**High Level Panel of Experts (HLPE) Report on Multistakeholder Partnerships to Finance and Improve Food Security and Nutrition in the Framework of the 2030 Agenda**

**WFP contribution**

***Draft scope of the report***

The World Food Programme (WFP) believes that this Study has ample opportunities to broaden the evidence-base for learning and good practices. WFP has reviewed the proposed draft scope of the HLPE Report, in particular the proposed questions, and have the following suggestions for the Project Team:

* Bullet 1: consider asking for definitions of both responsibility and accountability;
* Bullet 2: in addition to ‘tensions’, we suggest to also add ‘synergies’ so as to get at positive examples;
* Bullet 3: it would be useful to add relevance, cost-effectiveness and sustainability to the list of criteria to be used. There may also be space to consider a counter-factual when looking at relevance – was there value-added of the different MSPs in relation to not having partnered at all?
* Bullet 4: it would be interesting to broaden the question of context to explicitly reference the humanitarian – development continuum. A second question could be, “To what extent and how does this influence vary in humanitarian versus development settings?”
* Bullet 6: rather than asking “What should be…”, it would be interesting to replace this or add “What could be the respective contributions of each in the financing and improvement of FSN?”
* Bullet 7: in addition to asking “How to ensure to all stakeholders a ‘fair’ representation in multi-stakeholder decision-making”, could one also ask how to ensure “full and equal participation of all stakeholders”?

“People in their diversity” should be considered when asking “how to ensure meaningful and effective participation…”;

* Bullet 8: we would like to include “and equitable” in between “What incentives” and “mechanisms…”.

On the process side, we feel that it would be useful to:

* assess the extent to which MSPs regularly develop and use theories of change to define, monitor and report on their expected impact pathways;
* clearly define comparative advantage and then measure how it is defined and assessed by partners in a multi-stakeholder partnership.

On the outcomes side, we would like to suggest that questions be added about:

* the extent to which MSPs incorporate and respect UN norms and principles, gender and equity concerns, as well as the specific and diverse concerns of affected populations;
* the risk associated with some MSPs;
* the extent to which MSPs are uniquely placed to promote innovation.

**COUNTRY LEVEL EXAMPLES OF MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PARTNERSHIPS**

***NGO Partnerships in the Face of Climate Change, Natural Disasters and Chronic Food Insecurity***

**Overview: WFP works closely with NGOs** and other partners to ensure its climate and disaster risk reduction activities **provide the technical quality and reach** that will build vulnerable people’s climate resilience and achieve Zero Hunger. Partnerships are a key element of WFP’s climate and disaster risk reduction (DRR) policies, helping to leverage mutual strengths and complementarities towards more integrated support to food insecure populations. Key initiatives include:

* **Rural Resilience Initiative (R4)**: building climate resilience into safety nets through a combination of four risk management strategies (asset creation, insurance, credit & livelihood diversification and savings support);
* **Climate services**: providing tailored climate information to help communities and governments make concrete, climate-resilient decisions;
* **Safe Access to Fuel and Energy (SAFE) initiative**: helping people safely cook food through activities that improve cooking energy access.

**Country Examples:**

* *R4-specific*: In 2015, R4 reached about **40,000 people** across Ethiopia, Senegal, Malawi and Zambia, providing them with **USD 2.2 million** in micro-insurance protection. Together with partners, R4 was able to compensate **almost 180,000 people affected by El Niño** with over USD 445,000 of insurance payouts.
* *Climate services*: In Bangladesh, WFP has assisted **30,000 food-insecure** **households** by raising their homes above flood levels, and training 1.3 million women in disaster preparedness since 2001. WFP also works with many **partners** in **Malawi** and **Tanzania** to deliver climate information to **6,000 farmers and rural communities** through radio and SMS.
* *SAFE*: With **support** of **NGO partners**, WFP’s SAFE programme ignited **change for 540,000 internally displaced women and their families** in Darfur, Sudan by providing them with an alternative to collecting firewood and saver methods of preparing meals. At the close of the project an impact analysis demonstrated the significant value of SAFE and its contribution to improved livelihoods, human and social capital, empowerment and reduction of the on-going trend of forest depletion and energy-poverty in Darfur.

**Challenges:** NGOs can be a critical bridge to reach the last mile in our climate work. However, **NGO capacities can be limited on technical areas** such as weather index insurance, climate information and cook stoves. This requires efforts in finding the right partners as well as strengthening WFP and NGO capacities.

