought that the community asset might increase their ability to absorb shocks in the future but did not see them as directly affecting their household resilience at the time of the project’s close.

Key Project Findings and Analysis
MPC modality was highly appreciated by all respondents and showed strong preference in all quantitative data as it:

- is flexible and meets the targeted beneficiaries’ various needs;
- can reach the most vulnerable without conditions;
- makes cash available, which can enhance the market resilience;
- supports family as well as wider community resilience, providing opportunities for saving and reducing the fear of starving, and enabling targeted beneficiaries to also help others and participate in the community asset rehabilitation
- and increased the FS levels within the beneficiary’s household (during support).

While there was some savings and livelihoods investment reported, this is an area that could be reinforced. Many factors might influence the beneficiary saving for investment, including HHs specific vulnerability profile, context particular features, the amount of the MPC, and levels of programing that work to promote saving for investment among beneficiaries.

It seems that, for target beneficiaries and their households who did not have significant sources of income to secure their household food security, these gains erode significantly in the 3-4 months since the last distribution. While there were households that maintained their CSI and
FCS scores, they were those who had additional household resources to exploit, household members who brought in income from labor, or those who had more than just the MPC to support the totality of the household’s basic needs. As would be expected, when vulnerable HH’s food security improves, their CSI reduces, showing a reduction in their use of negative coping mechanisms.

This was supported by the findings from the quantitative study, where respondents indicated going back to their difficult situation before the support - as they did not have any alternatives.

The WFP-mVAM⁵, May 2019 assessment also highlighted the same issue that Food Consumption Scores (FCS) and CSIs (Coping Skills Index) scores declined 3 months after the last transfer for HHs, as they did not have sufficient replacement income resources. In comparison with the WFP-mVAM⁶ findings, the project target areas still show indicators slightly higher than the general level nationwide, even three months after the final MPC, which may indicate increased overall resilience, but there is no way to show direct casualty or correlation with the current data.

There were also important observable differences between the two governorates (mountainous Amran, and coastal Abyan) in terms of types of coping strategies, and food consumption habits, due to the differences in the mountainous and coastal traditions and habits, and also due to the type of livelihoods each area has access to. Generally, it seems that in the more remote mountains region, scores decreased more quickly, and families felt the lack of the MPC more acutely. In more accessible coastal areas with more livelihood options and lower levels of consistent conflict, there was a less precipitous drop in key scores and indices.

---

⁵ WFP –mVAM report, Yemen, due to June, 2019, WFP
⁶ Ibid
Recommendations:
Based on this report’s finding and analysis, there are a few recommendations that may improve the projects results and impacts. Many of these reinforce findings from earlier reports and assessments.

- When seeking a lasting effect on extremely vulnerable household’s incomes and ability to meet their basic household needs, it may be necessary to increase the MPC amount to cover medical needs and allow for saving and investment in income or livelihood activities.
- Considering each targeted HH’s specific vulnerability, and each targeted context’s specific features
- Include activities to promote saving, such as VSLAs and savings advocacy/awareness campaigns, linking the support to bank account opening, encourage saving through promotion/prizes, “push” activities to encourage savings till the end of the distribution cycles ...etc.,
- Including some plans for creating income generating activities for all HHs. Such activities may include business/skills training, networking with MFIs, granting, establishing/supporting business incubators among the beneficiaries, enhancing agri-business value chains to create suitable business cases
- Encourage the partners banks to target the beneficiaries with their financial service or developing specific products to meet these populations needs
- Promoting community share for the Community Asset rehabilitation projects to promote better community ownership to the assets,

Conclusion
Despite the challenging context, the project did well in addressing the most vulnerable HHs with the MPC and supporting the wider community resilience with diversity of community assets. A few minor issues were raised, which were re-summarized and discussed in the Conclusion table.

---

Please refer to all the recommended improvements for better scaling up in the Reflection section in the main report.

The Gendered Dimension of Multi-Purpose Cash Supporting Disaster Resilience (2019) Sarah Ward and Afcar Consulting for CARE Yemen
1. Introduction

This report is presenting the final evaluation findings on the project ‘Addressing food crisis in Yemen’, submitted to CARE. The report has been organized into four main sections: 1) Background, 2) Findings, 3) Reflections, 4) Conclusion, and finally Annexes.

1.1. Context and Program Overview

The worst manmade crisis: According to OCHA, the humanitarian crisis in Yemen remains the worst manmade humanitarian crisis in the world. Before the breaking out of the current conflict in 2015, poverty and vulnerabilities had been entrenched in Yemen. By now, after nearly four years of widespread armed conflict, the situation has been (seriously dropping down) in all fields including: severe economic decline, food insecurity and collapse of essential services, which continue to take an enormous toll on the population, driving the country to the brink of famine and exacerbating needs in all sectors. Referring to Yemen 2018 humanitarian updates, an estimated 80% of the population – 24 million people – require some form of humanitarian or protection assistance, including 14.3 million who are in acute humanitarian need.

Urgent humanitarian Response: In response to the above mentioned crisis, and in line with YHRP 2018, a 5000.000 EUR, 15 month program funded by the EU and implemented jointly by the consortium of CARE (lead organization), and Action Contre La Faim (ACF) in Amran and Abyan governorates respectively. The project targeted around 36 villages within 4 districts-Dhaibeen and Habour in Amran and Khanfar and Sarar in Abyan. The selection of the targeted areas (TAs) was based on their food and nutrition insecurity situation and gaps in access to needs besides excessive consultations with the local authority and community representatives in the Targeted areas. At the design phase of the project, the two governorates were classified by food security cluster in Phase III and Phase IV of the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification of March-July 2017 respectively and identified as priority governorates for intervention. The program mainly aimed at enhancing the food and nutrition security as well as livelihood recovery and resilience of vulnerable households while stimulating local markets in the targeted areas. The key activities were MPC transfers and CAs development:

Multi-purpose Cash assistance (MPC) contributes to increased food security and resilience of vulnerable households while stimulating local markets. Total of 10 cycles of MPC transfers were made, reaching 2010 HHs of the most vulnerable and food insecure men and women in 36 selected villages across the two governorates. Each targeted HH received monthly-based amount of 52.000 YR for the first six cycles, and 73.000 YR per month for the last four cycles in accordance with the standard set by the (FSAC) and the Cash and Market TWG. Cash was

---

9 https://www.unocha.org/yemen

10 Details of the project objectives and outputs are included in the TOR Annex 1.
transferred to beneficiaries’ locations through the outreach team of two main IPs: International Bank of Yemen in Amran and Al-Amal Bank in Abyan governorate, which handed the cash to each beneficiary HH in person.

**Community Assets (CAs)** rehabilitation/development component sub-activities have been implemented though CFW modality and included rehabilitation of water sources and facilities, which increased access to safe water by the benefited HHs. Market access roads improvements and this has facilitated the beneficiaries’ access to local markets. Formation of (VSLAs and trainings on best practices in animal husbandry, bee farming, and agriculture and business skills, which all contributed in supporting the livelihood and resilience of the targeted beneficiaries. The CAs were different from a district/village into another based on the defined priority of each.

Due to the dynamic changing situation in the country including the targeted areas, the project underwent three amendments mainly addressed; 1) modifying the LCSI into CSI, 2) increasing the MPC basket from 52000 up to 73000 in the last four months, and 3) time extension to meet the unexpected delay caused by the complicated procedures of getting the security clearance from authorities.

However, during the project’s implementation, the general country food insecurity situation increased dramatically creating more challenges against the project’s intended impact particularly in Amran, in addition to the break out of Hajjar’s war, an area nearby to Amran, during Jan-March 2019.

**Context change during the project period:** Reports show that for the first time ever, close to a quarter of a million people (238,000 individuals) are facing catastrophic levels of hunger (IPC Phase 5 Catastrophe) and are barely surviving. Across the country, 190 of 333 districts are facing emergency conditions (IPC Phase 4), which means that nearly two thirds of all districts in the country are pre-famine\(^\text{11}\).

In the absence of Humanitarian Food Assistance, 67 percent of the population would be experiencing Crisis or worse levels of food insecurity and would require urgent assistance to save their lives and livelihoods. Of great concern is a quarter of a million people who would be in Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) Phase 5 spread over 45 districts in 13 governorates in the country\(^\text{3}\) – their situation could worsen if no urgent action is taken. The worst affected governorates are Al Hudaydah, **Amran**, Hajjah, Taiz, Al Jawf, Marib and Sa’ada\(^\text{12}\).

---

\(^{11}\) [https://www.unocha.org/yemen/crisis-overview](https://www.unocha.org/yemen/crisis-overview).

\(^{12}\) Yemen famine prevention plan Jan-June 2019, FAO.
Further economic crisis: The unprecedented rapid and uncontrolled depreciation of the Yemeni Riyal (YER) across the country during September and October 2018 worsened the economic crisis, resulting in soaring prices of basic commodities. At its highest the exchange rate was 860 YER /USD in Aden, a 300 per cent depreciation compared to the pre-crisis rate (215 YER /USD). Moreover, the cost of food basket in October 2018 is 137 per cent higher than in the pre-crisis period. Due to all these persistent price increases, hundreds of thousands of families are being forced out of local markets, unable to purchase the basic necessities required to survive. More people are vulnerable now than at any time during the recent conflict\textsuperscript{13}. The opposite map\textsuperscript{14} indicate and table the level of IPC acute food insecurity classification per governorate. More specifically, the following table shows comparison of the general situation decline in Amran & Abyan, through 2016-2019:

Table 1 comparing the IPC\textsuperscript{15} classification for Abyan & Amran through the years 2016-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>June 2016 IPC</th>
<th>July 2017 IPC</th>
<th>Dec 2018 – Jan 2019 IPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>IPC3 IPC4 IPC5</td>
<td>IPC3 IPC4 IPC5</td>
<td>IPC3 IPC4 IPC5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td>GC* 27% 35% 0%</td>
<td>IPC4 35% 45% 0%</td>
<td>IPC4 29% 13% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amran</td>
<td>IPC3 35% 18% 0%</td>
<td>IPC4 35% 15% 0%</td>
<td>IPC4 37% 21% 1% **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*General Classification.

\textsuperscript{13} https://www.unocha.org/yemen/crisis-overview
\textsuperscript{14} IPC Yemen Technical Working Group, December 2018.
\textsuperscript{15} IPC Yemen Report December 2018 - January 2019.
**11000 people are assumed to be in IPC5 (catastrophe) in Amran for the first time.**

While it seems to have been improved slightly in Abyan due to the somehow stability in the Southern areas, it has declined noticeably in Amran due to the instability within the Northern areas in general.

1.2. Evaluation

1.2.1. Scope and objectives

*CARE international Yemen* has contracted ‘*Felix consulting*’ to undertake participatory and consultative approach to assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the activities implemented since the start of the project (following the OECD DAC Evaluation Criteria). The objectives of the evaluation assignment include:

- To assess the overall impact (positive as well as negative) observed as a result of the project intervention;
- To assess project’s performance and achievements against the project’s objectives identifying factors of success or failure;
- To measure how the project impacted on the various segments of the community;
- To evaluate how has the project been adhering to basic cross-cutting issues [gender, conflict sensitivity (DNH), and disability] while undertaking the intervention;
- To assess the replicability of the interventions and sub-sequent outcomes in other similar settings;
- To evaluate the relevance and consistency of the activities and outputs of the project with the overall goal, impact and the attainment of the objectives;
- To measure the factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives;
- To evaluate the cost-efficiency, timeliness and skills of the project staff involved in the project;
- To examine how the project has been adaptive to the ever-changing condition in the project area and how has the operational context (security) affected the implementation of the project;
- To draw conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations which could inform future programming, policymaking and overall organizational learning.

