



Guidance Document on the World Food Programme (WFP)

Khartoum Food Aid Forum

June 6-9, 2006

The Feinstein International Center (FIC) develops and promotes operational and policy responses to protect and strengthen the lives and livelihoods of people living in crisis-affected and -marginalized communities—those impacted by violence, malnutrition, loss of assets or forced migration.

FIC works globally in partnership with national and international organizations to bring about institutional changes that enhance effective policy reform and promote best practice.

How to Read This Document

The following document has been prepared as part of the World Food Programme (WFP) Sudan's Food Aid Forum held from June 6-9, 2006, in Khartoum, Sudan.

The document has been written for three audiences: the interested public, participants of the Food Aid Forum ("the Forum"), and WFP Sudan.

The purpose of the document is threefold:

1. To inform those who did not attend the Forum on its content and outcome
2. To serve as an outcome document for those who did attend
3. To be a tool for WFP in their strategic planning process

The document is comprised of three parts complementing one another. Each part is written as a stand-alone document so that it may be broken-up to serve the multiple purposes listed above:

Part I

Introduction to the Food Aid Forum: A summary covering its origins and outlining the pre-, during-, and post- Forum events.

Part II

Outcome Document: A four-section summary that presents and categorizes the advice to WFP. It includes:

1. A “summary advice table”
2. Advice and analysis from the Forum facilitators (the Feinstein International Center, Tufts University)
3. Advice that emerged in the Forum from participants
4. Advice given by the experts in their papers and presentations

Part III

Evaluation Analysis: A summary and analysis of the evaluation feedback received from the participants at the end of the Forum.

In addition to this document, a complete Food Aid Forum Kit has been developed that includes all of the inputs (all papers, an abstract compendium, and Forum agenda), resources (biographical summaries) and related Forum materials. (“Added-input forms” were collected but have not been included in the Kit.) This is an extensive set of documentation and is available on CD by request or on the Feinstein International Center’s web site:

<http://nutrition.tufts.edu/research/famine/>

Overall, this document is not intended to provide concrete “next steps” to WFP; instead it aims to shed light on the wide variety of opinions expressed and provide advice based on those opinions to WFP. It is also acknowledged that the advice is only intended to represent the first step of “casting a wide net” in gathering ideas (both implementable and non-implementable) to facilitate the longer process of strategic planning for WFP. In some cases, WFP may already be undertaking the advice being presented.

Part I: Introduction to the Food Aid Forum

Why Did WFP Have the Food Aid Forum?

The World Food Programme (WFP) has a long history of operations in Sudan. The first WFP development project in the world was launched there in 1963. Since that time, WFP has continued to provide development and relief assistance to the people of Sudan. Today, in 2006, WFP Sudan is implementing a Country Program and an Emergency Operation Program to address the immediate and longer-term food needs of 6.5 million people in the South, East, Three Areas, and Darfur.

The realities in Sudan are new and unique. The signature of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA)—and the fragile Darfur Peace Agreement (DPA)—represents a landmark development to ensure sustainable peace for the people of Sudan. The CPA and DPA provide a momentous opportunity—and also great responsibility for WFP to ensure that the agencies priorities are aligned with this post-conflict environment to best help the people of Sudan achieve food security and sustainable peace.

To respond to this opportunity and responsibility, WFP has decided to listen. Using a Forum as a platform for listening, WFP gathered a wide range of experts, partners, Government representatives, staff, and academics to Khartoum for a Food Aid Forum.

The Khartoum Food Aid Forum was initiated with the following three objectives:

- To create a Forum for key individuals from Government, United Nations (UN), civil society, academic institutions and other national and international experts to present their views on food security strategies and discuss their implications for WFP programs in Sudan.
- To inform a strategic framework offering direction to WFP Sudan through 2011 consistent with National priorities
- To forge new partnerships and strengthen current partnerships by improving the understanding of the role and impact of WFP programs in Sudan.

What Was the Food Aid Forum?

While the Forum itself lasted three days, there were both pre-Forum and post-Forum events that contributed to the overall objectives. This methodology was unique in that it combined three opportunities for the collection of opinions and advice: a commissioned set of opinion papers; a live process of debate; and post-Forum policy analysis and discussion with WFP.

Pre-Forum

The pre-Forum process began in mid-April with the gathering of a panel of experts and partners who would prepare a series of documents and reports that would be used as input to the Forum. Altogether, ten evidence-based “expert opinion” papers were commissioned, two “new research” papers were selected, and four “background papers” were provided. The papers included the following topics:

Expert Opinion Papers

- “Food Aid and Development in Southern Sudan (Post-CPA),” by Buzz Sharp
- “Global Trends in Food Aid Paper,” by Daniel Maxwell
- “From Food Aid to Livelihoods Support—Rethinking WFP’s Role in Eastern Sudan,” by Sara Pantuliano
- “The Future of Food Security in the Three Areas of Sudan,” by Jason Matus
- “Food Aid and Livelihood Support in the Darfur States, Western Sudan,” by Helen Young
- “WFP’s Role in the Sudan: A Five Year Perspective,” by Randolph Kent
- “Sub-Regional Integration: The Key to Food Security and Recovery,” by Brian D’Silva and Olivia Tecosky
- “Brief Overview of Sudan Economy and Future Prospects for Agricultural Development,” by Dr. Karrar A. B. Abbadi and Dr. Adam Elhag Ahmed
- “Food Security Policies in Sudan,” by Dr. Abdelrazig Elbashir and Dr. Adam Elhag Ahmed
- “Food Aid and Trade Under WTO,” by Hamid Faki, Mohamed A. Dingle and Eltigani Elamin

New Research Papers:

- “Accelerating Progress Towards Universal Salt Iodization: Time for Action,” by Ibrahim Bani
- “The Continuing Livelihoods Crisis in Darfur,” by Margie Buchanan-Smith and Susanne Jaspars

Background Papers:

- “Joint National Transition Team (JNTT), Structure, and Functions,” by Amb. Omer El Sheikh
- “Sudan: Institutional Capacity Programme, Food Security Information for Action (SIFSIA), Programme Document for Northern Sudan,” by Mohamed Osman Hussein
- “Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper 2004-2006”
- “Nutrition Policy for Sudan and Strategy for Implementation,” by Mohamed Osman Hamid

Together these papers addressed issues on Sudan’s future, aid programming in Sudan, and the changing nature of WFP and the services it provides. They aimed to help the Forum arrive at single set of quality discussions on the key issues WFP should be discussing to help steer programming through 2011. In addition to the papers, an “abstract compendium” summarizing the papers, and highlighting the key issues for WFP, was prepared. Abstracts and papers were made available to participants in advance of the Forum and can be found in the Food Aid Forum Kit

(<http://nutrition.tufts.edu/research/famine/>).