**Funding Overview:** As part of **WFP’s climate change policy**, an action plan has been drafted indicating a need of approximately **USD 8.2 million over 3 years** to increase the capacity of WFP and partners to respond to climate change. To scale up specific initiatives, additional estimates include:

* R4: USD 30 million over 5 yearsto reach 500,000 people by 2020.
* Climate services: USD 18-20 million over 4 years.
* SAFE reached over 6 million people in 18 countries from 2009-2015, and requires USD 20 million to support 10 million people by 2020.

A large component of these budgets go to partners and initiatives are all extra-budgetary funded.

**Partnerships.** WFP’s wider climate activities involve technical collaboration with the RBAs and UN system, including climate policy, analysis and action at both the global and field levels. Other examples of partnerships include:

* R4 is a **global partnership between WFP and Oxfam America**, with technical and financial support from the re-insurer company Swiss Re.
* Climate services: WFP is also a **lead partner** of global climate services policy under the **Global Framework for Climate Services** (GFCS). Nationally, WFP partners with Farm Radio Trust (Malawi) and Radio Farm International (Tanzania) to reach vulnerable communities, and is testing innovative GPS-based climate information with local enterprises (Ignitia, Manobi and Bamtaare Services) in Senegal.
* SAFE: **WFP is a co-chair of the SAFE Humanitarian Working Group**, an inter-agency consortium of key partners working to meet the energy needs of crisis-affected populations around the world. NGO partners include Food for the Hungry (Kenya), Lutheran World Federation (Ethiopia) and Kabkabiya Smallholders Charitable Society (Sudan).

**Partnerships related to global Food Security and Nutrition Analysis, Monitoring and Trends (source: WFP’s food security analysis unit, Vulnerability Assessment and Mapping (VAM)).**

**Integrated Phase Classifications (IPC)**

The global effort to develop a common approach for food security analysis and response through the implementation of IPC is led by the following 12 agencies: ACF, CARE, Save the Children, Oxfam, WFP, FAO, FEWSNET, JRC of the EU, SILSS, IGAD, the Central American Integration System and the Food Security Cluster.

After many years of use of the IPC approach to inform the need of interventions with short-term objectives to address crisis situations, the *IPC Chronic Food Insecurity Classification*, has been designed to complement IPC Acute Classification and provide crucial information for strategic and interlinked food security programming and policies.

The *IPC Chronic Food Insecurity Classification*, launched in 2014, provides invaluable information for decision makers that focus on medium and long term objectives, making IPC an inclusive classification system to inform both crisis mitigation and prevention as well as structural and developmental policies and programs. Eight countries have so far piloted the chronic scale and produced reports on the countries chronic food security situation.

The [**Food Security Information Network (FSIN)**](http://www.fsincop.net/) is a global initiative co-sponsored by FAO, WFP and IFPRI to strengthen food and nutrition security information systems for producing reliable and accurate data to guide analysis and decision-making. FSIN serves as a neutral technical platform for exchanging expertise, knowledge and best practices, developing harmonized methods and tools, and facilitating capacity development on food and nutrition security measurement and analysis. It has over 1000 members in some 96 countries. Key achievements to date are 7 technical papers on Resilience Measurements produced by the Resilience Working Group.

The **Global Network Against Food Crises**. The European Union (EU), WFP and FAO have joined forces to coordinate the compilation of food security and nutrition analysis to inform resource allocation for humanitarian and resilience responses. A Network of key stakeholders will enable joint review of existing information, findings and analysis from globally accepted sources through a consultative process. This “Network of Networks” does not replace but builds on existing initiatives, platforms, and other networks. The aim is to promote a global perspective through a consultative and consensus based process that provides added value to existing information and reports. The main output from Global Network Against Food Crises is an annual Global Report on Food Crises that compiles contributions from key actors and provides a comprehensive picture of the food security situation globally.