The scope of the evaluation was to cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project during the entire project period, with a special focus on the MPC modality, through answering the key TOR questions (see *Annex 1*). The geographical scope of the evaluation is Amran and Abyan Governorates.
1.2.2. Methodology
To fully address the evaluation objectives and comprehensively answer the evaluation questions, a mixed participatory methodology, combines quantitative and qualitative methods, was adapted for the purpose of this evaluation, as in the following:

Participatory approach: including all relevant stakeholders of the project, collecting as wide different points of views as possible and encouraging the active participation of project team during inception and tools preparation,

Mixed enquiry approach: combining both qualitative as well as quantitative tools for data collection,

Per CARE’s request, FS key indicators focus including: CSI, LCSI, FCS & MDDW was added to the evaluation.

A set of 11 different interrelated tool protocols were developed to collect the needed data as follows:

1.2.2.1. Tools
A variety of tool protocols were developed around the main TOR questions. The final questions were simplified and targeted to inquire about an item per question from all relevant targeted groups of respondents (see Evaluation matrix, Annex 2). The developed tools included:

- MPC beneficiaries’ survey protocol, including: general issues, satisfaction, DAC criteria, as well as FCS, CSI, LCSI and MDD-W surveys
- MPC beneficiaries’ FGDs Protocol
- CAs BNFs’ FGDs Protocol
- Community figures’ KII’s protocol
- Local authority KII’s protocol
- Banks staff semi structured interview protocol
- IPs’ structured interview protocol
- Checklist protocol
- Case studies protocol
- CAs documentation protocol
- IPs’ verification interview protocol

1.2.2.2. Sampling
The sampling covered 92% villages out of all the targeted villages by the project (33/36) within the four districts, Dhaibeen & Habour districts in Amran, and Khanfar and Sarar in Abyan, to capture a full picture of the diverse beneficiaries’ perception in different locations (see Annex 3, Covered villages). This targeting helped the evaluation team to gather a wide variety of perceptions and enriched the findings with several justification/explanation
possibilities. For selecting the respondents, two sampling methods were used for selecting the respondents:

**Random sampling:** This technique was used in the selection of survey direct BNFs (HHs) based on numeric intervals system from the given lists. Given 2010 of total targeted HHs, the sample size calculated at 95% statistical confidence level and 5% margin of error would be **323 HHs** (45.51% were females). Regardless the limited period of the evaluation, the prolonged bureaucratic governmental formalities of getting the required clearances and the current conflict situation, the evaluation team could reach them **all** as planned.

**Purposeful sampling:** This technique was followed to select respondents of KIIs and FGDs, a total of 52 KIIs and 16 FGDs of 8-10 participants each, 50% were females, were conducted in the targeted governorates, (see **Annex 3** for the KIIs respondents list and the FGDs map).

**Sample composition**

323 HHs were surveyed in both governorates. 45% of those surveyed were female-headed HHs and 54% male headed, representing not a fully equal split but sufficient for analysis.

![Figure 2 HHs survey sampling per gender](image)

The average age of surveyed respondents is 36.7 and the family size is 9.1 member/HH. The chart presents the total survey sample, gender disaggregated. Refer to **Annex 3** for complete sampling tables.

**Data Collection, processing and presentation**

HHs survey questionnaire data were electronically collected using **KOBO** toolbox platform, Web based structured interview protocol was used for the IPs KIIs, face-to-face interviews to local community, local authority, partner banks and market figures, 1-2 hours FGDs were used for community & beneficiaries. Case protocols were used to document success stories and CAs, and finally check list was used for the literature review and to observe the intended
change in the targeted communities. The data collection was performed during May-June, 2019 in all the targeted areas, about 3-4 months since the last distribution cycle, by a team of 23 members led by three key consultants (see Annex 3.4 for the evaluation team table).

1.2.2.3. Analysis & interpretation

- For quantitative Data, SPSS and MS Excel were applied for analysis by statistician. The analysis used some key quantitative data analysis methods: Descriptive, Exploratory and Inferential statistics methods as in the following:
  - Means was used as a calculation measure to the ‘Likert scale’ questions,
  - Frequency was used for the ‘select more than one option’ questions,
  - Percentage was used for the rest of the quantitative questions,
  - Average was used to calculate the average resulted value of wider groups.

For the sake of presentation clarity, all the results of the above calculations were transferred into percentage. Due to the fact that the numbers of respondents differ from a sub-group to another, each sub-group was calculated first independently, then values of sub-groups within a wider group were calculated by average to find out the total average per each question for the wider group, then the widest group using the same technique. Missing data were not counted, and each question’s answers were calculated by the existing responses only.

A theme tree was used for grouping the qualitative data. Answers were compared to the equivalent quantitative results.

1.2.2.4. Classification

Answers of different groups were compared for the sake of triangulation and further understanding. Data was disaggregated by every possible respondents’ sub-grouping. Values were calculated as discussed above and a portion of 10% was defined as a ‘significant difference’.

- In other words, if the difference among the sub-groups was ≥10%, then this difference was highlighted, discussed and presented in the report.
- Contrarily, if the difference was less than 10%, then this difference was neglected and the value average of the wider/widest group was presented instead, (see Dataset in Annex 6).

Presentation: After data processing and analysis, the final data was presented and discussed in the report using narrative description and explanation illustrated by the pictorial representation through graphs, tables and charts. The presentation focused on comparing the data between the two main groups (Abyan and Amran), unless there was a significant difference among the sub-groups (such as per gender, district, village, HHs size...etc.). If significant difference between two or more sub-groups appeared in the analysis, then it was presented and explicitly discussed in the report. The presentation then linked the primary data findings to every other possible source from the literature review. In addition to that,
indirect real factors beneath the direct findings were inferred and/or further explored and the key findings were prioritized. Finally, lessons learned and recommendations were elicited.

1.2.2.5. Data Quality Assurance

For the sake of increasing the data quality assurance, the following techniques were applied:

a) Triangulation

For increasing the level of data reliability, triangulation technique was used on two levels:

Internal: Triangulating the key items, first, through triangulating the same item in different questions within the same tool, and second via applying different tools to the same group of respondents.

External: Triangulating the key items using different tools for different respondents’ groups.

b) Cross check and double check techniques

Doubted answers especially from the BNFs’ survey were rechecked again with sample group from the same BNFs (re-contacting a sample of the same group and restating the questions in different phrases with more probing questions to validate the doubted answers). Daily debriefing helped to provide chance for immediate double check to the highlights appeared during data collection on daily basis. Eventually, as a result of this double check technique, only two survey forms were excluded from the total sample leaving 321 forms for analysis.

c) IPs Verification Interview

A verification interview was done with the consortium coordinator, after the analysis stage, aiming at discussing some main highlights from the findings and seeking the IPs clarification, justification and/or confirmation.

d) Ethical considerations

As a part of Felix values, the collected data from all parties have been treated with high confidentiality to ensure the privacy and the rights of participants and the work owner. Besides, all interviews, survey and FGDs were preceded by a respondents’ consent. The voluntary obtained consent was necessary to ensure the participants understanding of research subject and the interest to give sufficient information enriching the topics discussed. Enumerators were trained on and committed to Felix code of conduct including: respecting the respondents’ opinions and recording their answers with absolute objectivity.

1.2.3. Challenges and Limitations

The assignment timing was the main challenge, as the data collection phase was conducted during Ramadan, when work was only limited to couple of hours at night, and then work paused for Eid vacation for almost a week. Changes of the NAMCHA\textsuperscript{16} president during data collection also delayed the issuance of permit to work in Amran for three weeks.

\textsuperscript{16} The National Authority for Management & Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs and Disaster Response.
Some targeted districts like Dhaibeen are considered a military area, the data collection process was interrupted many times due to insecurity and denial of access. Therefore, significant time was devoted to coordination efforts and ensuring access, and these continued till data collection activities fulfilled successfully.

Perhaps the biggest challenge was the high possibility of respondents’ bias for the favor of the project extension and/or replication. It was obvious that some tried to minimize positive impact of the MPC on their food security for the purpose of pushing the stakeholders to continue the cash assistance. This was expected, that is why 11 different tools applied, covering most of the villages, using triangulation and double check techniques including re-contacting sample of the respondents again. Therefore, Felix considered this bias treated in the results and analysis.

2. Evaluation Findings
In spite of the complicated situation due to the continued conflict and the two governments, the project has achieved its objectives up to a good extent, adopting some key amendments to cope with the complex unstable situation in the targeted areas as discussed in the Context above.

The project also experienced some delays in its activities due to the authorities’ lengthy and bureaucratic approvals process and some obstacles to access the targeted areas. However, the project planned activities were delivered and the immediate outputs as defined in the project framework were met fully, sometimes exceeding the defined target, (see annex 4, result sheet). The Findings section classified into three broad themes including sub-themes each: 1) Findings against DAC criteria, and 2) Findings against project’s FS key indicators.

2.1. Findings against OECD DAC evaluation criteria
2.1.1. Relevance
In accordance with YHRP and FSAC’s strategic objectives and CHS: Referring to the YHR reports 2017-19 (see context above), the targeted areas were, have been, and still are, classified among the acute food insecurity areas. In addition, they are remote areas lacking some key assets such as roads and water resources, which maximizes the negative influences of the conflict, making access to the resources in general even more difficult.

Both project’s components followed the related humanitarian plan and standards and were relevant and appropriate.

- The MPC component was consistent with YHRPs 2017-2018 strategic objective that states “Provide life-saving assistance to the most vulnerable people in Yemen through an effective, targeted response” and relevant to FSAC strategic objective of “improving availability of and access to food for the most vulnerable”.
The Community Asset component was more in line with YHRP strategic objective to “Support and preserve services & institutions essential to immediate humanitarian action & promote access to resilient livelihood opportunities”.

The project addressed food insecurity through MPCs targeting 2010 HHs and supported the targeted communities’ resilience with a variety of community assets and livelihood support activities. The entrance points for beneficiaries’ selections and prioritizing the community assets project types and locations were the community committees and the local authority. This involvement with local authorities increased the relevance of these projects as well as the community feeling of ownership towards the project.

Furthermore, the project was initiated with different formal and informal consultations to the targeted communities including: Baseline/needs assessment community meetings and workshops, consultation with local authorities as well as the related clusters and active actors. This wide range of consultations informed the adaptation of project’s objectives and design to match the targeted population’s needs and preferences.

**Relevance of objectives and design to beneficiaries:** The project’s objectives and design were seen highly relevant by around 88% of the evaluation respondents.

They were in real need to get external support to overcome the food shortage, were secured by the MPC assistance. The community needed roads to facilitate access to food markets and other urgent services, and water tanks to endure they did not need to travel miles looking for water from far areas, which was addressed by the CAs.