Forum

The Forum was sponsored and hosted by WFP Sudan and the Ministry of International Cooperation and facilitated by the Feinstein International Center, Tufts University. It lasted three days and was attended by 237 participants ranging from academics, civil society groups, researchers, representatives from the Government of National Unity (GNU), donor agencies, the United Nations (UN), African Union (AU), World Bank (WB), and International Monetary Fund (IMF). At final count over eighteen donor representatives, 85 Government officials, and 61 WFP staff, including 22 from the sub-offices around the country, attended the Forum, along with 56 NGO representatives and fourteen staff members from other UN agencies.

Styled as a “public hearing,” there were morning plenaries, in which the evidence-based expert opinions were presented, and afternoon breakout sessions, in which the expert opinions were challenged and a

space for rigorous debate was formed. There were also four workshops held, where new research and national policies were presented. Finally there were three report-back plenaries that allowed for the entire Forum to hear outcomes of all breakout sessions and workshops.

The Forum built in additional mechanisms to gather advice in the style of an “added input form,” which allowed participants to write and submit their opinions or advice to WFP. A session was also held for WFP to answer questions of the audience, in which fifty-two questions were collected. WFP answered questions grouped according to similar topics, as well as specific questions. Forms and questions can be found in the Food Aid Forum Kit:

<http://nutrition.tufts.edu/research/famine/>

Post Forum

The post-Forum stage was initiated by the preparation and circulation of this document, which will hopefully be part of setting the direction of WFP Sudan in the post-conflict environment through 2011.

How Does the Food Aid Forum Fit into the WFP Sudan Strategic Planning Process?

This Forum marks a significant step within an ongoing process to help WFP “invent” its longer-term strategy for working in Sudan. The entire process, as well as the outcome presented in the next section, will support WFP in the following benchmarks:

- 2005: WFP Country Programme Mid-Term Review (2002-07)
- 2006: Annual and Rolling Food Needs Assessments
- May 2006: Sudan UNDAF process through 2011
- May 2006: Poverty-Reduction Strategy Process
- May 2006: Darfur JAM initiated
- June 2006: First WFP consultation forum
- August 2006: Evaluation of WFP Darfur interventions
- October 2006: Second consultation on WFP strategy
- December 2006: EMOP 10503.0 comes to an end
- February 2007: WFP Executive Board meeting

Part II: Outcome Document

The Khartoum Food Aid Forum held June 6-9, 2006, was designed to offer a wide range of advice to WFP Sudan. The advice was compiled from three sources:

1. Advice and analysis from the Forum facilitators (the Feinstein International Center, Tufts University)
2. Advice that emerged in the Forum from participants
3. Advice given by the Experts in their papers and presentations

The outcome document has been broken into four sections. The first is a Summary Advice Table that presents a snap-shot review of the key advice given in the Forum, followed by three sections, each detailing the advice from the three sources mentioned above.

A. Summary Advice Table: Summary Points and Key Focus Areas Matrix

Summary Points

Strategic Change: The changes in the political context of Sudan, coupled with the reality that WFP Sudan will not, in the coming years, operate at the same sustained level of 2005 are motivating WFP to undergo a strategic change process. WFP will need to determine its niche, especially in relation to the GNU and private sector.

Intervener to Partner: WFP will need to evolve from an intervener to a long-term embedded partner. This involves determining all stakeholders and changing WFP's relationship to them. It also means rethinking the way it carries out all operations and recruits, trains and assesses the performance of its staff.

Saving Lives to Saving Lives and Livelihoods: WFP must not lose its ability for life-saving emergency intervention, but increasingly it needs to understand how local economies function and to identify leverage points where resources and knowledge can unlock the full potential of livelihoods.

Information Management: In addition to its current work with Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM), food and nutrition assessments, and the Annual Needs Assessment (ANA), WFP needs to strengthen its monitoring of food market trends, implementation of agreements, and livelihood indicators, in a systematic and sufficiently standardized way to make meaningful comparisons across regions and time and to engage in evidence-based programming. This will require a shift in emphasis from food security to livelihood security and an

assessment of the wider policies, processes and institutions critical to vulnerability.

Positive Contributor to the Market: WFP needs to move beyond food aid as a deliverable product to food aid (its purchase, distribution and use) as a market manipulator that allows for more equitable distribution of entitlements. WFP can work with the GNU to identify strategies to increase production in food deficit areas and to link areas of surplus with areas of deficit.

Emergencies and Protection: WFP has to take seriously its obligation to use its resources and influence in a way that maximizes protection. It needs to look beyond the limited definition of protection only as protection from violent abuse acts, and implement the definition agreed to in their Workshop on Protection in 2005 as “protection as action which promotes the safety, dignity, integrity and empowerment of the civilian population.” WFP has the opportunity to work pragmatically and approach protection by reviewing the protection dimensions of the project cycle from assessment and registration through to implementation monitoring, etc.

What Is WFP?: WFP must first decide, and then make clear to partners, if it is a food aid delivery agency, an emergency food security agency, or an emergency intervention agency.

