

WFP Response to UK DfID Multilateral Aid Review (MAR)

WFP appreciates the opportunity to participate in the Multilateral Aid Review and thanks DFID for this timely and far-reaching initiative. We recognize that overall, the assessment indicates that we are performing strongly in the two main areas contributing to UK Development Objectives – meeting objectives internationally, as well as in fragile contexts.

DFID has established that WFP is both relevant and critical to delivering development and humanitarian outcomes, while contributing to meeting the MDGs and addressing poverty reduction. And we are encouraged that WFP is seen as critical in the delivery of other international development goals – such as economic growth, conflict prevention and humanitarian objectives – and is recognised for its pivotal role/leadership at a regional and country level.

WFP is described as becoming a more important developmental partner for the UK in countries where it is successfully managing the transition to a strategic and capacity building role – such as in Bangladesh. WFP's transformation from food aid to food assistance has positioned us to provide the right foods at the right times in the right place, allowing for smarter and more context-specific responses, including cash and vouchers, the Purchase for Progress initiative and a heightened focus on nutrition. These new programming tools allow us to simultaneously support local production, provide access to markets (which are key to sustainably addressing hunger) and embed the logic of resilience and recovery early in our humanitarian work.

Indeed, we firmly believe that emergency preparedness and response must be an integral part of development, and in Uganda, DFID is providing crucial support to WFP's development work under the Karamoja Productive Assets Programme, which, inter alia, aims to reduce exposure to drought through low-tech, labour-intensive water harvesting infrastructure and soil protection measures such as dams.

WFP abides by the core humanitarian principles of delivering food assistance in a neutral and impartial manner, focusing on getting it to the hungry. We work with governments to deliver assistance to those most in need. But often, the balance between maintaining good

relations with host governments and speaking out on humanitarian concerns is a delicate but critical one. As the ODI recently said: “Influencing the course and conduct of conflict is ultimately the business of politicians, diplomats and soldiers, not aid workers, whose main concern is with the victims of conflict and abuse.”

We realize that we must keep moving forward, both to address those areas we can, and to work with our partners and stakeholders such as DFID, to address those that are of a Governance nature or beyond our immediate control.

While noting WFP’s long track record of good gender policies, the MAR suggests a lack of gender mainstreaming across all programmes. WFP continues to require that gender is mainstreamed across all its operations including its new programme priorities such as the P4P, with established targets for women farmers’ participation and benefit. The participation of women, including 342,000 in leadership positions in its Food Management Committees worldwide, continue to be enforced. WFP has, in fact, invested heavily to establish institutional measures to strengthen the process of gender mainstreaming through training for staff and partners; expanding partnerships with agencies and research institutions (such as the Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex); promoting a system-wide accountability for gender mainstreaming by establishing a Gender Mainstreaming Accountability Framework (to be rolled out by end- 2011) and transforming the former gender focal points system into a Gender Advocacy Network. Finally, WFP has established a Gender Innovations Fund which facilitates Country Offices in designing and implementing projects based on gender analysis.

WFP looks forward to strengthening collaboration with DFID on Climate Change adaptation, an important and emerging area of our work. While highlighting some of WFP’s early successes in adaptation, it is notable that since the MAR began, more work has been conducted, and new initiatives have sharpened WFP’s analytical capacities and further contributed to the understanding of the impact of climate change on hunger.

In December 2010, WFP released a new report entitled “WFP and Climate Change: a Review of Ongoing Experience and Recommendations for Action” as well as contributing to two recent

publications on the subject. Besides deepening its collaboration with partners (such as UNEP), WFP has received more requests from governments for support in addressing the impact of climate change. WFP will be presenting an information note on climate change to its Executive Board in June 2011, followed by a revised disaster risk reduction policy in November, and a fully developed climate change policy in 2012.

The MAR states that “a proportion of (WFP’s) effort is directed at wealthier countries”, but also notes that this is largely driven by contributions from those countries. It would be more correct to say: “A very small proportion of effort can be directed at non-LDCs (least developed countries) ...”

