Update of WFP’s Safety Nets Policy (2012): Evaluation

WFP Office of Evaluation
Context

• The ‘Update of WFP’s Safety Nets Policy: The Role of Food Assistance in Social Protection’ - approved June 2012.

• Globally, the use of safety nets and social protection has grown considerably since 2012, including the use of social protection systems to respond to shocks.
WFP’s support for government safety nets or social protection initiatives, 2017

Policy & Legislation
- RBP, 4
- RBN, 6
- RBJ, 6
- RBD, 9
- RBC, 5
- RBB, 3

Institutional accountability
- RBP, 6
- RBN, 4
- RBJ, 7
- RBD, 8
- RBC, 9
- RBB, 6

Strategic planning & financing
- RBP, 1
- RBN, 7
- RBD, 9
- RBC, 9
- RBB, 5

Stakeholder programme design and delivery
- RBP, 11
- RBN, 7
- RBD, 13
- RBC, 13
- RBB, 12

Engagement and participation of civil society and private sector
- RBP, 7
- RBN, 5
- RBD, 10
- RBC, 3
- RBB, 2
Data collection methods

- **THEORY OF CHANGE**
- **KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS**
- **REVIEW OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL LITERATURE**
- **5 FIELD MISSIONS & 7 DESK STUDIES COUNTRY OFFICES**
  - Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, Lesotho, Kenya, Mauritania, Mozambique, Sri Lanka, Turkey, Uganda
- **REVIEW OF DATA FROM STANDARD PROJECT REPORT**
Findings – Policy Quality

- 2 clear pathways
- Aligned with prevailing concepts of its time and with national governments
- Well grounded in WFP’s mandate but lacked of clear vision, purpose, results framework
- Guidance since 2014 but limited dissemination and update
Findings – Policy Results

- Limited investments made for implementation
- Development of global evidence base in social protection
- Tens of millions reached directly each year
- Social protection systems supported through technical assistance and capacity strengthening
- Partnering successes but also competition for resources
Findings – Policy Results

Short-term, unpredictable funding a disadvantage for work in social protection

Little evidence that WFP’s work has:

- contributed to gender transformative outcomes
- addressed the needs of people with disabilities or
- enhanced accountability to affected populations
Findings – Factors affecting Implementation: External

WFP viewed as a credible actor based on its comparative advantages:

- FIELD PRESENCE
- DELIVERY ORIENTATION
- LOGISTICS
- LINKS TO LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS
- ANALYTICAL CAPACITY
- ABILITY TO DELIVER AT SCALE
Findings – Factors affecting Implementation: Internal

- CAPACITIES
- HUMAN RESOURCES
- KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT
- MONITORING
- REPORTING
Conclusions

Strengths
- Policy was relevant and remains important
- Supported dual approach – direct implementation and support to national efforts

Weaknesses
- Lack of positioning in broader social protection context
- No clear results framework, poor dissemination of policy and guidance
- Gender-responsive and disability considerations omitted
Conclusions

Opportunities

• Increasing CO and RB experience provides platform to develop WFP approach
• Attention to the “nexus” brings humanitarian response and SP into focus

Threats

• Senior management commitment remains unclear
• Challenging to operationalize and coordinate across WFP
• Work in partnership required to avoid competition and fragmented support to governments
Recommendations

- Prioritization and leadership
- Cross-functional coordination and coherence
- Knowledge management and positioning
- Internal capacity
- Monitoring and reporting