KEY FOCUS AREA MATRIX

WFP SHOULD 'Advised to Consider'	WFP SHOULD MAYBE 'Advised to Debate'	WFP NEEDS TO ASK 'Advised to research'
RELATIONSHIP WITH GOVERNMENT		
Coordination -Explain what WFP does to all GNU departments. Identify counterparts. -Internalize the new administrative structures in the South.	-Amend the Basic Agreement. -New Agreement with GoSS.	
Policy Development -Get advice from the GNU on appropriate foods and nutrition. -Integrate strategic approaches to nutrition with GNU policies.	-Get involved in the development of GNU food security policies. -Align itself to national policies and programs.	-What are the new national level policy frameworks (GNU and GoSS) and also the forthcoming Darfur State level policy frameworks (post DPA)?
Advocacy/ Capacity -Increase capacity for local involvement both through its cooperating partners and direct programming. -Second people into line ministries?	-Support the implementation of the CPA. -Build capacity of GNU in early warning and nutrition, food security and livelihoods.	
INFORMATION SYSTEMS		
Coordination -Build partnerships and <i>not</i> take on sole responsibility for data and information collection. Strengthen the interagency nature of the ANA. -Include community in stages of information collection and analysis. -Share findings at a livelihoods forum and build consensus on response plan.	-Gather information on food aid or food policy.	-How can WFP build trust on sensitive issues with the GNU?
Collection Methodology -Harmonize information collection tools and use the right tools. -Focus on what the existing information systems are and lessons learned. -Standardize methodologies.	-Work with the SSCCSE/LAF standard framework to develop context and encourage a broader livelihoods analysis.	-Will the GNU be willing to finance programs and endorse the sensitive findings in Darfur?
Collection: Subj. Matter -Broaden the statistical base. -Gather more information on the South, regional agro-ecological perspective, impact of local purchase, changes in consumption patterns, indigenous practices, traditional crop varieties, local initiatives, impact of IDP's/returnees and receiving communities. -Expand security assessments as part of their logistical operations into political assessments for livelihood programming. -Look beyond how people achieve or don't achieve "sufficiency" to what they are trying to achieve as a livelihood.	-Change ANA to assess livelihoods. -Expand the area coverage of ANA -Support GNU in early warning information. -Collect basis services information.	
SIFSIA -Engage in SIFSIA and seek technical support from professional bodies or consultancy groups (FEG) to avoid duplicating the information collection	-Help SIFSIA coordinate and capture livelihood information.	-What role should WFP take until SIFSIA is ready? Is SIFSIA neutral?
Analysis -Ensure an analytical interagency framework. -Analyze the market, social, political, and economic context as part of a livelihoods framework analysis. -Establish a monitoring system for WFP interventions. -Do more analysis of solutions not just problems.	-WFP should develop a system for sharing local, regional and general knowledge: a public database or network of institutional knowledge. -Develop ways to be more anticipative and link this to its policy formulation processes.	-Will international agencies or GNU lead in relevant information sectors? -Are donors flexible?

KEY FOCUS AREA MATRIX

	WFP SHOULD 'Advised to Consider'	WFP SHOULD MAYBE 'Advised to Debate'	WFP NEEDS TO ASK 'Advised to research'
PARTNERSHIPS			
Strategy Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Develop a "Partnership Strategy" based on a stakeholder analysis and assessment of WFP's capacity to foster partnership. -Prioritize areas of interventions based on stakeholder groups. -Hire staff with skills in building partnerships. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Consider MDG's and the UN reform process in setting WFP policy and strategy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can WFP harness social capital among Diaspora?
Communic.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Put in place mechanisms to improve accountability, transparency, and two-way communication. -WFP policy must be more concisely stated, in terms of both priorities and focus. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -What are examples of successful two-way communications between WFP and communities?
Joint Assessments/ Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Conduct joint assessments and evaluations such as TANGO, NMPACT. -Conduct external evaluations of WFP that prioritize participation of national and local stakeholder groups. -Foster "National Coalitions" of stakeholders on key issues. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Is WFP too expensive and can someone else in the market deliver the same product cheaper?
PROTECTION			
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Agree and act on a common definition of protection (from 2005 Workshop). -Acknowledge community participation has positive impact on protection. -Consider protection in a preventive way as was done in Somalia. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Have the same role as UNHCR for everyone it provides assistance to? -Review policies to ensure protection is noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Does WFP have a responsibility to raise awareness of protection?
Registration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Translate experiences with registration in Darfur into "best practice." -De-link head counts from gathering of information. -Include information campaigns, time for discussion and explanation, and sufficient numbers of staff in registration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Have a technical registration unit to support the NGO's. 	
Programming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Look at Darfur study for ways protection activities are incorporated into regular programming. -Think about ways food aid and staff can be manipulated at each stage of the distribution and try and prevent it. -Monitor coping strategies and risks linked to changed food rations. -Explore ways of reducing food aid sales. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Draw-up a security protocol like World Vision did in Mershing. 	
Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Have Protection officers or advisors associated with WFP activities. -Build protection capacity of staff, especially local staff. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -How does WFP fit into the many Darfur protection working groups?