WFP and OCHA have teamed up to provide access to global data on hunger and food insecurity through OCHA’s **Humanitarian Data Exchange (HDX)**, an open platform for sharing hunger and food insecurity data. The data can be used to understand the type of food available in certain markets, how families cope in the face of food insecurity and how WFP provides food assistance in emergencies to those in need. WFP’s food security analysis unit, Vulnerability Assessment and Mapping (VAM) have used open data processes to ensure that their data can be freely shared with partners. All food security data are anonymized, aggregated and hosted in an open data bank. Through an Application Programming Interface (API), anyone can access the data and produce real-time visualizations from different streams of food security indicators. This means that the data is automatically updated to the HDX platform, resulting in joint development of real-time data that give decision makers the clear and timely food security information they need.

***NGO Partnerships and Cash-Based Assistance***

**Background.** The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development plays a fundamental role in framing humanitarian-development actions, with SDG 17 calling for ‘Strengthening the means of implementation and revitalizing the global partnership for sustainable development’. The Grand Bargain seeks to increase the use of cash-based programming, while focusing on efficiency and disaggregation of functions for implementation.

In line with its commitments to the Grand Bargain and Agenda 2030, and with the overall aim to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of food assistance, WFP works increasingly with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) on joint approaches, platforms and partnerships in programme implementation.

***How to play to each-others’ strengths?*** WFP’s strategic focus on good programming (whether using cash based, non-cash based or hybrid transfers) is to put the beneficiaries in the centre of any intervention, ensure Zero Hunger outcomes at household, market and public systems levels, with the ultimate goal to create agile, sustainable and shock-responsive country systems.

In this view, there is a shift from the traditional focus on delivery assistance solely to a focus on strengthening capacities and programme design, selection of modality, targeting and registration, monitoring of intervention as well as enhancing partnerships. The focus is on contributing to achieving sustainable development outcomes, beyond only delivering assistance.

While the private sector plays a strong role in cash delivery transactions, WFP and NGO partners ensure value along the full intervention chain, focusing on the pre- and post-transfer. The added value of WFP-NGO partnering on cash based assistance are:

* Common targeting mechanisms, joint feasibility analysis and assessments, development of common tools, monitoring capacity;
* Work to better understand full beneficiaries’ needs (beyond food) and market functions when designing interventions, as well as joint efforts in choosing the right range of modalities to reach programmatic outcomes;
* WFP-NGOs assessments and use of data (e.g. use of knowledge on household behaviour to guide and develop better programming);
* Integration of different social protection components and collaboration with national governments – before, during and after crises – to help households’ communities and countries manage risks and respond to shocks; and
* Leveraging shared cash-based programming standards to achieve complementary results.

**Country examples of large-scale cash based assistance where WFP-NGOs are partnering:**

* **Syria+5:** In 2015, the largest cash-based transfer programme remained the Regional Emergency Response for Syrian Refugees, transferring USD 354 million through electronic value vouchers via WFP operations. A total of 10 partners are joining forces, including UN agencies, INGOS and LNGOs such as, Save the Children, World Vision, Norwegian Refugee Council, Turkish Red Crescent, ACTED, Human Relief Foundation, INTERSOS, Islamic Relief and the Sohag Community Development Association for Women and Children's Situations Improvement (SCDAWCI).
* **Iraq:** In 2015, WFP provided more than USD 62 million to displaced and conflict-affected people in both camp and non-camp settings through life-saving emergency operations (EMOP 200677). International NGOs support WFP’s cash-based transfer assistance, including Action Contre la Faim (ACF), Save the Children and ACTED.
* **Niger:** In 2015, WFP’s largest unrestricted cash operation was implemented in Niger where more than USD 13 million were delivered in collaboration with microfinance agencies. The CBT operation in Niger works with the support of 12 local and 4 international NGOs.

**Funding Overview:**

In 2015, WFP budgeted USD 1.54 billion including transfer value and related implementation costs, of which USD 1.38 billion was the planned transfer value. The actual value delivered to beneficiaries in 2015 amounted to USD 680 million. In 2016, the actual CBT transfer value to beneficiaries, as of early October, has exceeded USD 600 million.

**Future Plans:**

WFP’s Management Plan 2017-2019 foresees in the prioritized plan of work a global cash-based transfer budget of approximately USD 1.2 billion for 2017.

**Partnerships:**

To distribute cash-based assistance, WFP works together with more than 150 national and international NGOs. In 30 different countries, around 100 local NGOs provided assistance with an actual transfer value of USD 63.5 million in 2015. The transfer value channelled through the 49 international NGO partners reached more than USD106 million. These partnerships not necessarily work bilaterally but can also include multiple organizations, such as the Common Platform Delivery facilitated by WFP. 13 partners including other UN agencies and NGOs such as Save the Children and Oxfam collaborate on providing humanitarian assistance in the form of cash transfers in Lebanon, Jordan and Palestine.

