



Report Number: ICRR0024754

1. Project Data

Project ID P179066	Project Name Myanmar Community Support Project		
Country Myanmar	Practice Area(Lead) Social Sustainability and Inclusion		
L/C/TF Number(s) WBTF-C0664,WBTF-C0665,WBTF-C0666,WBTF-C4262,WBTF-C4263,WBTF-C4264	Closing Date (Original) 30-Sep-2024	Total Project Cost (USD) 22,354,251.00	
Bank Approval Date 26-Apr-2023	Closing Date (Actual) 30-Sep-2024		
	IBRD/IDA (USD)	Grants (USD)	
Original Commitment	0.00	22,400,000.00	
Revised Commitment	0.00	22,354,251.00	
Actual	0.00	22,354,251.00	
Prepared by Katharina Ferl	Reviewed by Chikako Miwa	ICR Review Coordinator Avjeet Singh	Group IEGSD (Unit 4)

2. Project Objectives and Components

a. Objectives

According to the Project Appraisal Document (PAD) (p. v) and the Financing Agreement of March 26, 2024 (p. 6), the objective of the project was “to improve food security and livelihoods of vulnerable populations in selected areas of Myanmar”.



When the project received Additional Financing (AF) in March 2024, the scope of the project decreased its level of ambition since the target of PDO indicator (share of households with an acceptable Food Consumption Score (FCS)) was decreased. At the same time, the PDO indicator target for households relying on emergency or crisis coping strategies was increased. In addition, the target number for beneficiaries across all components was increased.

The objective will be parsed as follows:

- i. to improve food security of vulnerable populations in selected areas of Myanmar;
- ii. to improve livelihoods of vulnerable populations in selected areas of Myanmar.

Target populations were identified through a status-based criteria approach (i.e. all internally displaced persons (IDPs) in a given settlement) or a vulnerability or needs-based approach (for the population living outside IDP camps).

b. Were the project objectives/key associated outcome targets revised during implementation?

Yes

Did the Board approve the revised objectives/key associated outcome targets?

Yes

Date of Board Approval

20-Mar-2024

c. Will a split evaluation be undertaken?

Yes

d. Components

The project included four components:

Component 1: Protect Human Capital (appraisal estimate US\$4.5 million, AF US\$3.1 million, actual US\$8.2 million): This component was to finance the delivery of cash and in-kind support to vulnerable populations in Rakhine State. The component was to reduce the vulnerability of the target population to food consumption insecurity, and to mitigate against the risk of lasting impacts of negative coping strategies, such as asset sales, dilution of savings, removal of children from school, and reduced consumption. Approximately 80 percent of beneficiaries were to receive cash transfers while the remainder were to receive either food or food plus cash, depending on market conditions and beneficiary group access to these markets. The component was to be implemented by the World Food Programme (WFP).

Component 2: Improve Nutrition of Vulnerable Groups (appraisal estimate US\$795,000, AF US\$552,000, actual US\$0.8 million): This component was to finance the provision of specialized nutritious foods to at-risk children under the age of five and pregnant and lactating women and girls and was to invest in improved knowledge on positive nutrition behaviors in Rakhine State. Furthermore, this component was to also provide technical support to promote optimal infant and young child feeding practices through



nutrition promotion sessions and counselling to caregivers (with children 6-59 months) and pregnant and lactating women and girls. The component was to be implemented by WFP.

Component 3: Support Sustainable Livelihoods (appraisal estimate US\$3.5 million, AF US\$2.4 million, actual US\$7.0 million): This component was to finance the provision of basic livelihoods support to reduce negative coping strategies by displaced and conflict-affected populations. The component was to specifically support i) unconditional cash transfers to assist households recover from the loss of livelihoods due to displacement, ii) cash-for-work wage transfers to cover critical needs of vulnerable households that would also help to maintain or repair community infrastructure, and iii) inputs and technical oversight and assistance to increase household agricultural production to improve food security. This component was to be implemented by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC).