KEY FOCUS AREA MATRIX

		WFP SHOULD 'Advised to Consider'	WFP SHOULD MAYBE 'Advised to Debate'	WFP NEEDS TO ASK 'Advised to research'
OPERATIONAL PROGRAMS				
Food Aid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Consider if food rations are encouraging a balanced diet. -Continue to provide food aid in the current context of Darfur because of the limited opportunities of other livelihood support interventions. -Review the distribution approach in the South. -Develop and apply transition and exit strategies. -Review targeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Review consumption patterns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -What is the outcome of the WTO and FAC? -What is the impact of food aid on markets and war economies? Who are the winners and losers? 	
Project Food Aid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Ensure food aid for public works is complemented by enough non-food aid resources from other partners. -Consider how WFP will phase out FFW/FFR especially in East. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Continue FFE, FFW, FFA, SFP, therapeutic feeding programs (TFP), especially in marginal areas. -Ensure flexibility for FFW policy across demographics. -Strengthen sub-regional integration and lack of purchasing power of poor/deficit areas/people. -Ensure exit strategies. -Consider local purchase options with cooperatives and local groups. -Incorporate rainfall insurance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Where has WFP acted as a catalyst for other partners to engage in FFW? 	
Non-Food Aid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Support roads and infrastructure. -Promote indigenous crop variety and off-farm production. -Improve processing, distribution, storage and transport. -Support small/traditional farmers (concept of "orphan agriculture") and diversification of production including provision cash inputs. -WFP needs to be part of the market. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Encourage the GNU to give priorities to areas where iodine deficiency disorder is endemic. -Support the production of iodized salt. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Can macroeconomic policies be rectified? -Will GNU implement CPA and DPA provisions on land legislation? 	
Salt Iodization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Support key production activities. -Support social mobilization and monitoring to support the Government national framework to meet objectives of USI. -Continue distributing the iodized salt as part of their food basket. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Encourage the GNU to give priorities to areas where iodine deficiency disorder is endemic. -Support the production of iodized salt. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Can WFP produce an updated national map on areas where iodine deficiency is still prevalent? 	
Nutrition/Micronutrient	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Act in collaboration with other groups to address underlying causes of malnutrition and look at quality control of food. -Review GNU nutrition policies-food fortification/emergency nutrition. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Who could develop a national nutrition information system? 	
Livelihood Interventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Consider what to do in a wider context of livelihoods. -Internalize TANGO. -Advocate for livelihood efforts at the policy/institutional level -Incorporate livelihoods analysis into the ANA. -Encourage a cost/benefit analysis when considering appropriateness of planned responses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Promote a collective process of the GNU, international community, UN, NGO's, etc. to ensure the provision of basic services and ensuring livelihoods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Is WFP merely a food <i>aid</i> agency or a food <i>security</i> agency? 	
Strategic Reserve Cash Interventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Research market capacity, cultural factors, relevant targeting, appropriate policy/market environment for cash interventions -Ensure interagency coordination on cash interventions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Assist in the establishment of strategic reserve mechanisms/storage facilities. -WFP should persuade and encourage cash donations rather than food donations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -What is the market capacity to absorb cash interventions? What are the security risks and threats? 	

B. Advice from the Feinstein International Center,
Tufts University

Sudan is changing rapidly. The global food aid regime is evolving. The future shape and role of the UN and its agencies is being hotly debated. The globalization of trade (including oil), information, and political alliances all affect Sudan. The global processes of climate change, disease epidemiology, and urbanization are all going to affect Sudan.

Sudan is one of a handful of countries where the full panoply of global change processes plays out. WFP Sudan is of sufficient size and importance to the future of Sudan that its strategy is not just a matter of national or agency interest. It goes beyond this. Given the size of the humanitarian operation, the international attention on Sudan—and WFP's long history of involvement in Sudan—WFP Sudan, along with the government of Sudan, is positioned to set an international example of what can be done with the tools at our disposal, to seize the opportunity of the day and build a 21st century approach to the alleviation of food insecurity—to saving lives and livelihoods.

Strategic change

We believe that WFP Sudan is of necessity, undergoing a range of strategic change processes. All of these need to be explored as the agency plans and operationalizes its future.

Business structure and process change: Regardless of the politics of Sudan, the prospects for drought, or those for peace, WFP Sudan will not, in the coming years, sustain the resource levels of 2005. Its structures and business practices will need to evolve to fit the likely resource base of the near future. Practices will also need to be able to respond to a diverse operational environment where there is unlikely to be clear linear shift from emergency to recovery and then development programming. The complexity in Sudan is such that WFP must have specific but interrelated approaches for specific problems/areas.

From intervener to partner: With the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) in the South and the fragile Darfur Peace Agreement (DPA) in the West, coupled with increasing oil wealth and the prospects for net food self-sufficiency in Sudan, WFP's relationship to the people of Sudan, GNU, National Government of Southern Sudan (and newly emerging State authorities as in Darfur) will need to evolve. We see an evolution from an intervener to a long-term embedded partner. The challenge will be the creation of true partnerships at multiple levels, in the sense of being supportively critical, not acquiescent. From WFP's Mission statement (which is also in-line with the principles of the CPA): "WFP

will ensure that its assistance programs are designed and implemented on the basis of broad-based participation.”¹

From saving lives to saving lives and livelihoods: WFP’s mission emphasizes the saving of both lives and livelihoods. In the past it has focused on the former; in the future it will need to focus on both. WFP must never lose its ability for effective life-saving emergency intervention, but increasingly in Sudan it needs to take advantage of its long history and extensive field presence to build a portfolio of livelihood-based programming that seeks to work within the economic, social, and emerging political process of Sudan to increase food security.

From food aid as a low price resource to food aid as a strategy: In WFP-terms, food aid began in the 1960’s as an option for the good use of disposable surplus. Under the WTO it has evolved into a purchased resource on the open global market, with a few notable tied exceptions. Under future WTO regulations the privileged position of food aid may be restricted to internationally defined emergency situations. We believe that WFP, globally and especially in Sudan, needs to rethink its relationship to food aid. It needs to move beyond food aid as a deliverable product (emphasizing efficiency and effectiveness) to food aid—its purchase, distribution, and use—as a positive contributor to market development.

From the UN of the Security Council to the UN of the General Assembly: The UN and its agencies will evolve rapidly over the next few years as member states, powerful and less powerful, and civil society battle through the implications of globalization, oil deficits, wars of identity, climate change, and much more to build the global conscience and safety net of the future. WFP will be a vital part of this and will need to evolve in partnership with its sister UN agencies, particularly the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and UNICEF in Sudan, to create an effective, less fractionated, less sluggish UN presence in Sudan.

With these four strategic drivers as backdrop and the opinions of the experts and participants of the Khartoum Food Aid Forum as evidence, we suggest the following five key foci for WFP’s future development in Sudan.

¹ WFP Mission Statement

<http://www.wfp.org/policies/Introduction/mission/index.asp>

Partnership

A key focus for WFP's future in Sudan is going to be creating partnerships to help guide, implement, and evolve its programming. WFP will need partnerships with the ministries of the new state governments, with implementing NGO's, and with the evolving civil society of Sudan. WFP will also need to create partnerships that deliberately cut across regions, fostering a Sudan-wide approach to the future. In building these partnerships, where the emphasis is on trust and process as much as effective delivery, WFP may need to evolve the way it recruits, trains, and assesses its staff.

