**IAWG Workstream**

**Integrated analysis- Food Security and Protection**

**Problem statement:** The GPC has formed a working group to examine the tradeoff between protection risks and hunger facing the most acutely affected populations in humanitarian crises , with a view to proposing more appropriate and effective responses. This builds on the advocacy work taken on by the GPC with the food platform which aims to 1) bring the voices of affected population to the centre and 2) show how integrating protection in food security is crucial.

**The relationship and interplay between food insecurity and protection risks**

In the context of humanitarian crisis, there is frequently a mismatch between the narrowness of agency mandates and the complex reality of affected populations’ overlapping and mutually reinforcing threats. Affected populations’ protection concerns are multifaceted and dynamic; the ‘delivery package’ of agencies, less so. This is to say that the specificity of mandates occasionally makes a poor fit with the complex, dynamic and mutually reinforcing nature of affected populations’ complex security environment. For affected populations, compromise, tension and tradeoffs between protection risks on the one hand and food insecurity on the other are a reality. This dynamic has far-reaching implications for shaping an effective humanitarian response. Protection programmes overlooking the reality of hunger and the coping mechanisms affected populations resort to as a result can have a negative impact on food security. Conversely, food assistance programming conceived and implemented without due attention to the larger context of risks to affected populations can have a negative impact on protection outcomes more broadly. Narrow assessments of food security conducted in the absence of a rounded assessment of protection concerns can be blind to serious threats and negative coping mechanisms that persist even in the context of adequate food security.

If interventions are to avoid these blind spots and unintended consequences, they must be well conceived, integrated and correctly implemented, with a view to aligning and harmonising food assistance and protection outcomes. An integrated and comprehensive approach to joint analysis and programming food assistance and protection is essential.

A few short examples suffice to illustrate the workings of this interdependence in practice. Food security actors often struggle to integrate the broader protection environment into their assessments and response. However for affected populations, balancing the need for food with security risks frequently take the form of a tradeoff. In practice, acceptable nutrition or food security scores are often obtained at the cost of resort to negative coping mechanisms – such as child labour, sexual exploitation, or forced absence from school, among others. Conversely, protection advocacy to promote freedom of movement has the potential to enable households’ secure access to markets to buy and sell goods and services. In the worst-case scenarios, food insecurity interventions that fail to take into account the broader protection context can overlook – or, at worst, exacerbate – existing protection risks and create new ones.

There is a need, then, for integrated and comprehensive responses to the interrelationship between food insecurity and the broader security environment. However the food security sector tends to see its mandate stop at the minimalist standard of “do no harm” - at the potential cost of shaping an accurate and appropriate response to the full spectrum of protection concerns facing affected populations.

This working group suggest to move towards more comprehensive, integrated and rounded - and ultimately more effective – joint analysis and response programming . This approach refers to food security work that aims to prevent and respond to violence or threat of violence; coercion and exploitation; deliberate deprivation, neglect or discrimination; and coping mechanisms.

**Incentives:**

* This approach will help operationalise the Centrality of Protection in a concrete, tangible way, helping better establish the inter-relationship between food insecurity and the broader protection environment;
* This proposal can be a way to maximise efficiencies and increase funding for joint protection and food security outcomes, who remain underfunded.

**As a collective, we propose to:**

1. Provide a framework for improved context analysis -including conflict sensitivity analysis- that takes into account threats, needs, vulnerabilities and capacities of populations, in conjunction with coping mechanisms resorted to as a means of obtaining food. One benefit of this approach is the potential to help break down siloes and the constrains of mandates, thereby helping ensure complementarity and operational harmonisation.
2. Offer guidance for programme design, indicator formulation, and monitoring for integrated food assistance and protection programming;
3. Strengthen the synergies and complementarities between assistance and advocacy.
4. Promote analysis that integrates responses to food insecurity within the context of a larger and more comprehensive protection response, taking full account of the whole spectrum of costs and risks to affected populations.

**Synergies and collaboration with other IAWG workstreams:**

. GBV risk reduction

. Disability and ageing inclusion

. MHPSS

. C2A for Human Rights and HPC

**Key tools and resources:**

WFP handbook: Link?

* [Protection Analytical Framework](https://www.globalprotectioncluster.org/2021/08/11/protection-analytical-framework/) developed through the Global Protection Cluster
* [Global Protection Cluster HPC Guidance](https://www.globalprotectioncluster.org/tools-and-guidance/hpc-guidance/)

**Workplan**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
| Context analysis Framework |  |  |  |  |
| Programme design guidance |  |  |  |  |
| Advocacy guidance |  |  |  |  |
| Country operations joint analysis roll out |  |  |  |  |