**Contentious issues:**

* Cash transfers enable a more direct relationship from WFP to financial institutions to beneficiary. The role of NGOs as “delivery” partners is challenged, compared with traditional food assistance where NGOs often look after the last mile delivery.
* In a “food aid” world, WFP’s role was essentially the aggregator between donor funds and NGOs as the last mile distributor of assistance. In a “food assistance” world, where cash-based assistance can be effective with fewer intermediaries between donors and beneficiaries, it is less obvious to NGOs why WFP rather than NGOs should be the intermediary of choice.

***Food Security and Nutrition projects implementation in Lebanon***

* In December 2016, WFP and FAO have signed an agreement for the implementation of a joint programme on “Enhancing Food Security and Livelihoods of Small Farmers through Semi Intensive Egg Production” in Lebanon.
* In the frame of this project, small-scale poultry producers are increasing their income through improved post-production handling and storage practices and improved market access including within the existing WFP contracted shops under the food assistance program. Furthermore, an e-card system managed by WFP is established for the delivery of chicken feed through a joint partnership with the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) for the monitoring, evaluation and implementation.
* FAO is currently in the process of selecting the chicken feed supplier where WFP has helped in preparing the tender documents.
* It is confirmed that the selected chicken feed supplier will deliver the feed to the 25 Farmer Field Schools (FFS) across Lebanon once or twice per month where WFP, FAO and maybe MoA staff would be available on site. For this purpose, the bank will issue a General Packet Radio Service (GPRS) Point of Sale (POS) terminal to the selected supplier.
* WFP is currently preparing with the bank for the printing of the e-cards pertaining to the beneficiaries.
* WFP is currently coordinating with Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) on the rolling out of the baseline and monitoring questionnaires related to the project.
* As a part of the school snacks programme, WFP’s Cooperating Partner IOCC currently conducts monthly nutrition awareness sessions for 10,000 vulnerable Lebanese and Syrian refugee children enrolled in second-shift implementing schools throughout the country, as a part of the school’s health curriculum.  These sessions are complimented by a nutritious daily snack ration of fresh fruits and UHT milk provided to students.
* During the 2017/2018 academic year, WFP will partner with Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE) to integrate these nutrition awareness sessions into a formalized nutrition curriculum, taught by health educators in all 313 second-shift implementing schools throughout Lebanon. Capacity building efforts for health educator staff will also be conducted as a part of this activity.
* Based on the findings of the Nutrition-Sensitive Scoping Mission conducted in December 2016, for the 2017/2018 academic year, WFP will engage mothers of children participating in the school snacks and cash-for-education programme to participate in nutrition awareness sessions. Topics of these lessons would synchronize to those within the above mentioned Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE) nutrition curriculum. These sessions would be particularly critical to families that receive cash for education grants, to hone in the message about food expenditures to ensure their child’s nutrition.

***Food Security and Nutrition coordination in Lebanon***

* The Food Security Sector Working Group (FSSWG) in Lebanon is co-lead by WFP, FAO and the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) and consists of 30 partners. Because of its extensive experience in complex emergencies, the FSSWG offers crucial links between emergency, recovery and development. The FSSWG aim at ensuring an integrated policy and programmatic approach to food insecurity and vulnerability, aligned to Syrian Crisis Humanitarian Response strategy and the Government of Lebanon (GoL) established framework & policy. The approach for fighting hunger combines targeted programmes for enhancing direct access to food for the neediest with sustainable agriculture and rural development.
* The Regional Food Security Analysis Network (RFSAN) in collaboration with the Social Protection division in FAO and WFP conducted the first set of trainings on Food Security, FS Indicators and Decent Work in Agriculture.
* The trainings took place at the field level targeting staff working on Food Security and related topics (national and International NGOs, UN, and GoL specifically Ministry of Agriculture and Chamber of Commerce)
* Trainings’ main topics were:
	+ Introduction to Food Security and related concepts (by RFSAN);
	+ Main Food Security indicators (by WFP);
	+ Linkages between Food Security and decent work with emphasis on Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) in agriculture (by FAO);
* The remaining regions (South, Tripoli and Beirut/Mount Lebanon) are planned for after mid-February.
* Excellent feedback was received from the participants requesting to continue doing similar trainings.
* 20 participants were trained in Zahle training from different UN agencies (UNICEF, WFP, UNICEF), I/NGOs (GVC, ACF, SCI, SDAid, Nabad) as well as MoA (3 Participants) and CCIAZ Chamber of Commerce, Industry & Agriculture of Zahle & the Bekaa (3 Participants).
* 22 participants were trained in Akkar from different UN agencies (UNHCR, WFP 4 participants), I/NGOs (Concern, ACTED, DAF, Abaad, Himaya, WV, DRC, LRC, Caritas), and MoA.