In many cases WFP responds as a last resort when people, markets, social networks, and governments are not able to meet basic needs. In these instances the success of WFP can have very little to do with the success of WFP itself, meaning some of WFP's problems are not problems of WFP's creation but of community social values, corruption, insufficient basic services, or spread of services. WFP must therefore continually consider its relationship with the market, social bodies, and political bodies because how these systems function will determine if WFP is able to phase out (that is, be successful). Therefore, identifying what WFP has direct control over with its programming and where it should have influence is very important in helping define when it should take action and when it should engage in advocacy with partners. What should WFP do in the next five years, and what should WFP be encouraging the Government and other stakeholders to do? Don't confuse being the largest with always being the leading or coordinating agency. WFP's strength can be translated into having a stronger *influence* rather than a larger presence.

Evolving from an intervening agency to one of responsible partnership is going to be the key challenge to WFP Sudan.

Information Management

Evidence-based programming is going to be critical to WFP's future in Sudan. In the traditional field of emergency food aid delivery, there will be increasing pressure to ensure that targeting is effective. Inclusion errors worry those who see food aid adversely affecting markets. Exclusion errors leave acutely malnourished people outside the safety net. The monitoring of food market and livelihood indicators in a systematic and sufficiently standardized way such that WFP can make meaningful comparisons across regions and time is critically important for both interventions in market manipulation and livelihood support as outlined below. WFP should take a critical look at the Food Security Information for Action (SIFSIA) proposals and commit to working with

them to build a nationwide food security information system. WFP must also champion the need for transparency in this system. Information about food security, food availability, and food choice needs to be readily available to Sudan's civil society and at-risk populations.

WFP needs to keep a wide watch beyond traditional food security indicators. For example, WFP's recent investments in security assessments as part of their logistical operations could be expanded into political assessments. WFP should consider an in-house political analyst who follows the peace processes, key legal and policy reforms, boundaries and administrative disputes, and any other points of conflict. WFP needs to analyze this, integrate this type of information into ongoing assessment and monitoring of livelihoods, and consistently assess the implications for WFP operations and its overall objectives. Scenario development is fundamentally important for all organizations, including WFP. WFP should develop ways to be more anticipative and speculative and link this to its policy formulation processes.

Market integration

Sudan is approaching food self-sufficiency, but the hungry populations are geographically distant from the regions of surplus production. The road and rail infrastructure connecting productive areas with potential market areas is woefully inadequate. The poor and hungry do not have the buying power to attract food through market forces alone, and it is by no means certain that the oligopolies who control grain trade in Sudan would want to take the risk of trading into the food deficit areas. Nevertheless, WFP has the opportunity to intervene, to nudge the market in the direction of more equitable distribution of entitlements.

WFP should examine what it would take to allow it to purchase food within Sudan in significant quantities even if this purchase is above market price. It should try to stimulate surplus production in deficit areas. It should consider how it can buy surplus from small farmers by being part of the market as a buyer early on in the production cycle, not at the output end. It should critically examine purchases from the few large-scale investors, which may undermine resolution of land issues. It should spell out its role in developing and urging others to develop the road and rail infrastructure vital to breaking the present disaggregated food markets of Sudan. It should reassess the ways in which cash or voucher distribution programs can be used to manipulate viable demand for traded food.

Livelihoods

Livelihoods interventions are about understanding how local economies actually function and then identifying the leverage points where resources and knowledge can be applied to unlock the full potential of the livelihood system. By definition, this approach seeks innovation rather than opportunities to apply pre-existing tools. For instance, if remittances from migrant workers in Libya are a major source of cash for food purchase for Northern Darfurians, and the flow of those remittances is now blocked by the security regime on the Sudan/Libya border, then a viable livelihood intervention might start with discussions among the relevant security forces about ways to meet their security objectives while permitting the flow of funds to resume. This is hardly the application of a pre-existing tool but is potentially a powerful way of changing the food security of northern Darfur.

Emergencies and Protection

In seeking a different future, WFP must not lose its ability to intervene with food aid in critical life-saving operations. Given that many of these interventions are needed in regions where the at-risk community faces severe security risks, WFP has to take seriously its obligation to use its resources and influence in a way that maximizes the protection of civilians. WFP Sudan may wish to engage in discussions with agencies, national and international, who already explicitly seek to support protection in Sudan. It needs to look beyond the limited definition of protection only in terms of protection from violent abuse acts, and implement the definition agreed to in their Workshop on Protection in 2005 as “protection as action which promotes the safety, dignity, integrity and empowerment of the civilian population.” WFP has the opportunity to work pragmatically and approach protection by reviewing the protection dimensions of the project cycle from assessment and registration through to implementation monitoring, etc. For the future, WFP needs to think of emergency aid as assistance and protection.

What Is WFP?

The most consistent question we heard at the Forum from WFP staff, from Government staff, the agency staff, and from donors was “What is WFP?” Is it a food aid delivery agency? Is it an emergency food security agency? Is it an emergency intervention agency? People ask this because they see the potential for WFP to evolve. The potential for evolution is in WFP’s track record, in its unparalleled foot print in Sudan, and in its existing innovations. WFP’s partners seem unsure if all this adds up to a changing WFP or just adaptation to the moment. Only WFP can answer this, and answer the question it must, if it is to build the trusting partnerships necessary for the future.

C. Advice from the Forum

Throughout the Forum, there were numerous sessions and mechanisms to try to capture a broad range of critiques, issues, and, most importantly, the advice to WFP for future programming through 2011. There were plenaries, break-out sessions, workshops, and numerous ad hoc side discussions in which participants debated and discussed a number of issues brought up by experts and then both formally and informally provided feedback points of advice for WFP. In addition to the direct discussions, participants also had the opportunity to express opinions and advice on an added-input form. Over thirty forms were submitted. The following is a summary of what was captured in these various mechanisms throughout the Forum. We have tried to keep as close as we can to the language used by participants. Inevitably, with 237 people expressing views, there is not always consensus; thus, at times advice may seem contradictory, but this is the reality in Sudan today. Not every path forward is a clear one.

The majority of the advice fell within five key areas: relationship with the Government, information systems, operational programming, partnership, and protection.

Within these five key areas, the specific pieces of advice have been organized into three categories of potential action for WFP.