*Respondents preferred cash distribution over in-kind food assistance with an average of 91% as it gave them chance to decide how to use the cash to meet their needs at support their own priorities,* such as food, water, transportations, cooking gas, medicine …etc.,

“We had been consulted by CARE at the beginning of the project whether it is better to distribute in-kind food assistance or cash transfer, we told them that cash will be better as it will save the cost and trouble of food transportation and it will help beneficiaries’ spend the money on their priorities”, a female local figure in Amran stated.

Almost all respondents thought that the project objectives were still valid and relevant for them and their communities. Furthermore, survey participants declared that the distribution process was highly suitable (93%-95%).

Banks agents distributed the cash assistance at the beneficiaries’ villages, and those with special needs, their assistance was delivered to their door. During distribution, logistical issues reported by bank agents included that sometimes they arrived to an area, when some beneficiaries happened to be absent and therefore, they had either to wait for some extra hours or move to the next village, where Beneficiaries had to follow them or agent might come back again to the first village.
As these issues were encountered, the project worked to address them and the bank agent suggested that upon registration, it would be advised to add an authorized person such as a first-degree kinship in the card so that he/she can collect the cash amount based on the BNF’s prior approval\textsuperscript{17}.

As for MPC beneficiaries’ selection, as seen in the chart above, the majority of respondents in both governorates (n=321) agreed about the appropriateness for the MPC and the fairness of the selection process and results.

Comments that arose over the course of the MPC that were raised during both the surveys, KII\textsc{s} and FD\textsc{g} as well as in data provided during the desk review:

- The selection did not include all vulnerable cases in the community,
- Sometimes, more than one member from the same family were registered and received support
- Small families used to receive the same amount of cash assistance as large ones.
- Community assets were not distributed fairly, characterized by comments such as “A road construction was planned to be done in this village, which really needs it. But it was moved to the district center, though the district center has a well levelled road already” a local community figure in Radman village said.

When these issues were raised during the course of the project, they were address by the CFM. When these issues were raised during this final evaluation data collection process, which occurred after the MPC distribution was closed, they were passed on to the project

\textsuperscript{17} Rephrased from a bank agent KII
implementers. However, in the course of the evaluation, there were not significant, only occasional issues (n=1-2) raised, so it was not identified as a key challenge or issue.

**In line with the governmental policies and TGs culture and traditions:** Respondents of different types agreed that the project objectives and design were in-line with the governmental policies, local traditions, and community culture within both governorates, “the project was in line with our customs and traditions, for example, upon payment, women were distributing for women BNFs separated from men. Even in the registration stage, a team of women met women in the targeted areas.” A local authority official in Amran explained.

**Beneficiary perceptions: listening to their thoughts post-project:**

During the FGDs and KIIs, the assessment team solicited the thoughts and suggestions from beneficiaries about what they might do to “improve” the next project, or what they might like to see done differently. Not surprisingly, most suggestions include expanding both the months and the number of households reached.

Some specific suggestions include considering the high cost of medical care and medication in the MPC, expanding the definition of ‘vulnerable’ to include more households, and creating a sliding MPC scale that would increase or decrease depending on number of household members. While these are interesting to explore, most were outside of the scope of this project.18

There were two main activities outside of the MPC, rehabilitation/construction community assets and supporting livelihoods. In most cases, from desk review to FGDs to KIIs, there was anecdotal and perceived focusing more interventions on **livelihood capacity building and VSLA promotion which were seen as more directly relevant to household level improvements and the ability to maintain FCS and CSI scores after MPCs ended.**

2.1.2. Efficiency

Through the consortium, the IPs could make use of the already similar efforts conducted by other organizations and/or relevant clusters such as the Market Monitoring activity.

The MEAL System had prepared a comprehensive package of tools and a plan for the marketing monitoring. However, as there was already relevant Price Monitoring data collection systems set up within the cluster system, the consortium saw it was better to make use of those. Not creating a parallel system saved effort and money then used to expand the project’s reach.

---

18 The MPC was set in accordance with national standard in collaboration with the Cluster System.
Furthermore, involving the CCs in the beneficiaries nomination and selection process also saved costs, efforts and resources, and more importantly decreased the opportunity of any conflict sensitivity in the targeted areas, (see Effectiveness, addressing cross-cutting issues).

**Cash transfers is always cheaper:** it has been established through different studies in different countries with similar contexts like that of Yemen that humanitarian cash assistance is more cost efficient than in-kind and voucher assistance, saving up to $7.0 USD per each transfer, especially when there is availability of and easy access to food in the market\(^\text{19}\). In this project with an amount of 1,907,100.00 EUR dedicated for the food basket, this modality allowed resources to go directly to the beneficiaries, and increased the reach by 15% (by more than 250 HHs) than if it had been in-kind support.

The partnership with banks, which already have service points in the targeted areas and able to access remote villages, was also more cost and time efficient (costing maximum of 4. 28 EUR per HH\(^\text{20}\)), saving beneficiaries time (see time efficiency below). It was safer and more effective than other alternatives such as forming special teams for distribution or transferring through banks that require the BNFs to go to the bank offices in the main cities to collect their assistance.

> “Comparing to the final results, this way to working with banks was worth all the efforts and resources especially that in relation to the project team’s transportation costs, which are costly in our areas, as our areas are hard to reach”. A local authority from Amran pointed out.

**Making use of the exchange rate increase:** during the project’s implementation time, the YER exchange rate changed significantly, which increased the total sum in YER. *IPs had the flexibility and adapted to make use of this increase to extend the project’s coverage, MPC cycles and number of the CAs as well. “Exchange rate fluctuation have enabled us to target 1050 HHs (in Amran), while the planned was 975 HHs. We increased the community assets till reached 53 assets (soft and hard) and increased the MPC cycles from 9 to 10 cycles.”* An IP staff explained.

**Efficiency and a new modality development:** Being a pilot, it seems understandable to spend higher portion of money on human resources, consultation, studies, learning events and visits. Calculating the direct support, the BNFs got in terms of MPC baskets and CAs to the rest of expenditures, it was around 48% - 52% respectively. This might be seen as high by

\(^{19}\) 2016), Humanitarian Cash and In-Kind Transfers across Sectors: Selection, Performance, and Research Priorities Background, paper for the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), The World Bank Group

\(^{20}\) The Project’s Final Consolidated Budget
humanitarian responses standards, including NAMCHA’s standards for humanitarian organizations to have up to 70% of the intervention’s total budgets directly reach the beneficiaries.

However, it is obvious that this increase in the expenditure ensured that the project was able to be flexible and adapt, adjusting the implementations several times to coping with the changes and challenges raised during the delivery period.

It also produced a good wealth of learning from this pilot to feed into improving the modality in future scale-ups. More importantly, it began the new shift in the humanitarian work in Yemen with a well-established, well-grounded and well-tested modality.

For the next iteration of the project, the distribution of the budget can be adjusted to refocus on widen the intervention’s reach and the impact. This investment in learning and flexibility at the initial stages that will allow a stronger scale-up can be taken as one of the many key lessons learnt produced from this intervention.

**Efficiency:** In relation to the time efficiency, first for the MPC activities, the distribution times was reported by the beneficiaries to be regular most of the time and the distribution points were accessible and nearby to most of them. This generated a high rate of satisfaction within the Beneficiaries.

*An overall average of 92% (n=321) among the survey respondents highly appreciated the time regularity and procedures of payment process across the targeted areas.*

In terms of maximum times needed for the beneficiaries to reach to/ waiting at the distribution points to collect their assistance, they are in-line with the international standards. An average of 80% of all beneficiaries reported having between 30-60 minutes of travel time to reach the distribution points. An average of 88% said they spent no more than 30-60 mins of waiting time at these points to collect their payments.

Those who indicated that distribution points were more than 60 minutes far from their residences, or that they had to use transport, came mainly from Dhaibeen-Amran. In verifying this issue with the IP, it was clarified as three planed distribution points in Amran (Dhaibeen district) were not granted the required security clearance from the authorities, as

---

22 55% of the Dhaibeen respondents used transport to arrive at the distribution points (n=91).
it was considered *a military area*, they were forced to relocation them. Thus, the IP tried to relocate those points to another nearest locations to the planned ones as much as possible. It was unclear if the project covered any expenses incurred from this necessary adjustment. Community assets were also installed/rehabilitated according the agreed upon schedules, as concluded from the community figures, local authority KII's and the Community FGD's in both governorates.

**A Case Study**

The presence of the intervention in the targeted areas inspired some communities to participate actively in supporting the community asset they chose. This community participation helped decrease the cost and make this happened faster.

In Sarar, Amha Village, the local community actively contributed to the construction of rainwater preserving tanks by *bringing their own construction materials and tools* to help in the construction efforts. They also mobilized community members to *provide food and water* for the skilled construction workers and *ensured a security escort* was provided to the building team.

The local community also *mobilized their own cash contributions* to cover some extra work expenses that were not included in the project’s plan. Families who were able to voluntarily donate to 10,000 YER, as confirmed by a community committee member from Sarar.

This example shows what when possible, the communities’ participation will maximize the efficiency, impact and sustainability, if involved properly.

2.1.3. Effectiveness

Effectiveness is often defined as a measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives. There is also value, when assessing a humanitarian intervention, in the degree of adherence to well-founded humanitarian principles. The following key factors contributed to the effectiveness of the project and were observable out of the evaluation findings.

**Flexibility and responsive**: Several pieces of evidence highlighted the issue of flexibility in response to the identified needs: prompt responses to the beneficiaries needs in changing the distribution points to more preferable locations, modifying the community assets’ design and locations based on the community committee requests and in consultation with local authorities. There were all confirmed by project generated reports and independent KII’s. Other adjustments to context included the increase in the MPC amount from 53,000 YR to 72,000 YR based on the recommendation from related clusters, extensions in the transfer times and frequency of the transfers, and shared data collection for price monitoring.

23 Key questions include: to what extent were the objectives achieved / are likely to be achieved? What were the major actors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm
In the gathered data, the highest rates of satisfaction were recorded around:

- ease of registering for the project (92%),
- accessing to the cash support (92%)
- team helpfulness when needed (98%) with no significant difference among the groups when disaggregated by gender or location.

The program activities that support these high percentages are:

- registration via the community committee based on clear, shared criteria
- distribution point at the beneficiary’s villages (majority with some exceptions)
- large program team which were flexible and responsive to beneficiaries (as discussed earlier.) These key factors were drawn from the desk review as well as supported by the results from all the FGDs and KII.

An outline in their data collection showed that around 63% of the beneficiaries’ respondents claimed that they had ‘not been consulted’ by the project with significant differences among the districts. Dhaibeen has the instance of this response highest (85%, n=91). While project staff did attend most distribution cycles, there are some possible explanations for this outlying data point that are worth noting here:

- Daibeen is a remote, military area where field work is very restricted, which may have prevented the high levels of INGO staff engagement.
- The idea of “consultation” may have been misunderstood in this context as being approached before by an enumerator – not have awareness or voice in the project process.
- Many times projects staff worked via community committees, so the individual beneficiaries who responded during the survey may not have worked directly with staff from the implementing partners CARE or ACF. This is supported by the CCs answers who confirmed high level of engagement during the design and the implementation of the project(see Forming CCs later)

Clear well Communicated CFMs: the MEAL system designed and communicated a clear CFM from the early stage of the project. As concluded from the interviewed beneficiaries, 80% within both governorates confirmed their awareness about and suitability of the CFMs, and that is was communicated to them from the very start of the project.