WFP currently chairs a Nutrition Platform, holding monthly meetings with nutrition actors from UN, civil society, academia and ministries. The ultimate aim of the Platform is to support knowledge sharing/evidence-based approaches, galvanizing support to inform national level nutrition-specific and sensitive policies and programmes.

***Programme to benefit refugees and host communities in Kalobeyei, Kenya***

On Wednesday 8 February 2017, in Nairobi, the European Union, UN partners, County and National Government Representatives have launched a programme that aims to improve the living conditions of refugees and host communities in Turkana County, Kenya.

The Support to the Kalobeyei Integrated Social and Economic Development Programme, funded through the EU Trust Fund for Africa, will place refugees on the development agenda and contribute to an inclusive approach to managing protracted displacement and promoting durable solutions for refugees and host communities.

Kenya hosts an estimated 495,000 refugees, of whom over 160,000 are hosted in Kakuma, Turkana County, a region Northwest of Kenya, suffering from economic and social underdevelopment. The upcoming Kalobeyei settlement area will be an attempt to better take into consideration the long-term interests of host populations, bringing together humanitarian and development efforts under the leadership of the Kenyan Government and County authorities.

The objective of the programme is to improve health standards for the host communities and refugees in Kalobeyei, increase food and nutrition security and promote economic opportunities, increase school enrolment for children, improve child safety and wellbeing and enhance social cohesion between refugees and host communities.

The implementing partners, i.e. UNHCR, Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), United Nations Children’s Emergency Fund (UNICEF), and the World Food Programme (WFP) kicked off the Kalobeyei programme.

The EU has committed €15 million (Sh 1.6B) towards the programme as part of the EU Regional Development and Protection Programme (RDPP) in the Horn of Africa, led by the Netherlands, which has been set up to address some of the protection and development challenges related to forced and protracted displacement and also includes projects in Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda.

***WFP working with private sector in Bangladesh: establishment of fortified rice kernels (FRK) production capacity***

For the first time in Bangladesh, the local production of rice premix kernels has become feasible. Abdul Monem Limited (AML), a local conglomerate, is producing locally, rice premix kernels with technical guidance and support given throughout the process by WFP national and international expertise and DSM. AML imported extruder machines from China. AML signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with DSM for technical oversight and supervisory support to strengthen the quality of rice premix kernel production, which meets the standard, as endorsed by the Government. This engagement of DSM and AML has mitigated potential quality control issues. The Government has been purchasing rice premix kernels from AML to meet the distribution requirement of fortified rice for the Government safety net programme, called the Vulnerable Group Development (VGD). AML, based on a technical review undertaken by WFP is enlisted as one of WFP’s suppliers of rice premix kernels. The local production of kernels has resulted in a significant reduction of the rice fortification cost in Bangladesh.

**Establishment of fortified rice, blending capacity**

The rice fortification process requires blending of the usual rice with the rice premix kernels at a ratio of 100:1. In order to find an appropriate technology for the blending, WFP worked with local engineering firms and millers, and provided technical supports to design, develop and assemble blending equipment locally. A successful trial run was completed in June 2013. The cost of the locally manufactured equipment is about USD 8,000. The blending facilities were established by the millers at their own cost. Seven blending mills are now operational, each having a capacity of mixing 500mt of rice per year.

The affordable cost and ease of establishment of the blending convinced the local millers to participate in the blending of fortified rice. The development of a local alternative was a turning point for the millers, and they quickly moved to consolidate their respective operations.

This local invitation has also contributed in reducing the overall costs of rice fortification in Bangladesh.

One of the milers from Bangladesh participated in the competitive bidding, received the order and exported 300mt of fortified rice to Bhutan.