- *WFP is advised to consider:* This is based on advice that was categorized by participants as “Points of Agreement.”
- *WFP is advised to debate:* This is based on advice that participants had “Alternative Viewpoints” on. Therefore, WFP should consider having an in-house debate on these questions and issues.
- *WFP is advised to further research:* This is based on advice that participants felt were “areas of uncertainty” and needed further research and information. Often, these are questions that need to be asked of other stakeholders such as the Government, donors, and partner agencies before being able to clearly define actions which WFP should consider.

Some pieces of advice are particularly targeted at certain regions. In these cases the region is listed in parenthesis at the end of the sentence.

Examples and Ideas

Ethiopia, Joint Assessment:

Prior to 1996, the Government of Ethiopia (GoE) would come up with their own data figures for food aid needs. No one was clear where the data came from. In 1996 WFP took the initiative to support GoE structures through participation in the annual needs assessment exercises. Now the GoE and WFP together develop one appeal document. This could be replicated in Sudan.

Examples and Ideas

Afghanistan, Review of VAM:

A DFID grant led to a review of the VAM with support to the GoA which does not just focus on food aid but also cash, market access, access to water, seasonality, etc. This is now a component of a nation-led structure. The Sudan VAM system could be reviewed to see if all are happy with the product. Advice could be sought on how to improve the system to make it more relevant and to move towards a coordinated system. This could lead into a GNU-led collective analytical system.

Key Area: Relationship with the Government of National Unity (GNU)

Coordination with the Government

Advised to consider:

- Coordination with the Government in the relief stage has worked well. It should now be considered whether new working arrangements need to be established for recovery and development programming.
- WFP needs an initiative to explain what it does to all concerned Government departments. There is a need for WFP to know exactly who the Government counterpart for each issue and activity is.
- WFP needs to internalize the new administrative structures in the South, and the Government of Southern Sudan needs to internalize the work of WFP (South).

Advised to debate:

- Do WFP and the Government need to review and possibly amend the Basic Agreement?
- Does WFP need a new agreement with Government of Southern Sudan?

Capacity-Building

Advised to debate:

- Could it be WFP's role to support disaster preparedness and management skills in the line ministries?

Policy Development

Advised to consider:

- A mechanism should be set up for the Government to give advice to WFP on appropriate foods and nutrition, including the Government's thoughts on underlying causes of malnutrition and strategic approaches.
- There needs to be strategic coordination by State governments to develop and then implement a comprehensive rehabilitation and development plan with technical inputs from the international community.

Advised to debate:

- To what extent should WFP get involved in the development of GNU food security policies?
- To what extent should WFP match or align its policies and programs to national policies and programs?

Examples and Ideas

Darfur, Interagency Meetings:

The recent interagency sectoral meeting coordinated by UNICEF to improve analysis between the various sectors in health, nutrition, and food security and livelihoods has led to agreement to move forward into a more collaborative process. A state-level forum now exists, but challenges lie in defining who leads the process.

- Is it the role of the WFP or the GNU to strengthen sub-regional integration? Who is better placed?

- How can WFP support policies that would support the poor?

Advised to research:

- WFP needs to better understand laws and policies related to welfare, government expenditures, and taxation in Sudan.

Advocacy

Advised to debate:

- Should WFP do advocacy to support the implementation of the CPA?
- What is WFP doing to encourage the Government to assume its responsibilities in providing social safety nets to vulnerable populations?

Key Area: Information Systems, Research and Analysis

Coordination and Collaboration

Advised to consider:

- WFP should rely on partnerships (including line ministries and NGO's) and not take on sole responsibility for data and information collection. Experience from VAC, LAF, and the Food Security Assessment Unit (FSAU) demonstrate the need to support the Government to develop the lead coordination role in information.
- Good practice has already been ensured through capacity-building and close collaboration between WFP and Centre for Statistics/ Ministry of Agriculture.
- Community participation should ideally be included in all stages of information collection and analysis.
- The Annual Needs Assessment (ANA) defines community priorities. Sometimes what is listed may not be food; therefore, other agencies need to review and contribute according to their mandate. The ANA should be used more as an interagency tool.

Advised to debate:

- While the Government is building capacity to be a lead in the information sector, what is the role of WFP in the interim?
- Should WFP take the lead in gathering information related only to food aid, or should it also have the lead in information on food policy?
- How can WFP work with other agencies to share data, coordination and collaboration, and joint analysis?

Examples and Ideas

Replicate Food Aid Forum:

WFP should consider holding a similar Food Aid Forum in Nairobi or Juba on improving coordination in Sudan. There is a risk that other actors are not aware of the Khartoum Forum, so we may find other agencies “reinventing the wheel”.

Advised to research:

- How can WFP address trust issues and sensitivities with GNU and GoSS on conflict-related data and build consensus with other partners on methodologies for data collection and analysis. The example of the links between contextual changes in North Darfur and changes in information collection should be reexamined. WFP needs better to understand how conflict affects information systems and how conflicts hinder the ability to build consensus about food needs and drought impact.

Information Collection Methodology

Advised to consider:

- There is a need to focus on what the existing information systems in Sudan are and what lessons have been learned from past experiences (low levels of skills, attitude, technology etc.) to ascertain what is needed to make information collection successful in the future. This is what the LAF has been doing with members under the GoSS and SSCCSE for the last 2 year and WFP should consider participating in the process.
- Harmonization of information collection tools and methodologies should be sought. WFP could commit to the analytical approach agreed within the South Sudan Centre for Census, Statistics and Evaluation/Livelihoods Analysis Forum (SSCCSE/LAF) that is currently ongoing. When this is subsumed within SIFIA this will avoid having to re-invent the wheel and replicate the last two to three years’ work finding consensus on this issue.
- WFP should assist in the monitoring of key data and broadening the statistical base.
- There is a need to standardize the data collection assessment methodologies, for example, using Sphere standards as a tool to standardize the methods used.

Advised to research:

- Funding for information systems can be a challenge where there is reluctance by the GNU to endorse the outputs and the findings of the analysis. There are examples of this from SCF/UK in Darfur and CARE in Kordofan where the GNU was reluctant to accept findings and endorse results of nutrition surveys. Will the GNU be willing to finance programs and endorse the findings in the future? How will this affect WFP?