The CFMs modalities were mainly:

---

Have you been consulted during any stage of the project? If yes, how and when? If not, why you think you were not consulted?
- suggestion box
- a hotline number
- INGOs staff phone numbers and email addresses.
- Direct contact with INGO staff at the village and community level

Only 11% of surveyed beneficiaries reported using the CFM. When suggestions for adjustments to the process were needed, such as adjusting distribution points’ and shifting community asset locations, they were not funneled to the CFM, but raised through the community committees, who used to communicate directly with the INGO staff. Those who raised these issues in this way reported total satisfaction of the prompt reactions to their fellows’ concerns.

Most of those concerns were in Amran at the very early stage, mostly regarding the beneficiary eligibility, community asset installation schedules and MPC distribution points, all of which were reacted up in time and solved.

As it was cited from the project’s interim report, that project management had received 3 complaints (including 1 female) from Abyan and 945 (including 329 females) from Amran, which had been all addressed ²⁵, and confirmed by the CC KII.

In data collected during this study, 11% Beneficiaries (n=28) who confirmed using the CFM, rated the effectiveness of the response to their concerns up to 71% and 46% Abyan and Amran respectively. The less satisfaction rating was mainly for the complaints sent through ‘suggestion box’, where it took a long time for the responses to come. The data points were confirmed during a FGD in Habour-Amran.

Forming and engaging the Community Committees: The project staff supported the formation and engagement of community committees within each of the targeted areas. The community selected the members themselves, then those committees were engaged in all the project stages. They contributed to the design phase, MPC beneficiary selection & distribution phases, and the identification, planning and execution of the community asset projects.

The community committee’s establishment and involvement was a key action in increasing the project’s relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

²⁵ The interim report, developed by the IP after the 6th distribution cycle, Page 7
First, it helped increase the project’s ability to understand and respond to the communities’ priority needs and preferences and adapt the most suitable procedures to the community traditions and culture.

Second, it could also increase the efficiency in some cases. For example, in Sara-Amha, where it helped support a strong community contribution to the community asset project building rainwater tanks.

Third, it supported the effectiveness of the beneficiary selection, identifying community asset based on the community needs, and ensuring safe and equitable MPC distribution. The community committees decreased the possibility of any conflict, community risk and/or challenges in militarized areas; this extended the impact as well.

Finally, the CCs increased the community feeling of ownership towards the project’s community assets, which may support their sustainability/maintenance.

The community committee led workshops and the broader meetings helped in increasing the community awareness of the project and its objectives and increasing the community’s positive reactions towards the project. To ensure gender inclusion in the formation of the project support committees, women were encouraged and supported to participate in the community committees, which by turn promoted their voice, as revealed by some female members of committees in the KIIIs, (see the Impact section below, Empowering Women).

Addressing the Cross-cutting issues: regardless of the difficult context, the project worked to address key cross-cutting issues as follows:

**Vulnerabilities coverage:** With one of the worst humanitarian situations in the world today, it seems impossible to address all the vulnerabilities in the area, as it is the case in the whole country per OCHA reports and situation updates. However, the consortium tried to reach as wide a variety of vulnerabilities as possible through certain criteria, which were set in advance in consultations with the community committees and local authorities for, the MPC beneficiaries’ selection to prioritize HHs with vulnerable individuals. The following chart illustrates the variety and numbers of vulnerable individuals with the MPC 2010 targeted HHs per governorate:

---

26 IPs explained that the criteria were set in consultation with the targeted communities.
Furthermore, 19.4% of the targeted HHs had females between ‘10-15 years old’ (represented by 47% of this evaluation sample size) as a form of fighting early marriage, and an even higher percentage having females between ‘15-45 years old’ (in the productive age).

**Protection:** The consortium’s project documents indicated they initiated the project with a risk assessment, and monitored staff interactions with beneficiaries. There were references to a code of conduct for all staff all to ensure protection whether for the project staff and/or the beneficiaries.

No serious abuse, teasing, and/or troubles were reported in all the evaluation consultations, from desk reviews to the current data gathered for this study. As concluded from the evaluation enquiries with all the respondents’ groups. 99% of respondents confirmed that they had not faced any negative consequences on the basis of their participation in the project. Particularly, females, children and people with disabilities and/or chronic diseases were given special consideration as supported by the following illustrated results from survey respondents:

Most of the survey respondents, 91% in both governorates, thought that females, children and disabilities had got safe and equitable opportunity
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27 Unfortunately, this was not available for the evaluation team during the desk review.

28 The assessment team did not review the code of conduct but was informed that each INGO has their internal protection systems.
in the project. Besides, 83% in Abyan and 78% in Amran believed that female, children and disabilities were given special consideration as represented in the opposite figure. Moreover, elderly, disabled and chronic diseases HHs heads reported having their cash delivered to their doors to save them the trouble of/ the undesirable accidents when they move distances to collect their support.

**Gender Equality:** During KIIs with project staff, they spoke of a gender mainstreaming policy which had been put in place to ensure the principle of gender equality and gender mainstreaming along the project’s stages\(^{29}\), confirming that the project provided special spaces and opportunities for women to engage throughout the different activities such as Community Committees, beneficiaries registration, MPC distributions ...etc.

The project also engaged women in its different phases, and this was cited by participants during this assessments FGDs. In reviewing the CFMs, there were no discrimination cases reported. During a FDG in Abyan, a female participant said she felt that “*Men and women were treated alike*”. In addition, the community asset rehabilitation projects were designed to benefit the broadest group of residents in the targeted areas without a focus on gender.

In terms of targeting, the MPC support addressed 2010 HHs that included 12871 people (male=6424 and female= 6447), **with MPC beneficiaries relatively equally split along gender lines.**

However, there was a wider gap between the male and female headed HHs, with the percentage of female headed HHs in Amran at 34% and in Abyan, 12% as shown in the following figure: The project worked to target female headed households and ensure they were included in the MPC registration process. Due to the absence of data regarding how many female headed HHs, there were not targets specific to female-headed households set, but anecdotal evidence from FDGs and other studies show \(^{30}\) that they were

\[\text{No rejection of women participation happened. Women were involved in a number of activities like CCs, organizing the cash distribution process and in the assets rehabilitation. No one teased them”, a female community FGD revealed.}\]

\[\text{Figure 6 HHs disaggregated by HHs heads gender}\]

\(^{29}\) This document was not available to evaluation team.

\(^{30}\) *The Gendered Dimension of Multi-Purpose Cash Supporting Disaster Resilience* (2019) Sarah Ward and Afcar Consulting for CARE Yemen
included at a high level based on their instances within the targeted communities.

**Do No Harm:** To minimize any unintended negative effect from the project, the project reported:

- holding coordination meetings with the authorities since the beginning at both central and local level
- involving the community through the community committees
- continuous and systematic monitoring and consultation,

These minimized the drift from objectives and increased the targeted communities’ satisfaction and ownership, which consequently reduced the chances of any conflict occurrence. The variety of the activities introduced by the project, and the involvement of the wider community in the process of selection, distribution and reflection helped to decrease the conflict sensitivity among the target geographies.

Though the project brought money into a volatile and conflict-affected area, which can naturally cause conflict, especially when support cannot cover all people with urgent need in the community, almost no serious conflict case was reported during the lifetime of the project as concluded from this evaluation and supported by the documents reviewed during the desk research. However, it would be always better to start such intervention with a thorough project-level conflict sensitivity analysis (CSA) to increase the level of the do-no harm and decrease any chance for conflict or risk. It is worth mentioning that CARE has already two ready to use project-level CSA toolkit, one international and the other Yemeni context specific. Both have been tested and used.

Furthermore, the variety of the community asset projects has the added benefit of increased the level of satisfaction among the wider community (non MPC beneficiaries) and created some opportunities for community members to earn money at the same time in the CFW.

In some areas, MPC beneficiaries report that they also help in maximizing the community harmony through the VSLAs that were supported by the project. However, it would be difficult to quantitatively measure this without a study that can point to causality (such as an RCT).

**EU-added Value:** Though there were no other intervention in the targeted areas during the project delivery to coordinate with, the consortium led several effect coordination efforts at the regional and national level with key humanitarian actors, such as UNs, related clusters, the local authority and even local community through community committees.

The project came as a response to the YHRPs and was designed to preserve the FASC strategic objectives and reflected the different CHSs. Regarding the internal coherence, the different activities were clearly coherent with/supporting each other.
For example, road leveling facilitated the market access so MPC could be well utilized and livelihoods could improve. Access to basic services were supported by the building of/access to water tanks in other community asset projects. The water tanks also allowed beneficiaries to save the expenditure on water to meet other urgent needs – this may justify why in these communities the expenditure on water ranked the lowest among the spending categories on the PDMs. The VSLA and livelihood trainings enabled some beneficiaries to save some cash in order to establish income generating activities, **“We could save some money from each distribution till we could buy some sheep”**, a female MPC and training beneficiary from Amran declared.

In regard to **EU visibility**, a low level of visibility was found among the surveyed beneficiaries, most of them are aware just of the INGOs as implementing partners, CARE in Amran and ACF in Abyan. Even during the KII, FGDs respondents were asked about ‘what they knew about the project’, only one KII mentioned “EU-funded” in his answer.

2.1.4. Impact
Towards its medium and long-term impact, the project fully achieved its immediate outputs as defined in the framework (see Annex 4, results sheet). This section explores key impacts and outcomes according to the beneficiaries’ perception.

**Intervention’s benefits per Beneficiaries’ perceptions**: Across the different groups and sub-groups of respondents (geographic age, gender) there were no significant differences. 99% agreed that the project was between very and moderately beneficial and left a positive impact on their lives, at least during the project period. The pie chart visualizes the grand total of survey respondents rating to the project’s benefits for them:

82% (n=321) said that the intervention was ‘Very much beneficial’ for them. Next comes the second option ‘Beneficial’ with 14% of respondents. The reported benefits varies, including:

31 Over 10%, see Classification section of the Methodology for clarification
securing family food, repaying debts, improving health and education, avoiding more debts, improving FCS, facilitating market access, and securing community needs of water.

Moreover, around 83% of the consulted beneficiaries stated that the project helped them to have more time to care for their family needs and reduce family stress points such as: dedicating more time for their kids’ education follow up and support, more time to sit with the family members and discuss the family problems, which was not the case before. Some also reported having chance to save their usual little earnings during the distribution, which that helped them to invest in livelihoods, and finally, offering HHs better option than sending their youths to war.

Beneficiaries also listed other coping mechanisms that they did not need use, but would have had to if the project was not implemented, including: living on credit, commuting to towns around for hard manual labor, traveling outside the community for extra work in agricultural and sheep grazing (very limited income), begging/waiting for help from others, and/or sending their male youth to the fight.

**MPC Impact:** Multi-Purpose Cash (MPC) are transfers that people affected by crises can use to cover their basic needs. By their nature, MPCs are the assistance modality which offers people a maximum degree of choice, flexibility and dignity. There is also growing evidence that it is more cost-efficient and cost-effective to meet multiple needs. The transfers can be either one off or regular, and the amount of money is based on how much a household needs to cover a set of basic and/or recovery needs. By making sure people can cover their basic needs, MPCs allow people to make the most of in-kind goods and access services, contributing to more successful sector-specific interventions.²²

This definition matches the MPC modality in this project. The MPC was impactful as it improved FSC scores and lowered CSI rankings for all beneficiary household during the implementation period.