Component 4: Ensure Access to Basic Services (appraisal estimate US\$4.4 million, AF US\$3.1 million, actual US\$6.4 million): This component was to finance construction materials, basic equipment, contractor costs, labor and technical oversight for small-scale infrastructure that supports access to basic services such as water, sanitation, and shelter. This component was to benefit households displaced by conflict, as well as residents, returnees, and resettled communities. The component was to be implemented by ICRC.

e. Comments on Project Cost, Financing, Borrower Contribution, and Dates

Project cost: The project was estimated to cost US\$13.20 million. The actual cost was US\$22.35 million. On March 20, 2024, the project received Additional Financing (AF) in the amount of US\$9.20 million to scale up the project's scope.

Financing: The project was financed by a Trust Fund (TF) in the amount of US\$2.05 million (TF-C0666) (which completely disbursed), a TF (TF-C0665) in the amount of US\$3.24 million (which completely disbursed), a TF (TF-C0664) in the amount of US\$7.90 million (of which US\$7.88 million disbursed), a TF (TF-C4262) in the amount of US\$5.52 million (of which US\$5.49 million was disbursed), a TF (TF-C4264) in the amount of US\$3.53 million (which completely disbursed) and a TF (TF-C4263) in the amount of US\$151,700 (which was completely disbursed).

Borrower Contribution: It was not planned for the Borrower to make any contribution.

Dates: The project was restructured was restructured two times:

On December 15, 2023, the project was restructured to extend the closing date by three months from December 31, 2023, to March 31, 2024, to ensure that there was no financing gap until the AF was approved.

On March 20, 2024, the project received AF in the amount of US\$9.20 million to expand project activities. Also, the project was restructured to: i) increase component costs to reflect the scale up of activities; ii) include a PDO-level indicator aligned with the World Bank Corporate Scorecard; iii) reflect the increased number of beneficiaries; iv) adapt target values for several indicators; and v) extend the closing date by six months from March 31, 2024 to September 30, 2024 to allow for the completion of project activities.



The project was approved on April 26, 2023, and became effective on May 2, 2023. The project's original closing date was December 31, 2023, and the actual closing date was September 30, 2024.

Since some of the PDO targets were reduced, a split evaluation will be conducted.

3. Relevance of Objectives

Rationale

Country/region and sector context. At the time of project appraisal, in May 2022, Myanmar faced significant challenges, a difficult recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic and a military takeover in February 2021. This resulted in a 20 percent decrease in Gross Domestic Product (GDP) between 2021 and 2022, a currency depreciation against the US Dollar by 50 percent, and an inflation rate of 22 percent. In addition to the economic downturn, the military takeover intensified more widespread civil demonstrations and political violence.

As a result of this economic downturn and violence, over 1.1 million people were newly displaced in 2022. By the end of that year, an estimated 15.2 million people (around 28% of the population), faced acute food insecurity and experienced decreased access to basic services, such as water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH), healthcare, and education.

Due to this challenging situation, the World Bank team cooperated with experienced Implementing partners in the country (the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the World Food Programme (WFP)). Through these implementing partners, the project aimed to ensure essential food, nutrition, and livelihood needs were met through a proven set of short-term interventions aligned with established best practice.

Alignment with the World Bank strategy. The objective was in line with the World Bank's most recent Country Partnership Framework (CPF) (FY20-23) and one of its focus areas "building human capital and fostering peaceful communities". One of the key objectives of this focus area included expanding equitable access to basic services and community-level infrastructure in the most underserved communities. No current CPF for Myanmar was in place at the time of project closing. The objective of the project was also in line with the World Bank's Strategy for Fragility, Conflict, and Violence 2020 2025 (FCV Strategy), which emphasized the need for the World Bank and others to stay engaged during times of active conflict and to work closely with humanitarian and other partners to ensure a synergy between short- and medium-term responses. Finally, the objective of the project was in line with the priorities of the United Nations Socio-Economic Resilience Response Plan and the 2023 Humanitarian Needs Plan, which stressed the importance of minimizing the number of people slipping into acute need and maximize convergence of humanitarian and development planning while doing so.