Information Collection: Subject Matter

Advised to consider:

- WFP should assist in the monitoring of key data and broadening the statistical base.

Examples and Ideas

Analysis of Food Aid in South:

WFP needs to better understand what is happening at its distributions—the cost and benefits to the people. The analysis of general distribution of food aid (especially in the south) needs to be strengthened. WFP currently does monthly distributions to address a seasonal problem. For twelve years and for almost every month those years' women keep showing up for several days to get food aid, even when it is consistently as low as 3-6 kg. Unless they are being forced to come (which may be a possibility), there must be benefits that WFP is unaware of. Most likely it is not the calories but the type of food that is the incentive. Sorghum is probably more important to the diet than other types of foods, or it may hold a high cash value. For some women the food may also equal profits that could be made in a couple of days of work. In order to know the real value of the distributions and if they are necessary, further assessment is needed.

- There is still a lack of knowledge on basic facts of what is happening in the south. More information on the evolving situation in the south is vital.
- WFP should gather more information from a regional agro-ecological perspective; impact of local purchase on market prices and local production; impact on transportation infrastructures (including transporters); their food and income sources besides cereal such as labor and livestock, goods, etc.; and changes in consumption patterns.
- More information and implementation strategy is needed on indigenous practices, traditional crop varieties, local initiatives, impact of internally displaced persons and returnees on receiving communities (Three Areas).
- To be able to support sub-regional integration, WFP would need to collect better information on surpluses and deficits and assess the hindrances to and the opportunities for food access (not only food availability). This involves assessing purchasing power.
- WFP should look beyond how people achieve or don't achieve "sufficiency," to what people are trying to achieve as a livelihood.

Advised to debate:

- When we look at the Annual Needs Assessment (ANA), it seems that it focuses mainly on food deficiencies and not much on livelihoods. Should the ANA be modified/redesigned so that the essential information on livelihoods is gathered (as is done by the LAF in southern Sudan)?
- Should WFP support the GNU in data collection on early warning, distribution from surplus to deficit areas, and social safety nets?
- Should WFP participate in the process of collecting available data on levels of needs and basic services?
- How should WFP deal with the States that are not currently included in the ANA?

Implications of SIFSIA on WFP Sudan

Advised to consider:

- SIFSIA offers potential for coordination and provides a link to policy. WFP should engage in SIFSIA and provide technical support where appropriate and eventually be the end user of the information generated.
- WFP should retain its lead role in emergency assessments but should not duplicate the information SIFSIA will gather, specifically information on food aid needs, possibilities for local purchase, etc.

Advised to debate:

- SIFSIA is not yet up and running (projected for 2007)—what happens in the meantime? What should WFP’s role be?
- Should WFP support and commit to the LAF initiative?
- Relationship with other on-going analytical forums like LAF: Given all the logistical constraints, will information enable timely decision-making for operational agencies like WFP?

Advised to research:

- Will SIFSIA be able to handle the coordination necessary to be able to obtain all of the data collection by various agencies?
- Will SIFSIA be “neutral” enough in gathering information since it is funded using Sudanese funds frozen by the EU? Policy is a 50% match from GNU to externally funded projects, and costs are \$25 million for four years.
- Will SIFSIA be able to capture all the livelihoods information, for example income, consumption, etc.?

Analysis

Advised to consider:

- WFP should ensure that there is an analytical framework to help pull together different information against a contextual picture, thereby allowing a much greater opportunity for analysis, consensus-building, and programming. WFP should capitalize on the successful examples of the technical committees that were developed with SCF/UK, Oxfam, WFP, and GNU counterparts where data was reviewed and analyzed and where the committee determined the needs for the state for that year. Oxfam has had similar experience in southern Sudan with the GNU and communities where priorities are defined and used to develop programs. The analysis was used to improve understanding with the actual problems and what needed to be done. It also improved consensus between different agencies.
- One of the roles for WFP should be to understand the market in which it is operating, to be better able to support and transfer food from surplus to deficit areas.
- Experience with the Food Security Analysis Unit model coverage of evidence would be useful to pull in information for a common analysis.
- WFP should invest more in analyzing the social, political, and economic context in which it operates. It needs to assess where cash and food distribution are inducing dependency, and gain a better understanding of the Sudanese culture and environment. VAM needs to be better used in the West.

- WFP should take the lead in establishing monitoring systems for WFP interventions, including development of a database to enable analysis of the data.

- WFP should do more analysis of solutions, not just problems.

Advised to debate:

- As there is currently no standard framework for an information system and analysis in Sudan, should WFP take the lead in developing one, or is it the role of the GNU? Who should fund it?

Advised to research:

- Would international agencies together with relevant line ministries be willing to take on the lead for information in relevant sectors so as to decentralize information gathering and analysis which might reduce the time lag between collecting data, undertaking analysis and sharing the data, e.g., UNICEF's taking the lead in analyzing nutrition and education data, WFP's taking the lead in market data, etc.?
- Would donors be willing to be more flexible with funds and resources to meet the needs for improved information systems that are not just about food?

Key Area: Operational Programs

Food Aid Interventions

Advised to consider:

- WFP should consider if the food ration provided is encouraging a balanced diet and to what extent the WFP food ration is influencing general food consumption patterns.
- WFP should continue to provide food aid in the current context of Darfur because of the limited opportunities of other livelihood support interventions.

Advised to debate:

- How successful is WFP's current targeting of food aid, especially in the South? Are the most vulnerable, conflict affected, and drought affected populations being served?

Advised to research:

- Who is most influencing the decisions for continued food aid and are those decisions in the interests of community driven recovery and development?
- Has donor pressure been the reason behind the distribution problems remaining unaddressed, or is it simply a question of logistical and management constraints?

Examples and Ideas

Stimulating Local Production:

Can WFP create incentives for local farmers to produce for the local market and national consumption? Currently many small farmers only produce for themselves. The market is limited and poor for their goods. The groups that can take risks and invest in surplus production are the few large-scale producers who know if the market (and WFP) fails to buy their surplus, the government will buy it or help protect their monopoly. That safety net needs to be there for the small producers as well. WFP could have a small but very important role in local purchase, supporting local farmers by providing the incentive to produce quality foods with a system of “insurance” to small holders. Producers, especially small and poor farmers, will not produce surplus based on the potential of an assessment team assessing their surplus and only possibly getting funding to buy it (if policy permits). Small farmers are generally in negotiations with buyers at the beginning of the production cycle and base their decisions on their own cost/benefit analysis.