The MPC amount was determined by an MEB basket defined by the Technical Working Group and informed by the related clusters recommendations to cover 80% of the cost of **food, water, hygiene materials, gas/firewood and transportation for a HH.** It had

³² [http://www.cashlearning.org/thematic-area/multipurpose-cash-assistance](http://www.cashlearning.org/thematic-area/multipurpose-cash-assistance)
been first decided to be 53000 YER during the first 6 cycles, then again, based on the updates from the Food and WASH clusters due to the prices increase, it was raised up to 73000 during the last 4 cycles. The figure above illustrates how beneficiaries distributed the cash assistance on those basic items averaged over the course of the full 10 months transfer period.

It is worth mentioning that data represented in the figure 8 above have been collected 3-4 months after the last distribution cycle, though the question was asking about the usual spending of the cash assistance by the beneficiaries during the periods of the distributions. Therefore, it is not unusual to have some difference from the data collected on site during or immediately after the each distribution as reported in some of the PDMs and the endline assessments that were conducted by the IPs during and immediately after the last distribution (Apr. 2018 to Feb. 2019. As people may forget the exact amount spent for each, in addition it is normally to be changing from a month into another based on the instant needs.

However, while food comes first in all the four districts, there are significant differences among the districts regarding the rest of the needs, as illustrated in the following chart:

![Figure 9: Beneficiaries Expense Categories for Cash Assistance on the Basic Needs Per Districts](image)

There were significant differences in the order of the rest of the four items targeted in the defined basket: While in Khanfar and Habour ‘Transportation’ ranked second, in Sarar ‘Gas/firewood’ was the second and in Dhaibeen it was ‘Hygiene materials’. After that water came as third in Khanfar alone, whereas water ranked last within the rest three districts.

These differences in expenditure among the four targeted districts refers to several factors including:

- The cholera spread in Dhaibeen during the project’s period, which caused this expenditure on hygiene materials increase. This was supported from Dhaibeen local...
market KIs, who confirmed the increase in the hygienic material’s sales during the project period.

- The hard and rough roads in Habour and Khanfar increased the transportation costs.
- Water ranked last in the districts that got water tanks, which may suggest the contribution of the water tanks CAs to support food security through saving money for.

While food ranked as the top expense, it does not necessarily mean that the intended variety of food was purchased or consumed by the beneficiaries. The probing questions explored that most of the food expenditure was mainly on the cereals or bread (see FCS section) especially in Amran, as cereal is the most important item to secure the family survival for longer times according to the beneficiaries’ culture. It is an established culture in Yemen to purchase and store as much cereals as possible, often neglecting everything else, especially in the hard times, more specifically in the Yemeni Northern mountainous areas such as Amran. This is seen as the best way to secure the HHs food for the longest period possible. This was also supported the market actors interviews, that confirmed that the most noticeable sales increase was in ‘wheat, rice, sugar and oil’.

Spending MPC amounts on certain categories did not necessarily mean that households secured all the family’s needs of the referred to items. Most of the respondents showed that they could cover just between 25% - 50%, or between 50-75%, of the defined items, as well as needing to cover other urgent needs of the family as illustrated in the following:

As can be observed from the chart above, medical needs were the most selected item, followed by settling debts. It shows the level of spending and need when cash saving was selected to the same degree as buying Qat. There may be some hesitation on the part of beneficiaries to claim savings, as it would show the amount was sufficient and they were not displaying need. This was not accounted for in the data collection for this survey and other surveys that showed higher (but not significantly higher) savings levels encountered the same
possible bias. However, out of the small portion of beneficiaries, who could make saving, interesting claims were cited. Those who saved reported they could buy/invest in some sorts of livelihood (honey bees, cows, sheep and water tank) as well as use savings when they needed medical treatment and or had social affairs. Most of the responses from the inquiries showed that increasing the MPC amount might enhance savings and investing. These conclusions were supported in other assessments of the project as well.

**Community Asset Project’s influence in the response’s impact:** The community assets played a key role in maximizing the project relevance, impact and sustainability. The different types of community assets rehabilitate and built within the project supported each other such as: leveled roads have been facilitating access to market and water and helping in facilitating transportation of construction materials for other assets e.g. water tanks, Water tanks saved the HHS expenditure on water, saving some money for other needs and also saved women struggle for locating water. Lands cleaning might contribute into enhancing agri-livelihoods, VSLA promoted saving culture and livelihood training encouraged beneficiaries to think of income generation activities (for beneficiaries, who were involved in these two activities,) Finally, CFW extended the assistance reach through the conditional cash assistance and gave opportunities to reach other HHs in needs.

Community Asset Project/Resilience Supporting Activities Key Takeaways:

- Integrating with MPC enhanced results,
- CFW is an good supporting activities for MPC
- The different activities were well harmonized and supported each other for maximum effect: such as leveling roads served transportations of water tanks constructional materials,
- Gained the wider community satisfaction, thus decreasing the opportunities for conflict to develop
- Supported the project’s relevance, effectiveness, impact (and somewhat its sustainability)

In addition to that, with the presence of CFW modality, the intervention could be considered as a combination of more than one modality giving variety of alternatives to the households in the target areas, which surely would maximize the relevance, effectiveness and extended the coverage and impact of the project. These claims were evidenced by a wide appreciation from all FGDs, community and local authority KIs. They all confirmed the assets integration with/linking to other activities in the project, as explained above, as well as their benefits to the wider community. “The roads work made it easy to bring the water tanks tools to the area” a male participant in community FGD in Khanfar. While there is no evidence that these
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34 These findings are concurrent with the report *The Gendered Dimension of Multi-Purpose Cash Supporting Disaster Resilience* (2019) Sarah Ward and Afcar Consulting for CARE Yemen

projects had direct impacts on the household level resilience or the household FCS or CSI further longitudinal studies could be done to explore if they helped communities be more resilience to future shocks and conflict.

**Empowering women:** Though women empowerment was not too broad, there is evidence of intended and unintended empowering to women resulted from the project.

Approximately around 70% of the surveyed female headed HHs in both governorates declared that they were now more responsible for making money decisions and spending on family needs, or at least sharing more the decision. In discussions, women said this was not the case before the project for many of them.

In addition to that, the MPC helped to buy the needed gas/firewood, which saved women from the hard work of searching for, cutting of and carrying firewood, sometimes from mine-risky areas. Similarly, as outlined above, the multi-modal design of the community asset projects had water tanks selected in some districts in need, which also saved women from the burden of running after and carrying water from long distances on their heads or backs, effecting their health and wellbeing severely, “As a woman, I suffered a lot fetching water from far away areas on my head” a female local community FGD participant, Sarar –Abyan said. In the same FGD, another woman said, “During drought seasons we had to leave our village looking for water in other areas, now (after installing a water tank in the village) we can rest”.

On the same line, market figures in Amran confirmed that the number of women customers has increased during the intervention time. The cash assistance opened opportunities for some school-age girls to re-join the schools, after being taken away from schools due to the inability to pay the fees and/or the need of the family for the girls to work outside for food, “because of this project, my daughter could go back to the girls’ secondary school in Je’ar” a beneficiary from Khanfar stated. Moreover, some targeted HHs females could improve their MDDW score. Further anecdotal evidence is outlined in The Gendered Dimension of Multi-Purpose Cash Supporting Disaster Resilience, however significant and lasting changes to gender or cultural norms were not seen. This too is supported by the findings on above mentioned report.

**Enhancing the local market resilience:** Enhancing the local market was one of the project’s aims. It is also one of the criteria that are taken into account when selecting cash transfer modality. The evaluation revealed that the cash distribution within this intervention have supported market stability and enhancement, at least during the project’s delivery period. The direct influence varied to tackle different issues most of them included increases in the
local market actors’ sales - consequently increasing their profit, settling most of longstanding debts, and enhancing the cash flow. This allowed some of them to expand their businesses as well.

Almost all the interviewed market actors in both governorates confirmed the above claims. They revealed an increase in their sales within an average of 50% reporting more sales, especially for consumer goods. They also brought new goods based on their customers demand, “My sales increased by 70% during the project and the most demanded goods were rice, sugar, oil and wheat” a storekeeper in Habour-Amran stated, “When the project came, I could regain some of the past debt on my customers, who were selected for the assistance, after I thought it would never be paid back.” Another storekeeper in Amran clarified. In Abyan also, some market’s KIIIs revealed that they recruited additional staff and a few new shops were opened (see Annex 5. Success stories).

“A was about to close my business because most of my capital went on debts to the customers who were unable to pay me back, at the same time, I had my debt to the whole sellers. But when CARE project came, I could collect my money, renew my business, paid my debt and continued my work”, a storekeeper explained.

5. Success stories).

A grocer keeper in Abyan highlighted that “I noticed increase in sales, which let me recruit an assistant ...... New shops were also opened”. Almost all the market figures interviewed referred the mentioned change/increase in the market to the project contribution.

The same market figures interviewed also thought that this increase might vanish soon after the project’s completion, as they believe that most of the targeted people did not have sustained sources of income, “surely, as soon as the project ended, I noticed a clear decrease in my sales” a grocery owner in Harbour raised. However, they anticipate some influences will last longer, such as the cash availability, the debt settlement and the profit gained during the sales increase. This might provide less stressors on the businesses, especially if such benefits are utilized well in developing the businesses, before things get worse again.

Reducing pressure, family conflict and strengthening community harmony: Based mainly on the respondents’ responses, many indicated that the multi-modal project helped in reducing conflict among families and supporting the wider community harmony. ‘Pressure reduction’ was the most reported impact, followed by ‘decreasing the conflicts among the family’ and lastly ‘helping others’. A possible analysis as to why they appear in this order could be: the first is personal and has an immediate effect, the second needs cooperation within the same family, and the final needs more understanding and cooperation among the wider community.
Surveyed beneficiaries defined the pressure reduction as: reducing the fear of family starving after securing their basic food needs with the cash support, the ability of some of them to settle their debts, the opportunity to spare more time with the family, the ability to secure some other critical needs such as medicine and education.

More responses from the different FGDs also mentioned reducing crimes within the targeted communities, enhancing community member understanding and increasing family links. Local stakeholders shared in KII that, due to securing the family needs of food, they believed less people needed to go to war, some debts were settled, families’ health conditions were improved (slightly, especially for children and mothers), many family problems disappeared and a less movement out of the villages was observed. Yet, they also thought that most of those remarkable impacts might fade away soon after the project’s end.

Interesting significant differences can be noticed among the districts. Focusing more on the harmony within the wider community, Dhaibeen ranked the top with an average about 24% of both respondents confirming helping others in the community, whereas Habour (both in Amran) ranked the least with only 6%. Khanfar and Sarar (both in Abyan) are also significantly different from Dhaibeen with an average of 9%-13% respectively, being all with a very low rate.

This significant increase in Dhaibeen might be best explained by the fact that the VSLA initiatives were reported in Dhaibeen more than Haboor. VSLA in Dhaibeen dedicated a
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36 Both in Amran, however, there were no such initiatives in Abyan.
percentage for helping others in need who were not covered by the assistance. Furthermore, these initiatives promoted group savings among the beneficiaries, creating trust and building reserves in case of emergency.

**Financial Inclusion/access to financial services:** Banking partners did not report that any beneficiaries asked for their financial services. This might indicate that the financial services the banking partners provided commercial were not well suited to the beneficiary needs, or perhaps the banks did not see beneficiaries as possible clients.