Responsiveness to changing country needs: According to the ICR (para. 60), in October, 2023, cyclone Mocha hit Myanmar as one of the largest storms recorded in the Indian Ocean resulting in huge infrastructure and agricultural damage. Also, armed conflicts increased resulting in civilian casualties, human rights abuse and large displacement of people, Furthermore, the situation of the economy



deteriorated with a high depreciation of the Myanmar Kyat against the US Dollar as well as high inflation resulting in even more challenging living conditions, especially among the project target beneficiaries.

The project addressed a critical development problem and was pitched at the outcome level appropriately. However, when the country's situation deteriorated, the objective of the project was not revised to remain highly relevant. Therefore, relevance of the objective was Substantial.

Rating

Substantial

4. Achievement of Objectives (Efficacy)

OBJECTIVE 1

Objective

Improve food security of vulnerable populations in selected areas of Myanmar

Rationale

Theory of change: The project's theory of change stated that project inputs/activities such as distributing food and/or cash transfers to populations affected by conflict, providing supplementary feeding of at-risk children under five and at-risk pregnant and lactating women/girls, as well as providing support to organization/support of food assistance decision making bodies and for growth monitoring and technical support for infant and young child feeding practices were to result in several outputs. These outputs were to include beneficiaries receiving food/cash transfers in a timely manner, children under five and pregnant/lactating women/girls receiving timely supplementary feeding rations and capacity of food assistance decision making bodies strengthened. These outputs were to result in the outcome of improved food security of vulnerable populations in selected areas of Myanmar.

The project made the following assumptions: i) implementing partners have continued access to affected areas; ii) local contractors are available/interested in civil works activities; iii) implementation arrangement (especially relating to movement of cash) do not deteriorate; iv) conflict and violence does not escalate to levels that further undermine beneficiary wellbeing; and v) global inflation pressures do not compromise core project activities or beneficiary coverage. These assumptions were relevant and appropriate, but they were framed in different ways, mixing external conditions with internal or vaguely defined factors and would have been stronger if they were more specific, observable, and consistently focused on conditions outside the project's control.

Outputs:

- The project supported 45,215 beneficiaries, exceeding the original target of 27,800 beneficiaries.
- The percentage of food assistance decision-making entity members being women decreased from 48 percent at baseline to 41 percent at closing, not achieving the original target of 50 percent (this target was not revised when the project received AF).



- 96 percent of beneficiaries were satisfied with the support provided, exceeding the original target of 75 percent (this target was not revised when the project received AF).
- 16,900 beneficiaries were provided with specialized nutritious foods, exceeding the original target of 8,619 beneficiaries (this target was not revised when the project received AF).
- The percentage of dietary diversity of women being supported under component 2 decreased from 67.5 percent at baseline to 28 percent at closing, not achieving the original target of 70 percent (this target was not revised when the project received AF).
- The percentage of household food coming from own production increased from 20 percent to 73 percent, not achieving the original target of 80 percent. TPM data showed that by project closing, 60 percent of assisted households used harvests for consumption, 25 percent for both consumption and sale, and 15 percent primarily for sale contributing to livelihood improvements.

Outcomes:

- The percentage of targeted households that had an acceptable Food Consumption Score (FCS) decreased from 74 percent at baseline to 69 percent at project closing, not achieving the original target of 80 percent.
- The percentage of households relying on emergency/crisis livelihood strategies increased from 49 percent at baseline to 58 percent at closing, not achieving the original target of 40 percent (this target was not revised when the project received AF).