WFP programmes are significantly more in the area of *humanitarian* needs, leaving a very small portion of our plan of work focusing on addressing most severe needs in the development arena. WFP has, over the years, carefully prioritized its scarce un-earmarked development funds according to strict criteria approved by its Executive Board to countries defined as “concentration countries”¹, with less than 2 percent of such un-earmarked development funds (or US\$ 5 million) allocated to non-concentration countries last year (and plans for further prioritization this year).

This being said, WFP’s Strategic Plan shifts the focus towards breaking the cycle of hunger and meeting hunger needs, rather than categorizing those needs as either humanitarian or development, thus limiting the range of responses. It is also more efficient and cost effective to help food-insecure communities improve their resilience rather than having to regularly scale up assistance when shocks occur.

In the area of Strategic & Performance Management, DFID notes that WFP’s Executive Board is working constructively with management and that the quality of evaluations is improving. WFP has concentrated on its measurement and reporting of performance against objectives – especially at the field level.

A new Performance Management Framework was approved by the EB in 2009 and is being rolled out across WFP; we expect to reap the

¹ at least 90 percent of the undirected multilateral resources from traditional donors used for development should go to countries that: are least developed or have equally low income; and face a problem of chronic malnutrition measured as a rate of under-five child stunting greater than 25 percent (Source: WFP Strategic Plan 2004-2007)

benefits of improved qualitative and quantitative reporting from 2011. Some key components include: a Strategic Results Framework, which answers the question “*are we doing the right things?*” and a Management Results Framework (including securing resources, stewardship, learning and innovation, internal business processes and operational efficiency) which helps us answer the question “*are we doing things right?*”

Also, Risk Management aims at ensuring that our Strategic Objectives are carried out with full regard to the organisation’s risk appetite and the risks it faces.

The Review recognizes the considerable achievements of WFP in Financial Resources Management which reflects the Organization’s commitment to this key area. It acknowledges that the major area of weakness (the “limited flexibility to manage its resources ... [due to resources being] earmarked by donors”) is a result of “externally imposed constraints”. Notwithstanding this, WFP is committed to working with its donors to reduce earmarking and maximize flexibility as outlined in its Executive Board documents which include “Funding for Effectiveness, and Resourcing for a Changing Environment.”

The section on Cost and Value Consciousness outlines that “WFP's cost recovery model provides incentives for managers to maximize volume rather than minimize costs” and mentions that “there is a specific issue around direct support costs”. WFP highlighted this in its Financial Framework Review and proposed a change in the calculation of Direct Support Costs to remove the food volume incentive. This proposal was approved by the Executive Board in November 2010.

In terms of the promotion of positive Partnership Behaviour in 2010, WFP collaborated with other United Nations agencies, funds and programmes through 74 joint programmes in 45 countries. In sub-Saharan Africa, some 80 percent of WFP’s 35 country offices had at least one joint United Nations programme. To enhance coherence and efficiency, WFP’s increasing efforts to maximize development impact are being pursued through joint planning and design of operations, joint advocacy and a more harmonized approach to operations within the UN family. Efforts have included the harmonization and simplification of business practices covering procurement,

information and communication technologies, and the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT).

WFP is strongly committed to its partnerships with approximately 2,000 NGOs. The WFP-NGO consultation, held annually at WFP Headquarters since 1995, provides a strategic setting for enhancing and fostering partnerships beyond the field level. WFP is fully committed to the Principles of Partnership – equality, transparency, result-oriented approach, responsibility and complementarity – which were endorsed by the Global Humanitarian Platform in July 2007.

The Review acknowledges that Transparency and Accountability has recently improved and that developing countries (which constitute the majority of the Executive Board) have redress for grievance through this body. WFP has also made progress in the areas of anti-corruption and disclosure policies. The WFP Anti-Fraud and Anti-Corruption Policy, as well as the Policy for Disclosure of Internal Audit Reports to Member States were both approved by our Executive Board in 2010.

In general, WFP is proud of its track record. Our reputation depends on our ability to feed the world's hungriest people, and our obligation is to show the governments who support WFP – through 100% voluntary contributions -- that we are using their resources responsibly