It might be worth an exploratory conversation between the partner banks and the project to better coordinate to initiate particular financing products relevant to the beneficiaries’ context and preferences, which might extend the impact, doubling the benefits and enhancing sustainability.

When the idea was suggested to a partner bank agent in a KII, he replied positively adding that, “*The bank might plan to open electronic bank accounts so that the cash assistance is deposited in and beneficiaries can withdraw their money from the account any time they like through bank agents. The bank also might plan to carry out an awareness campaign about its services and introduce saving accounts service*” A bank agent suggested.

### 2.1.5. Sustainability

**Innovating a blend of interrelated activities:** It is actually hard to talk about sustainability in humanitarian responses in general, and in a complicated context with ongoing armed conflict as in Yemen in particular. However, the MPC transfers and complementary community asset and community support activities supported each other results to enhance impact and hopefully better protect gains.

**Introducing longer lasting community assets:** First, most of the introduced CAs in the project have sustainable nature such as water tanks, wells, roads ...etc. While these longer-term assets did not show a direct link to improving the households economic conditions or ability to directly meet their families basic need in the short-medium term, they may have longer term benefits if the communities are able to develop a maintenance and usage plan for upkeep and protection.

**Continued MPCs creating opportunities for sustainability:** On the other hand, continued MPC transfers might give a chance for the beneficiaries to save or invest some money for future needs at the same time as described above, especially if the MPC amount is increased beneficiaries are
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37 As concluded from community FGDs in Dhaibeen
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**Hints for sustainability enhancement:**
- Increasing the MEB amount,
- Livelihood/business skills training,
- Saving encouragement,
- Relevant loan products,
- Encouraging earning usual income.
encouraged and supported to save and invest in future-looking activities and income earning opportunities.

The support could be through livelihood/business skills training as well as VSLA expansion, encouraging opening saving accounts within the same bank of distribution, designing a particular loan product relevant to the context and the clients’ needs and preferences, link the assistance with a saving and business planning as a condition, matching the amount of the saved cash for those who save and plan to invest as an encouragement.

Additionally, making cash available in the area might enhance the local market specially the SMEs to continue and might even develop “many of my customers could repay some of the debt that had been overdue. In addition, more goods were demanded so I could have enough cash to continue business” A small grocery owner said.

**Increasing sustainability through Multi-Modal Programming:** Multi-Modal programs (cash+) helped to further the impact by some degrees. Roads can facilitate market access and good transportation, livelihood training encouraged some beneficiaries to save and invest some money in livelihood activities such as: buying sheep, honeybees, a cow, opening small shops …etc. The following figure presents the consulted beneficiaries’ perceptions to the extent of saving and/or investing some of the cash assistance for future needs:

According to the above chart, most of the respondents in both governorates haven’t saved money for their future needs, nor invested some of the cash assistance. Though many thought of investing some money for future (35%) while out of those 35% (15%, N=115) of respondents confirmed that they did. The data from the expense categories show that only 1% of the beneficiaries claimed to have saved any of the MPC. The difference here may be attributed to this question coming outside of the PDM survey and therefore beneficiaries are not only responding to what they did with MPCs but will household income in general.
Significantly, in Amran, the FGDs revealed an increase of those who said to have saved/invested some of the cash assistance, more than it is in Abyan. This clearly refers to the livelihood training as well as the VSLA initiatives that were delivered only in Amran.

An important trend this data reveals is that while more thought about saving/investing, few did (or were able to). Most of the those, who confirmed thinking of saving/investing said that had the amount of their MPC transfer been little higher, they would have been able to save, “we could not save for investing because the cash we received hardly covered our needs, we could not spare even a little for saving” A female beneficiary in a FGD, Amran disclosed.

2.2. Findings on CSI, LCSI, FCS and MDDW Indicators

This section presents and discusses the evaluation findings in relation to the targeted HHs’ food security key indicators. It has been arranged according to indicators after a short introductory paragraph showing the total average findings of the four indicators. This ‘Key Indicators’ section reveals some interesting results, highlights certain significant lessons and infers some future improvements as will be discussed herewith.

The first interesting finding refers to the factors the evaluation highlighted in comparison with the results of both the baseline assessment (BL) and the end-line assessment (EL). **The Endline was done immediately at the end of the project and shows significant and dramatic improvement in all areas.**

Table 2 Comparing 4 key indicators among the four assessments findings per governorate*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Abyan</th>
<th>Amran</th>
<th>National Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>Final Eval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>17.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSI</td>
<td>21.21</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>31.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% FCS ≥ 24</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>64.50%</td>
<td>34.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of women with acceptable MDDW</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The tables present the MDDW measures for Final Eval only. **details for those shadowed areas are missing

The general findings support the conclusion that MPC transfers, even with multi-modal support, while very effective during the distribution period, were not sufficient to move vulnerable households to continue to meet all their needs at the same levels when the support ended. They were extremely successful as they were on-going. However, as most households needed to use the full amount of the MPC to meet basic needs, as shown in the
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38 WFP –mVAM report, Yemen, due to May 2019.
expense category analysis above, and only 1-15% of any households showed any ability to save or invest extra money’ during the MPC cycles, the drop in FCS, the higher CSI and LCIS scores showing more use of negative coping mechanisms and the loss of any gains is not unexpected.

As illustrated in the above table and chart, the average of scores for the two governorates, shows that while there was significant Baseline to Endline improvement, there was a decline of the curves appear in the final evaluation results, three months after the last MPC transfer was disbursed.

This loss in the gains from the MPC after three months without any transfers, in some case, show indicators worse than the initial baseline results. However, for the most part the Final Evaluation scores are somewhat close to/ and slightly better than the general country scores from the WFP-mVAM report to the same period of time as the evaluation (May 2019). This indicates that the losses are not specific to the beneficiary households, but universally felt and due to outside factors such as increased conflict, worsening economic situation and increase instability.

Data Analysis

While CSI was high in the baseline (15.31), it improved in the endline up to (4.15), then it got worse again in the final evaluation (19.6). However, it remains about a point better than the WFP-mVAM results that showed (20.5).
The same for the LCSI, which was (17.97) in the Baseline, up to (5.58) in the Endline, yet, (27.57) in the Final Evaluation With a 53% change negative movement. There is not comparison data from WFP-VAM for these indicators.

It is slightly different in the % of the HHs with FCS> 42, which showed (19.1%) in the Baseline, remarkably increases up to (79.9%) in the Endline, then declines again into (35.4%) in the Final Evaluation. While there are significant gains lost, there is still an improvement from the WFP-VAM results that hits (25%).

Similarly, the percentage of women with acceptable MDDW, which shows an average of 25% within the project targeted areas though lower then endline, is still significantly better than the WFP-VAM result that concluded with 10% only.

The data shows that all the indicators had been poor before the intervention. All the indicators were significantly improved during the intervention. Then, after about 3-4 months since the last distribution, all the indicators dropped down dramatically. However, the indicators results shown in the Final Evaluations kept better levels than the equivalent results in the general country indicators as in the WFP-mVAM showing that targeted households are still faring better than the majority.

**Similar drop was cited from other relevant reports:** Other project’s external assessments have also shown a decline in the relevant indicators after 3 months of the last distribution cycle, even worse than the general level of equivalent groups who have not got assistance at all, as illustrated in the following chart from the WFP-mVAM report on other projects³⁹

![Figure 14: Indicator average decline after 1-3 months of the last distribution as per WFP-VAM](image)

The following chart visualizes the relationship between the increase of the FCS and the decline of the LCSI simultaneously that was stated in possibilities numbers 4 & 5 above:
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So, in situation where families might not get enough cash to secure their food needs, and with the absence of any other income resources or any external support, families seem to adopt higher LCS to cover the needed expenses for better FCS.

Therefore, the better the FCS indicator goes, the worse LCSI indicator drops down and vice versa.

More similar findings in relation to the FCS and LCSI contradicted relationship in the absence of other income resources was highlighted in other humanitarian responses evaluations in different countries including Yemen. The same relationship can be elicited between the MDDW score and LCSI.

The whole discussion above suggests several possible analysis points:

- The ability to maintain gains is closely related to the MPC value and the ability to replace the MPC income with other sources when the support ends.
- Beneficiaries seem not to have other alternatives to continue the same or close food security comparing to the good level they had during the MPC transfer period, especially those who could not make any saving and/or investment during the cash assistance.
- Households, who were selected due to extreme vulnerability, will lose gains more quickly and more dramatically due to their vulnerability.
- The general situation declines in the country have a direct influence on the humanitarian responses’ objectives and project timelines and end dates are not shifted due to continued national decline.
- Beneficiaries worked to maintain the food consumption habits/level they used to follow during the MPC period, which can explain why the FCS average remained above baseline.
- To preserve slightly better FCS levels as mentioned in point 4 above, families, who do not have other sources for income, seem to turn to use higher LCSI to cover the needed expenses.
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40 Pamela Pozarny (2016), Evidence on the comparative cost efficiency and effectiveness of varying social assistance modalities, GSDRC Helpdesk Research Report,
The following sections discuss the findings against each of the four key indicators in details. The presentation tackles the significant differences among the sub-groups disaggregating data by different possible mean:

2.2.1. Analysis of Food Consumption Scores (FCS)

The indicator: % of HHs with Food Consumption Score ≥ 42

Threshold measurement & FCS calculation: FCS findings have been presented and compared through thresholds measures in terms of poor, borderline and acceptable level as in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 28</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 28 and ≤ 42</td>
<td>Borderline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 42</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 FSCs thresholds measurement

With an overall FCS average of 37.7 (Borderline), ‘Cereals’ comes first in both governorates and across the different sub-groups of participants.

Almost all reported consuming ‘Cereals’ on daily basis. For the rest of the food groups, answers differ from a group into another.

The following table disaggregates the food groups average consumption frequency by governorate from data collected during the Final Evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food group</th>
<th>Consumption frequency</th>
<th>Overall Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td>Amran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereals, grains, roots and tubers</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables and leaves</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat, Fish and Egg</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses, nuts and seeds</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk and dairy products</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil / fat</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar / sweets</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condiments / spices</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows the differences of food groups’ consumption within each governorate. (Excluding spices), While fruits and vegetables and leaves have higher frequency in Abyan, the frequency of milk & dairy products, and sugar is higher in Amran. Both are nearly close to
each other regarding Oil/fat (high), and pulse, nut and seeds (low). Though meat fish and egg frequency is low in both, Abyan is still higher than Amran.

The reasons may refer to the nature of the area, the customs and features. Abyan is a coastal area famous of its fruits and vegetables’ agriculture, fishing and grazing, so those food groups’ supplies come from their own, relatives’ and/or friends’ productions. Amran is a mountainous area famous of Qat and coffee farming as well as honey productions that is why many habits include sugar, sweets, honey is common, in addition to the common knowledge that people in mountains are tighter to cows and milk.

_Thresholds measure disaggregated:_ As highlighted in the following chart, in Amran governorate, the _average FCS_ of surveyed HHs is _37.6_, which falls within the “Borderline” category. According to the thresholds measure presented earlier, _36.13%_ of the surveyed HHs are in "Acceptable" food consumption, and almost the same percentage (36.65%) are in "Borderline", while only 27.23% are in "Poor" food consumption.