The project was not able to decrease the percentage of households that were relying on emergency/crisis livelihood strategies. The targeted households' FCS decreased and did not achieve its target. Also, the project was not able to provide dietary diversity for women. As the two PDO indicators had negative progress (the actual results were worse than the baselines), the achievements of outcomes could be rated Negligible. However, the efficacy is rated Modest; because, prior to the escalation of conflict following October 2023, the project had realized positive progress towards all original outcome indicators (ICR, paragraph 34). Without the significant change in operational context post-October, it is likely that positive trends would have continued. Achievement of the original objective was Modest.

Rating

Modest

OBJECTIVE 1 REVISION 1

Revised Objective

Improve food security of vulnerable populations in selected areas of Myanmar

Revised Rationale

The theory of change under this objective was not revised. The target beneficiaries increased when the project received AF, but the PDO indicator on "percentage of targeted households that had an acceptable FCS" decreased its level of ambition.

Outputs:



- 45,215 beneficiaries were supported through food and cash assistance under component 1, exceeding the revised target of 42,215 beneficiaries.
- The percentage of food assistance decision-making entity members being women decreased from 48 percent at baseline to 41 percent at closing, not achieving the original target of 50 percent (this target was not revised when the project received AF).
- 96 percent of beneficiaries were satisfied with the support provided, exceeding the original target of 75 percent (this target was not revised when the project received AF).
- 16,900 beneficiaries were provided with specialized nutritious foods, exceeding the original target of 8,619 beneficiaries (this target was not revised when the project received AF).
- The percentage of dietary diversity of women being supported under component 2 decreased from 67.5 percent at baseline to 28 percent at closing, not achieving the original target of 70 percent (this target was not revised when the project received AF).

Outcomes:

- The percentage of targeted households that had an acceptable FCS decreased from 74 percent at baseline to 69 percent at project closing, not achieving the revised target of 76 percent.
- 279,240 people benefitted from strengthened food and nutrition security through food and cash assistance (component 1), nutrition assistance (component 2) as well as livelihood support (component 3), not achieving the target of 304,400 people.

While the project was able to deliver some outputs, it was not able to achieve an acceptable FCS in targeted households and provide people with strengthened food and nutrition security due to an increase of armed conflicts after October 2023 and a contraction of operating space, particularly due to reduced access and increased insecurity (ICR, paragraph 60). As a result, overall achievement under this objective was Modest.

Revised Rating
Modest

OBJECTIVE 2

Objective

Improve livelihoods of vulnerable populations in selected areas of Myanmar

Rationale

Theory of change: The project's theory of change stated that project inputs/activities such as providing cash grants and cash-for-work wage transfers to conflict or other disaster affected beneficiaries, providing agriculture inputs and technical assistance for agriculture production, as well as identifying and financing small-scale works for basic services were to result in several outputs. These outputs were to include households receiving cash grants and wages or agricultural inputs, as well as constructing small-scale works subprojects. These outputs were to result in the outcome of improved livelihoods of vulnerable populations in selected areas of Myanmar.

Outputs:



- 217,140 beneficiaries received livelihood assistance under component 3, exceeding the original target of 144,000 beneficiaries.
- 76 percent of target households received cash support that enabled them to cover their basic needs, not achieving the original target of 80 percent (this target was not revised when the project received AF).
- The percentage of household food coming from own production increased from 20 percent to 73 percent, not achieving the original target of 80 percent.
- 282,799 beneficiaries had access to project supported infrastructure, exceeding the original target of 136,000 beneficiaries.
- 91 percent of female beneficiaries indicating that infrastructure support/service had a positive impact on them, exceeding the target of 80 percent (this target was not revised when the project received AF).

Outcomes:

- The percentage of households relying on emergency/crisis livelihood strategies increased from 26 percent at baseline to 49 percent at closing, not achieving the original target of 20 percent.

