

GLOBAL PROTECTION CLUSTER | STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK 2016-19

Consultations at the World Food Programme

Rome, 19 October 2015

1. The work of the World Food Programme in developing its protection policy and in mainstreaming protection into its activities may not be well known but it has taken undertaken serious work in ensuring protection is integrated into its programming, including through the deployment of several ProCap advisors to its operations. The consultations in Rome represented a frank exchange of views about the work of the GPC.
2. Partly as a result of its distance from Geneva, WFP feels out of the stream of discussions on protection but, also, excluded. The network power of the GPC could be improved. Information is not circulated as well as it should be and many of the processes and decisions taken in Geneva remain mysterious.
3. The creation of the Strategic Advisory Group as part of the GPC has created a problem of inclusivity, which needs to be overcome if the GPC wants to meet the challenge set by the Whole of System Review of reaching out to a broader range of actors on protection. Similarly, the annual retreat should be open to all participants in the GPC, including non-mandated agencies.
4. WFP would appreciate the holding of more round-tables on substantive protection issues that have a current operational relevance. An explanation or re-definition of protection as a concept is of less interest than understanding how to overcome protection challenges in a particular context.
5. The work of the GPC and its Task Teams need more clarity and benchmarks need to be set for the work of TTs. There would also be benefit from setting out clear rules on engagement of partners in the work of TTs as short turn-around times for working on policy drafts does not allow for input from agencies, like WFP, that do not have dedicated protection policy teams.
6. Some frustration was expressed about how the notion of the centrality of protection is translating at the field level where WFP feels it is being held responsible for something it has no control over, e.g. a general situation of insecurity in South Sudan, in which someone may be raped on the way to food distribution centres. On the ground, there is a sense that HCT protection strategies are not translating into definition of roles, responsibilities etc. The GPC should explain in operational terms what the responsibilities of agencies are.
7. There is a feeling that guidance on mainstreaming is not always operationally literate or relevant to an agency like WFP and the perspectives of non-protection agencies need to be factored into guidance.
8. The GPC was asked to provide assistance in shaping the scope and meaning of Accountability to Affected People to make it operationally relevant and to ensure that protection clusters in the field are doing a

better in advocating that all clusters need to include AAP in their work. The role of the Emergency Directors Group in providing guidance on AAP is unclear to WFP. Finally, the GPC needs to convene a round-table on the use of cash as a multi-sector intervention and the implications of this for programming, including for protection outcomes.

Conclusions

9. The focus of the discussion on operational relevance was never going to be in doubt in a consultation with WFP. The distance of WFP from discussions on protection in Geneva is partly a result of its physical distance but the feeling of exclusion of an agency that is an IASC principal from the protection agenda is of concern and needs to be addressed.
10. The emphasis on explaining in operational terms the relevance of certain concepts is clearly a priority for WFP and a wish to focus on substantive, current, protection concerns rather than generic issues of process or concept.