Although disaggregating data of the FCS categories by HHs districts and size, HHs head gender and age, shows a quite balanced distribution of percentages among different groups, when disaggregating data by the marital status of the HHs head, it is out that the highest percentage of HHs in the acceptable food consumption level goes to those headed by a "Singles" first with 60%, then comes ‘married’ second (40%), while divorced and widowed headed HHs are within the borderline category (75%- 1% respectively).
This may indicate that single headed HHs perhaps without large number of dependents had more ability to earn income outside of assistance were able to spend more on food consumption habits, while windowed, divorced a married headed households felt more pressure to limit the type and diversity of food consumed and direct resources to other pressing needs. Nonetheless, this matter need more in-depth investigations before generalizing.

Like in Amran, the average FCS category in Abyan governorate also falls within the "borderline" with FCS average of 38. 34.6% of the surveyed HHs are in the "Acceptable" level, the same percentage are within "Borderline" food consumption, and 30.8% are suffering in the "Poor" category. But, the data disaggregation analysis of the FCS for Abyan reveals significant differences among the different groups. As illustrated in the following figure:

As can be noticed in the chart, HHs based in Khanfar had better FCS than their equivalents in Sarar.

- Sarar is more remote area than Khanfar, so people in Sarar have fewer options to supplement their incomes or access diverse foods
- Female headed HHs scored higher than those headed by males,
- A possible analysis is that females headed HHs may focus on food and household expenses better than their men counterparts. Men’s use of/purchase of Qat was also cited by respondents as a possible reason for the differences.
- Finally, HHs with 8 or more members seemed to have better food consumption habits than smaller HHs with less than 8 members.

Respondents explained the issues of how bigger families have better FCS to the probability of having more working hands in the family, who could share the expenses. Alike results were found for Amran as well. **Disaggregating Abyan’s data by respondents HHs heads’ marital status** indicated that, again similar to that in Amran, most of the surveyed HHs single-heads (60%) fall into the ‘Acceptable’ level, following them married HHs heads (36%), with an equal
percentages of ‘married’ HHs heads fall into the other two categories. On the other hand, Divorced HHs heads fall mostly into the ‘Poor’ level (75%), the rest into ‘Borderline’ (25%), and (0%) in the Acceptable’ category. HHs widow heads fall mostly in the ‘Borderline’ category. This table introduces the difference among the surveyed HHs in Abyan per marital status. Yet, simultaneously, single-headed HHs showed higher LCSI.

Both Targeted areas HHs average FCS falls into **borderline**. At the same time, disaggregated data for both targeted areas showed close FCS results among the sub-groups, in which single-headed HHs showed higher FCS than their counterparts, the same for Female-headed HHs and bigger size HHs when comparing to their equivalents as well.

### 2.2.2. Analysis of the Coping Strategy Index (CSI) Data

**The indicator: % of decrease of the Coping Strategy Index Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVERAGE CSI</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 3</td>
<td>No/low coping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 9</td>
<td>Medium coping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 10</td>
<td>High coping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The thresholds measurement was applied in measuring the CSI in both governorates.**

*This index represents negative coping skills used and their frequency. High index number show poor situations and low index number show improved situations.*

**In Amran Governorate**, the three most common coping strategies reported by the surveyed HHs are: 1) to rely on less preferred and less expensive food (5.8 days per week) by 92.15% of the respondents, 2) to limit portion size of meals (4 days per week) by 86.91% and 3) to borrow food or rely on help from a relative or friend (2.3 days per week) by 69.63% respectively, with an overall average 21.7 as in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COPING STRATEGY</th>
<th>FREQ.</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relied on less preferred, less expensive food</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed food, or relied on help from friends or relatives</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced portion size of meals</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparing the CSI results to the three standard pre-defined CSI thresholds, the majority of surveyed HHs resort to High CSI (around 89.53%), whereas, only about 6.28% of HHs fall to Medium CSI, and the least 4.19% are in the preferable Low CSI.

This pie-chart illustrates the distribution of the Amran surveyed HHs on the CSI thresholds measurement:

Comparing findings among the different consulted HHs sub-groups in Amran shows no significant difference in CSI recorded between female and male headed HHs, nor in disaggregating by size by the family or the HHs heads marital status. However, comparing data between the two districts of Amran reveals more food insecurity with Dhaibeen than Habour, though HHs in both areas are within high CSI area (23.6 – 19.9 respectively). There was no significant difference (10% or above) in male and female scores.

Table 7: Amran. Data disaggregation- Reduced coping strategy index score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COPING STRATEGY INDEX</th>
<th>DHAIBEE DISTRICT</th>
<th>HABOUR DISTRICT</th>
<th>MALE-HEADED HHS</th>
<th>FEMALE-HEADED HHS</th>
<th>HH SIZE &lt; 8</th>
<th>HH SIZE ≥ 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Abyan governorate, on the other hand, the three most common coping strategies are: 1) to rely on less preferred and less expensive food (3.8 days per week) by 87.69% of the total respondents, 2) to limit portion size of meals (2.5 days per week) declared by 64.62% of HHs, and 3) to restrict consumption by adults in order for young children to eat (2.3 days per week) by 51.54% of the surveyed HHs.

The results are similar to Amran in the first and second strategy, and different in the third strategy, with lower average of the CSI (17.4), even though both averages are high (poor).
The following table summarizes the average weighting of the CSI strategies adopted by the targeted HHs from Abyan.

Table 8 Abyan. Coping strategy index score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COPING STRATEGY</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relied on less preferred, less expensive food</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed food, or relied on help from friends or relatives</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced portion size of meals</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrict consumption by adults in order for young children to eat</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced the number of meals eaten per day</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCORE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, large portion of Abyan HHs reported a High CSI to Medium CSI, showing they are using a significant number or negative coping skills to survive and only 12.31% fall within the No/Low CSI.

In spite of falling within the high coping category, Female headed HHs in Abyan are closer to fall in medium coping than Male headed. In addition, HHs with less than 8 members are scoring better than those with more than 8 members. With respect to districts level, Sarar has recorded better CS than Khanfar. However, both are still within the high coping category as represented here.

Though the CSI scores are slightly better (lower) in Abyan, they both fall mainly within the high CSI with an overall average of (19.6). Besides, while no significant differences appeared when disaggregated Amran data, there are slight differences in Abyan’s sub-groups with some lower index numbers in Sarar district HHs, female headed HHs and smaller size HHs.
when compared to their counterparts. It seems that while the FCS are worse, they are using a bit fewer negative coping skill. This relationship is explained in the Figure 14: Relationship between FCS and LCSI indicators above.

2.2.3. Analysis of Livelihood Coping Strategy Index (LCSI) Data

Table 9 The standard LCSI categories/thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVERAGE LCSI</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 26</td>
<td>No/low coping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 - 51</td>
<td>Medium coping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 52</td>
<td>High coping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The threshold scale was used in measuring the LCSI in both governorates

This index represents negative coping skills used and their frequency. High index number show poor situations and low index number show improved situations.

Sustaining the general score within (no/low coping): Despite the ongoing deterioration of conflict situation and the soaring in food prices (see Context section at the start), the project was able to sustain the overall LCSI within the (No/Low coping) category with an average of 26.87. Abyan recorded higher coping score (poor) than Amran with “medium" coping category averaging 31.23.

The following table presents the overall frequency average for each LCSI of the surveyed HHs in both governorates:

Table 10 overall average of the LCSI frequencies for the surveyed HHs in both governorates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livelihood coping strategy</th>
<th>Frequency (Avg.)</th>
<th>Overall average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold productive assets</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold household assets</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent savings</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumed seeds stock held for the next season</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased food on credit</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrew children from school</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold house or land</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed money</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold last female animals</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced health and education expenditures</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begged</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Abyan, Surveys revealed that the first and most livelihood coping strategy used by HHs in the targeted areas when facing lack of food is to purchase food on credit with 92% of respondents. To borrow money came second with 73%. In third place with 49% of the respondents was to sell last female animals.

The pie charts presents the thresholds LCSI classification of Abyan surveyed HHs. It shows that first, majority of Abyan surveyed HHs fell within No/Low LCSI (56.15%), second came within Medium index (32.31%), and the least went to High LCSI (11.54%).

The data disaggregation on districts level showed (No/Low coping) in Khanfar while it is (Medium coping) in Sarar district, this is because the last is a remote and slightly more mountainous area with very limited spaces for agriculture, while in Khanfar – a more coastal area - people have income generating opportunities through fishing beside cultivating seasonal corps. No significant difference among other disaggregated sub-groups, such as gender, marital status or age

Table 11: Abyan. Data disaggregation- Livelihood coping strategy index score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIVELIHOOD COPING STRATEGY INDEX</th>
<th>KHANFAR DISTRICT</th>
<th>SARAR DISTRICT</th>
<th>MALE-HEADED HHS</th>
<th>FEMALE-HEADED HHS</th>
<th>HH SIZE &lt; 8</th>
<th>HH SIZE ≥ 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>25.26 No/low coping</td>
<td>33.34 Medium coping</td>
<td>32.21 Medium coping</td>
<td>29.77 Medium coping</td>
<td>29.65 Medium coping</td>
<td>35.88 Medium coping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Amran, on the other hand, while similar to Abyan that 92% of targeted HHs would ‘purchase food on credit’ as the first and most used LCS, when facing lack of food, their second LCS was to ‘reduce health and education expenditures’ (84%), and third ‘borrow money’ (77%).
It is an established culture in the mountainous areas in Yemen that unlike coastal areas, people resist selling households objects, and so they rely on selling only as a last option, when there is no other choice.

Again, no significant differences among the other sub-groups as in the following table:

![Figure 22 Amran – Thresholds Measure of LCSI](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIVELIHOOD STRATEGY INDEX</th>
<th>COPING</th>
<th>DHAIBEEN DISTRICT</th>
<th>HABOUR DISTRICT</th>
<th>MALE-HEADED HHS</th>
<th>FEMALE-HEADED HHS</th>
<th>HH SIZE &lt; 8</th>
<th>HH SIZE ≥ 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.62 Medium coping</td>
<td>19.61 No/low coping</td>
<td>25.46 No/low coping</td>
<td>22.26 No/low coping</td>
<td>21.17 No/low coping</td>
<td>25.48 No/low coping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intervention could keep the average LCSI within the No/Low coping category. While in both targeted areas, HHs showed similar index rankings on the three categories, Amran recorded slightly better results than Abyan.

Disaggregating data within both targeted areas showed slight differences at the district level, yet no significant differences among the other sub-groups could be found.

The different LCS categories between the districts may refer mainly to the geography of the targeted districts and the differences in local traditions around livelihood and household coping strategies.

2.2.4. Analysis of Minimum Dietary Diversity for Women (MDDW) Data

Indicator: % of Women with an acceptable average of MDDW.

While the acceptable of MDDW is 5 or above (means having 5 groups of food a day), the following table shows the total average of the MDDW score in both governorates as per the data collected for this final evaluation 3-4 months since the last distribution:
In Abyan Governorate, the survey revealed that, respectively, all surveyed women (100%) ate cereals the previous day/night; 35.29% consumed other types of fruits (such as papaya and banana); 31.93% consumed milk or dairy products; 26.89% ate other types of vegetables (such as cucumber, onion, and tomato); 15.13% ate meat or fish or poultry; 12.61% ate beans; 11.76% ate dark leafy green vegetables (such as spinach, kale, broccoli, and lettuce); 8.40% consumed eggs; 5.04% ate fortified foods; 4.20% ate vitamin A-rich fruits (such as apricot and pumpkin); and finally 0.84% ate nuts.