The project was not able to decrease the percentage of households relying on emergency/crisis livelihood strategies since the implementing environment deteriorated due to conflict and natural disasters during project implementation. The project would have benefitted from revising the PDO indicator under this objective to allow for measuring actual achievement. Overall achievement was Modest.

Rating
Modest

OBJECTIVE 2 REVISION 1

Revised Objective

Improve livelihoods of vulnerable populations in selected areas of Myanmar

Revised Rationale

The theory of change under this objective was not revised but the scope of the project was increased when the project received AF.

Outputs:

- 217,140 beneficiaries received livelihood support assistance, not achieving the revised target of 245,500 beneficiaries.
- 76 percent of target households received cash support that enabled them to cover their basic needs, not achieving the original target of 80 percent (this target was not revised when the project received AF).
- The percentage of household food coming from own production increased from 20 percent to 73 percent, not achieving the revised target of 70 percent.



- 282,799 beneficiaries had access to project supported infrastructure, exceeding the revised target of 204,000 beneficiaries.
- 91 percent of female beneficiaries indicating that infrastructure support/service had a positive impact on them, exceeding the target of 80 percent (this target was not revised when the project received AF).

Outcomes:

- The percentage of households relying on emergency/crisis livelihood strategies increased from 26 percent at baseline to 49 percent at closing, not achieving the revised target of 23 percent.

The project was not able to decrease the percentage of households relying on emergency/crisis livelihood strategies since the implementing environment deteriorated due to conflict and natural disasters during project implementation. While the project was not able to achieve its outputs and outcome targets, achievement could be rated Negligible. However, the efficacy is rated Modest; because, prior to the escalation of conflict following October 2023, the project was able to make achievements under its outputs targets. Without the significant change in operational context post-October, it is likely that positive trends would have continued. Therefore, overall achievement was Modest.

Revised Rating
Modest

OVERALL EFFICACY

Rationale

Achievement of the first original and revised objective was Modest. Achievement of the second original and revised objective was Modest.

Overall Efficacy Rating
Modest

Primary Reason
Low achievement

5. Efficiency

The PAD and the ICR did not conduct a cost-benefit analysis and stated that data collection was not possible due to the prevailing conflict situation in the country.

The PAD (para. 98) conducted a review of similar interventions in other countries, which found that a positive economic impact was to be expected from all different components: i) food and cash transfers improve food security, reduce negative coping, and build household assets, with cash transfers being more cost-effective; ii) nutrition interventions targeting early childhood stunting and exclusive breastfeeding yield high returns ranging from US\$4 to \$35 per dollar spent; iii) multi-purpose cash grants boost household and livestock assets, enabling



savings, debt reduction, and livelihood investment; iv) agricultural input kits, as used in Myanmar, show positive margins and cash flow increases; and v) small-scale infrastructure (water, electrification) delivers strong economic returns (Economic Internal Rates of Return (EIRRs) ranging from 12.2–132%), while shelter provision improves health outcomes.

The ICR (para. 50) stated that a rigorous economic and financial analysis was conducted for the follow-on Myanmar Community Livelihoods Assistance Project (MCLAP, P181475), which estimated the following EIRRs: water supply (32.1%), unconditional cash transfers (30.5%), nutrition/food security cash transfers (20.8%), shelter (26.0%), and crop production (11.7%).

Operational efficiency:

According to the ICR (para. 51) WFP administrative costs (direct and indirect) were 10.9% of the total grant, which was within the typical 10-12% range for World Bank financed cash transfer programs. Administrative costs associated with ICRC-implemented components were 22.7%. The ICR did not state if these costs were typical for a project implemented in a conflict area. Input costs were 4% for WFP, representing an improved value over previous WFP-World Bank operational partnerships, and 6.5% for ICRC, consistent with prior World Bank-ICRC operational partnerships.

The project’s implementation period was extended twice by a total of 21 months to allow for the increase in the project’s scope.

Overall, the project’s efficiency is rated Substantial despite lack of a traditional economic analysis given the conflict situation.

Efficiency Rating

Substantial

a. If available, enter the Economic Rate of Return (ERR) and/or Financial Rate of Return (FRR) at appraisal and the re-estimated value at evaluation:

	Rate Available?	Point value (%)	*Coverage/Scope (%)
Appraisal		0	0 <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
ICR Estimate		0	0 <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable

* Refers to percent of total project cost for which ERR/FRR was calculated.

6. Outcome

For both the Original and Revised objectives: Relevance of the objective was Substantial. Efficacy was rated Modest and Efficiency was rated Substantial resulting in an overall outcome of Moderately Unsatisfactory.



	Original PDO	Revised PDO
Relevance of Objective	Substantial	
Efficacy	Modest	
Objective 1	Modest	Modest
Objective 2	Modest	Modest
Efficiency	Substantial	
Outcome rating	Moderately Unsatisfactory	Moderately Unsatisfactory
Numerical value of outcome rating	3	3
Disbursement % at time of restructuring	59%	41%
Weighted value of the outcome rating	$3 \times 0.59 = 1.77$	$3 \times 0.41 = 1.23$
Final outcome rating	$1.77 + 1.23 = 3$ Moderately Unsatisfactory	

- a. **Outcome Rating**
Moderately Unsatisfactory

7. Risk to Development Outcome

The project's risk to development outcomes can be classified into the following categories:

Political and economic: Ongoing risks include the potential escalation of conflict, which could lead to large-scale displacement, increased movement and access restrictions, and further deterioration of the country's economy.

Environment: Major natural hazards such as another cyclone continue to pose serious risks to life and safety, and might result in widespread infrastructure damage, undermine livelihoods and household resources, and force population movements. The cumulative effects of such shocks are likely to severely weaken human capital, exacerbate food insecurity, and intensify both the scale and depth of poverty throughout Myanmar.

8. Assessment of Bank Performance

a. Quality-at-Entry

According to the ICR (para. 48), the project was built on lessons learned derived from previous World Bank projects implemented in Myanmar. These lessons highlighted, for example, the importance of: i) cash and food support addressing immediate needs while support for local infrastructure and livelihoods, providing the basis for longer-run resilience; ii) simplicity in FCV contexts to ensure effective implementation; iii) delivering directly to communities in places where governance institutions are



contested; iv) putting in place quick disbursing mechanisms working through specialized partner agencies with a presence on the ground in case of an emergency situation.

According to the PAD (para. 132), the project identified relevant risks to project implementation and the following as High political and governance as well as overall financial management due to the country's FCV environment. Mitigation measures included individual conflict analyses by each organization to inform implementation and suspension of work in given areas in case of deteriorating security. Several risks were rated as Substantial including: i) macroeconomic due to the country's economic volatility; ii) technical design due to physical access restrictions as well as constraints to transferring cash to communities and beneficiaries; iii) overall residual procurement due to potential price increases for commodities, logistics challenges in distributing project inputs etc.; iv) environmental and social due to e.g., potential exclusion of disadvantaged or vulnerable households and ethnic minorities; and v) stakeholder due to large number of stakeholders with diverse views. The World Bank team provided mitigation measures that were adequate. However, several risks, which were outside the World Bank's control, materialized with Myanmar's economy substantially deteriorating, armed conflicts increasing after October 2023, and Cyclone Mocha, one of the largest storms ever recorded in the Indian ocean, hitting Myanmar. According to the ICR (para. 63), both the WFP and the ICRC conducted regular assessments and monitoring activities with the aim of mitigating those events to the extent possible.

The Results Framework was mostly adequate (see section 9a for more details).

Overall, Quality at Entry was Satisfactory.

Quality-at-Entry Rating Satisfactory

b. Quality of supervision

The World Bank team conducted four implementation support missions and two technical field missions during the project's 27 months implementation. According to the ICR (para. 79), the World Bank team's Implementation Status Reviews (IRs) were candid, and findings of the third-party monitoring agent were discussed with implementing agencies and the Country Management Unit.