Accordingly, the women dietary diversity score is calculated at 3.94/11: women within interviewed HHs consumed an average of approximately 4 food groups (out of the total 11 food groups) during the previous 24 hours, with only 17% of Women in the surveyed HHs eat more than five variations (the acceptable average).

The following table shows disaggregated data across districts, head of HH, and HHs size:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COPING STRATEGY INDEX</th>
<th>KHANFAR DISTRICT</th>
<th>SARAR DISTRICT</th>
<th>MALE-HEADED HHS</th>
<th>FEMALE-HEADED HHS</th>
<th>HH SIZE</th>
<th>HH SIZE &gt; 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37% of HHs recorded that women in their household of productive age had eaten more than five food groups.

In Amran governorate, the MDDW average scored the same value in the baseline with 2.8/11, the following table lists the percentage of women consumed the respective food group during the 24 hours before the survey day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Group</th>
<th>% of women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grains, white roots and tubers, and plantains</td>
<td>99.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses (beans, peas and lentils)</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Category</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuts and seeds</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>30.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat, poultry and fish</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark green leafy vegetables</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vitamin A-rich fruits and vegetables</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vegetables</td>
<td>16.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vegetables</td>
<td>23.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortified food</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table shows disaggregated data across districts, head of HH, and size of household.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COPING STRATEGY INDEX</th>
<th>DHAIBEEEN DISTRICT</th>
<th>HABOUR DISTRICT</th>
<th>MALE-HEADED HHS</th>
<th>FEMALE-HEADED HHS</th>
<th>HH SIZE ≤ 8</th>
<th>HH SIZE &gt; 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 12% of HHs recorded that their women in productive age had eaten more than five food groups.

**Key Thoughts Across the Data Analysis**

The discussion in this section highlighted several interesting points that can be summarized as in the following:

- Though the key indicators (FCS, CSI, LCSI and MDDW) worsened 3-4 months after the last distribution cycle, for the most part they still remained slightly better than the general situation in the country.
- It has been highlighted in this evaluation and supported by other assessments that the key indicators for food security and well-being can be negatively affected within supported groups in 3-4 months after the last MPC support when working with highly vulnerable families in conflict zones.
- The extent of preserving gains is influenced by the geographical, demographical and cultural factors of the target areas.
- The dramatic decline across the whole country from 2017 to 2019, including the project’s targeted areas, influenced the intended impacts of the intervention.
3. Reflection
3.1. Observations & Lessons
The main significant contribution to the intervention is being the first project of multi-modality that is expected to make a leap in the humanitarian work in Yemen for during/post conflict contexts. The creative design and different activities coherence inspired the following:

- The design and implementation of the MPC modality was highly appreciated by all stakeholders because, in comparison to other known modalities in Yemen, such as in-kind assistance, pure cash transfer and conditional cash transfer assistance, it proofed to be more relevant to beneficiaries various need, more efficient, effective and generating wider impact. In addition, the availability of cash can enhance local market’s continuity and stability. The findings show that it can also contribute to increasing community as well as family resilience and it helps in reducing pressure, family conflicts and increasing community harmony, at least, during the distributions period. However, in terms of sustainability, like any other short humanitarian response, the evaluation reveals that the sustainability of MPC modality in its present form is challengeable, having the key indicators dropped in a four months since the last distribution, people might go back to their difficult situation/level prior to the intervention, especially with the general decline in the country, and the fact that most of the beneficiaries have not got other sources for income to support saving, the market also reported dropping down in the sales volumes.

- The main issues influencing the number of beneficiaries who saved or invested were:
  - The MPC amount did not give space for saving, though many would like to, but could not,
  - Medical needs, which was not a part of the MEB and value setting of the MPC, scored the highest of beneficiary’s expenditure beside the intended five items, thus consuming most of the possible saving,
  - Most of the beneficiaries were not directed towards saving/investing some cash, they did not even think of,
  - Some beneficiaries stopped their usual activities to earn some extra money, though little, which might be spared for investing. They totally depended on the assistance.
  - In fact almost all the beneficiaries used some cash from the intended expenditure on the targeted five MEB items.

- Beneficiaries needed to cover non-MEB calculated needs including medical needs, especially people with chronic diseases (see Annex 5, for alike case studies); debt settlement, which was the most frequently reported one along the evaluation; and/or other expenses as in chart 10. However those who could save extra cash for investing are mostly either, HHs without members with chronic diseases, HHs with small or no
debt to settle, HHs with more than one beneficiaries in the support packages (CFW and others, see Annex 5. Success stories, Habour), larger HHs with different working members who could add extra earnings or HHs with extra source of income, and/or much smaller HHs who did not need to spend all the MPC amount. This clearly suggest that the MPC amount be adjusted to allow extra saving for investment, as raised above, and also the importance of taking into consideration those factors when defining the future MEB valuation system.

- There was a significant difference among districts in beneficiary’s expenditure on the MEB items due to the special circumstances of each district during the assistance period. This suggests that those special circumstances of each context such as cholera spread, availability of water and firewood for cooking, transportation cost, should be taken into consideration while defining the MEB,

- Involving the local community through community committees, which in turn have participated in the different stages of the project, contributed to better identification of needs of the targeted communities. This allowed the needs to come from the beneficiaries themselves, provided a more welcoming environment by the target areas as they felt it was their choice, and eventually created fewer challenges and possibilities for conflict within the wider community. However, this does not mean decisions should be left totally to the CCs and local authority, as bias may occur. They can be used as influences on the projects’ systems and processes.

- The multi-modal project create coherence among the different activities within this intervention. This coherence helped increase the project’s results, efficiency and effectiveness, in addition to expanding the impact.

- As in the Amha-Sarar example, when the community shared the costs of the community asset project, even very simply, they also share the responsibility of preserving the asset. Amha-Sarar was the only reported case of this in this evaluation, and it is also the same area, where a local community committee was formed to look after the assets maintenance and preserve it for the future using people’s own simple tools.

- It seems that, for targeted HHs who do not have other sources of income or lack enough cash to secure their food security, all indicator may drop down significantly 3-4 months from the last MPC distribution. It also seems that for those vulnerable HHs, when MPC stops, even as FCS improves, CSI and LCSI can increase showing families using negative coping skills to secure their food needs.

- It can be assumed that the extent of preserving household level gains is influenced by the geographical, demographic and cultural factors of the target geographies, as shown in the differences between mountainous and coastal areas, remoter and less remote areas, female and male headed HHs, and single and other marital status headed HHs and these much be taken into consideration when setting targets.
3.2. Recommendations
Based on the findings, discussions and presentation above, the following summarizes the evaluators’ key recommendations for replication of the intervention in future:

Project Design:
- Continue the support to the current beneficiaries, building on the previous support and adding activities in promoting savings, livelihood and income generating activities to ensure better sustainability for extended HHs resilience.
- Increasing the MPC amounts to reflect medical needs and to give more space for the targeted HHs to save for investing in income generation activities,
- Specific needs of each targeted HHs and the unique feature of each targeted context should be taken into consideration while defining the MEB amount,
- Promote the livelihood/skills training to all beneficiaries, including plans for and support to creating income generating activities for the beneficiaries to take them from dependence on the external support into self-dependence, such activities may include: business/skills training, networking with MFIs, granting, establishing/supporting business incubators among the BENEFICIARIES, enhancing agri-business value chains as most of the Yemeni rural areas are agricultural areas to create suitable and feasible business cases for the beneficiaries to invest on,
- Including activities to promote saving culture such as expanding VSLA formations as happened in some areas in Amran during this intervention, to all beneficiaries, advocacy campaign, raising awareness, linking the support to bank account opening, encouraging saving through promotion/prizes, cutting some of the cash assistance for obligatory savings till the end of the distribution cycles,
- Encouraging the partners banks to target the same beneficiaries with their financial service, giving them especial facilitations and features,
- Promoting community share for the CAs and promoting the community ownership to the project as well as the assets,

Advocacy
- Promote the MPC and multi-modal project design to more donors as well as other humanitarian actors working in Yemen along with the learned lessons to further the reach to more communities in urgent needs, as it is expected to contribute significantly to better humanitarian response and community resilience. Promotion can be through sharing learning reports, conducting discussion meetings, proposing interventions.
In spite of the challenging context, the project addressed the most vulnerable HHs with the MPC, and supported the wider community with community assets and support projects. The following concluding table highlights some minor issues raised during the evaluation that it would be valuable not to miss. While some of them were reported only once, it is assumed that some other similar cases might occur.

Table 17 concluded minor issues and their specific recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>The identified issue</th>
<th>The evidence</th>
<th>Expected negative influence</th>
<th>Comment and recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low rate of response to the complaints sent through the suggestion boxes,</td>
<td>The survey respondents rating to the team responsiveness to their concerns (71% Abyan- 46% Amran), in addition to the quotes from some FGDs,</td>
<td>The team might miss important issues effecting the some of the intervention effectiveness and results,</td>
<td>The project reworked the suggestion box and refocused on the hotline, staff reporting, face-to-face check ins and community committees based on these findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Depending on the CCs and local authority to decide the CAs locations,</td>
<td>Leveling the road in Habour Center, which reported to be first for Radman village (which do not have road at all), then based on local authority consultation, it was moved to the Center, which already has a new</td>
<td>-May promote bias within the local authority, -May create CS among the community, -May prevent people in more needs from the</td>
<td>Though single case was reported, might wish to review the CC as well as local authority suggestion, recheck with different local parties and stakeholders to be sure of the feasibility of the suggestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leveled road. Alike citation from Abyan was recorded, benefits of the CA,</td>
<td>There is no data on how many female headed HH there are in the target areas. Missing some may cause inequality, reducing female headed HHs of getting equal opportunities with male headed HHs,</td>
<td>In a society like Yemen, females are more vulnerable than male, having limited options for work and/or earning money. Moreover, due to war, more burden is placed on women due to the death of the male member, injury or absence in the fight. It should be a priority to ensure that as many are exist are reached. This starts with collecting data regarding how many female headed HHs are there in the targeted community, then making balance as much as possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A wide gap between male and female headed HHs in targeting,</td>
<td>The targeting statistics show: Amran: 66% male headed HHs – 34% female headed, Abyan: 88% male – 12% female headed HHs,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lack of key documents to keep the Cross-cutting issues on track</td>
<td>Except for one criteria stating to include HHs with girls under 15 years old, there was no clear gender or youth focus and the evaluators did not see in their desk review of the project documents policies emphasizing protection, gender equality or DNH issues</td>
<td>If this is, in fact, an absence – and not just that documents were not shared, it might cause the staff to neglect important issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Low level of donor (EU) visibility among beneficiaries and other stakeholders,</td>
<td>No one of the KII, FGDs respondents (except one local authority figure in Amran) mentioned EU in their description of the project,</td>
<td>If it falls within the conflict assessment plan, the donor’s visibility could be raised in the field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be easy to share and access clear strategies, policies and criteria and communicate them well to the project staff and all stakeholders. Monitoring tools should document these publicly and they should be central to any new activity.
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