The World Bank team secured AF to increase the number of targeted beneficiaries. As a result, the World Bank team also modified the project's Results Framework to better reflect the increase in scope.

The Results Framework could have benefitted from a revising the project's objective (for the objective to remain high relevance after the security situation deteriorated) and decreasing and adapting targets, when it became clear that the country's situation was deteriorating and negatively impacting project implementation.

Overall, Quality of Supervision was Satisfactory.



Quality of Supervision Rating

Satisfactory

Overall Bank Performance Rating

Satisfactory

9. M&E Design, Implementation, & Utilization

a. M&E Design

The objective of the project was clearly specified. However, the project's theory of change and how key activities and outputs were to lead to the intended outcomes had logical gaps since the PDO was pitched at a relatively high level. The selected indicators encompassed all outcomes of the PDO statement. While the indicators were adequate to measure the contribution of the operation's activities and outputs towards achieving the objective, the Results Framework did not include two indicators that were stated in the project's theory of change: i) children under the age of five that were consuming sufficient nutrients (component 2); and ii) beneficiaries using food/cash transfers as intended (component 1).

Overall, the indicators included in the Results Framework were specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time bound (SMART) and had baselines.

According to the PAD (para. 88), WFP and ICRC were to report on the selected indicators and targets through quarterly progress reports to the World Bank. While most of the results were regularly recorded and reported through the management information systems of the two partners, data for the two PDO-level outcome indicators was to be collected through surveys conducted by the partners.

b. M&E Implementation

According to the ICR (para. 67), M&E data was collected through the implementing agencies' broader post-distribution monitoring (PDM) survey processes on a bi-annual basis and reported to the World Bank. Also, the implementing agencies ensured that reported data could be traced to beneficiaries supported under the project, among their larger caseloads.

According to the ICR (para. 68), the World Bank hired a third-party monitoring agent (TPMA) to complete a baseline assessment and three additional rounds of monitoring between September 2023 and October 2024. This assessment experienced some delays due to the need to build capacity to improve data collection and reporting quality.

When the project received AF in March 2024, the Results Framework was revised to reflect the increase of the project's scope. However, the project would have benefitted from revising the objective as well as indicators and its targets when the country's conditions deteriorated and achievement of PDO indicators 1 and 2 was beyond the project's control. According to the ICR (para. 66), with the deteriorating FCV conditions, it was unlikely that beneficiaries were able to access nutritious and diverse foods required for achieving the food consumption score (PDO indicator 1) which was also linked to the livelihood coping



strategies index (PDO indicator 2). Since these two indicators were not revised, actual achievements of the project were challenging to measure.

c. M&E Utilization

According to the ICR (para. 70), M&E data were used to inform project management and decision making such as the increase in project financing/scope. Also, monitoring of the local environment allowed for adjustments in project implementation. The World Bank shared third party monitoring findings with implementing agencies in a timely manner, allowing them to identify and address implementation issues.

The project's M&E had several shortcomings such as a not logical theory of change and PDO indicators 1 and 2 that were inadequate to measure the project's outcomes and should have been revised during the project restructuring. Therefore, overall M&E quality is rated Modest.

M&E Quality Rating

Modest

10. Other Issues

a. Safeguards

The project's overall environmental and social risk classification at appraisal was Substantial. The E&S risk was downgraded to Moderate in June 2024 due to the satisfactory E&S performance of ICRC and WFP. However, the overall safeguard risk remained Substantial. According to the ICR (para.73), all Environmental and Social Standards (ESSs), except ESS9 (Financial Intermediaries), applied and were complied with. Both WFP and ICRC prepared and disclosed an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Environmental and Social Commitment Plan. Also, a simplified Labor Management Plan was included within the ESMFs.

The ICR (para. 73) stated that both Implementing Agencies and the World Bank built capacity throughout project implementation to ensure that the project was in line with the safeguard instruments. The project experienced two incidents (spillover of armed conflict occurring close to the project area), which were reported in a timely manner to the World Bank. The project addressed these incidents by reviewing the safety and risk protocols at the sites and adopting mitigation measures. However, once the security situation worsened, stakeholder engagement became more challenging.

b. Fiduciary Compliance

Financial Management and Procurement:

According to the ICR (para. 74), the project followed the financial management and procurement guidelines of the implementing agencies. For the WFP this aligned with the use of Alternative Procurement



Arrangements, as outlined within the World Bank’s Procurement Policy. For ICRC, this was in line with the Operational Framework Agreement (OFA). An Anti-Corruption Guideline waiver was processed for WFP. Also, a waiver was processed to allow the financing of food expenditures under the project. During project preparation, the World Bank conducted a country-specific procurement assessment, which resulted in a “low” risk rating. However, in the PAD the risk was rated as Substantial due to acknowledging factors beyond the control of WFP and ICRC.

The ICR (para. 74) stated that interim unaudited financial reports were of acceptable quality and submitted on time.

c. Unintended impacts (Positive or Negative)

NA

d. Other

11. Ratings

Ratings	ICR	IEG	Reason for Disagreements/Comment
Outcome	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Unsatisfactory	Shortcomings in Efficacy
Bank Performance	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Quality of M&E	Substantial	Modest	The project’s M&E had several shortcomings
Quality of ICR	---	Substantial	

12. Lessons

The ICR (para. 84-94) provided useful lessons learned which were adapted by IEG:

- **In complex and rapidly changing operating environments, designing programs with built-in redundancy can strengthen continuity, reach, and overall impact.** In this project, engaging multiple implementing partners proved critical to maintaining coverage under challenging conditions. Different partners brought distinct networks, operational histories, and access routes, allowing the response to reach diverse geographic areas. Even where partners had overlapping technical capacities or geographic mandates, this redundancy ensured wider and more reliable access during urgent situations—such as the response to Cyclone Mocha and operations in conflict-affected areas of Northern Rakhine where ICRC access was essential.



- **Embedding flexibility into project design can be essential for effective implementation in FCV contexts, where conditions can change rapidly and unpredictably.** In this project, built-in design flexibilities enabled the project to navigate a highly fluid operating environment marked by escalating conflict, new and repeated displacement, Cyclone Mocha, rising inflation and liquidity constraints, and access restrictions. By remaining less prescriptive about geographic focus, beneficiary groups, and implementation approaches, the project was able to adapt dynamically—shifting to new locations, supporting emerging beneficiary groups, engaging local partners not originally envisioned, adjusting delivery modalities, responding to urgent infrastructure needs, and reallocating resources across components to sustain delivery.
- **Sustainable impact in fragile and contested settings can result from service delivery, but also from strengthening local institutional systems that can link immediate assistance with longer-term development outcomes.** Within this project, the limited strength of local institutional capacity underscored the importance of investing in such systems. While humanitarian efforts in Myanmar largely prioritized direct delivery of essential services, insufficient attention was given to building local institutions' ability to identify priorities and make resource allocation decisions. In a context of weak, fragmented, and contested local governance, this constrained opportunities for locally led planning and response. The experience points to the need for future support to build or reinforce local institutional platforms that can manage resources, enable inclusive decision-making, and bridge humanitarian and development interventions—drawing on lessons from initiatives such as the National Community-Driven Development Project (P132500).

13. Assessment Recommended?

No

14. Comments on Quality of ICR

The ICR provided an adequate overview of project preparation and implementation and included useful lessons learned that can be applied to future World Bank projects. Also, the ICR was internally consistent and sufficiently outcome driven by providing relevant data. Overall, the quality of the ICR was Substantial.

a. Quality of ICR Rating

Substantial