(Continues next page . . .)

- In the CPA era, will one of the possible harmful affects of continuing food aid be fewer resources for the less developed forms of interventions, and, if not, will they complement each other?
- How will the outcome of the WTO and FAC negotiations impinge on WFP’s food aid operations in Sudan?

Project Food Aid Interventions

Advised to consider:

- Currently programming of WFP is resource-driven, rather than needs-driven. But food itself is not enough (e.g., impact of school feeding on enrollment rates versus quality of education).
- Ensure food aid for public works is complemented by enough non-food aid resources from other partners.
- WFP should provide more direct support to women’s groups and in-patient feeding since malnutrition among children is often linked to poor health of mothers.
- WFP can be very good at food-for-work (FFW) especially in recovery period. Food-for-education (FFE) and food-for-training (FFT) are areas to channel food for rehabilitation activities.
- WFP should consider FFW in North Kordofan for watermelon production of local varieties.
- WFP should ensure it has strategies to phase out FFW and food-for-rehabilitation (FFR) over the mid-to-long term (especially in the East).

Advised to debate:

- WFP should continue to use and develop alternative modalities of food deliveries—FFE, FFW, food-for-assets (FFA)—especially in marginal areas supporting traditional agricultural producers. Institutional feeding in hospitals. Supplementary feeding programs, therapeutic feeding programs, and fortification should also continue. FFW could also be used to ensure access to safe water.
- If WFP continues to shift toward promoting food security rather than addressing emergency needs, more coordination with other actors is required, and interventions such as FFW/school feeding should be assessed based on their impact on food security.
- WFP should more carefully take into account other factors that affect the implementation of its project food aid programs, for example provision of clean water in FFW projects.

Advised to research:

- In which cases has WFP acted as a catalyst for other partners to engage in project food aid for recovery?

(Continued . . .)

WFP can provide “insurance” by giving some guarantees (possibly through a cooperating partner) to small farmers that, if they produce surplus, they are guaranteed a market. This requires a donor willing to put in a set amount of money for several years. In addition to the money, a group (not Government) would need to help organize farmers to negotiate the collective production and price, collect the surplus, and help with quality control like processing, packaging, and fortification. WFP would also need to consider not buying only from a few large-scale producers or traders.

Non-Food Aid Interventions

Advised to consider:

- WFP should continue to support roads and infrastructure. Where one has roads, one has access to markets for the people’s produce. Without roads there will be no cross-border or regional integration. This is a problem for the South and the Three Areas, where there are major constraints to bring goods in and take goods out.
- WFP should promote indigenous crop variety and off-farm production (forest products) through local purchases.
- WFP should improve processing (blending, fortification, packaging) distribution, storage, and transport.
- In the post-conflict setting WFP should be promoting food security by supporting small/traditional farmers (concept of “orphan agriculture”) and support diversification of production including provision cash inputs.
- Post-war, WFP needs to contribute to reconstruction, reintegration of returnees, and drought recovery and also coordinate with the Government and other NGO’s on environmental protection.

Advised to debate:

- How can WFP support the removal of additional barriers to strengthening sub-regional integration: limitations of the transportation network itself and lack of purchasing power of poor/deficit areas/people?

Advised to research:

- How can all partners move away from the issue of food and toward the issue of making all of the people of Sudan more productive? Who will increase the skills and capacity of the people, and what is WFP’s role?
- What are the prospects and timeline for rectifying macroeconomic policies, such as appreciation of the dinar, which have a negative effect on sub-regional integration?
- What are the prospects for the successful implementation of the CPA and DPA, particularly the clauses regarding progressive land legislation? How would various scenarios for peace affect sub-regional integration and food needs? How would the potential conflict in the East affect food security needs?

Salt Iodization

Advised to consider:

- WFP activities can support key production activities, social mobilization, and monitoring to support the Government national framework to meet objectives of universal salt iodization (USI). WFP’s focus should be more on prevention of malnutrition rather

Examples and Ideas

WFP has a very developed logistics network in Sudan. Trucks delivering food to remote communities arrive loaded with food, but they leave the remote regions empty on a return journey. The return journey of WFP trucks could be used to support remote farming communities who are trying desperately to reach the market area by transporting goods to markets. Conveniently, markets are often located near WFP return bases. This intervention could be coordinated with the NGO community.

than cure, for example the use of iodized salt. WFP should continue distributing the iodized salt as part of their food basket.

Advised to debate:

- Not all states are receiving the same support in addressing iodine deficiency disorder (IDD). Can WFP encourage the GNU to give priorities to areas where IDD is endemic, e.g., the White Nile and where WFP has no presence, or can it encourage alternative vehicles for iodine (water, flour, etc.)?
- Could WFP put all actors involved in salt iodization together, especially the salt producers, to support the production of iodized salt?

Advised to research:

- How can WFP support updated national data preparation to map out areas where iodine deficiency is still prevalent to reveal regions or areas where iodized salt supply chain is failing?
- What is the role of WFP in monitoring and accelerating the Sudan progress towards USI?

Nutrition and Micronutrient Interventions

Advised to consider:

- WFP needs to act in collaboration with other groups to address malnutrition. It is a structural issue. Food aid is not enough. There is a need to revisit program design to support addressing root causes of malnutrition (how to support water, education, health, capacity building, livelihoods, etc.) (especially in the South).
- There is a need to look at quality control of food (micronutrients, safety, etc.). Micronutrients are a critical factor for long-term food aid dependent populations. This issue goes beyond fortification to include promoting/providing indigenous varieties of crops and off farm foods. The “wild foods” in rural Sudan probably do the most to add diversity to the diet, even more than farmed foods.
- WFP should review the national nutrition policies such as food fortification and emergency nutrition. Interventions are addressed in the policy and this can help guide WFP response.

Advised to research:

- Who could develop a national nutrition information system?

Livelihood Interventions and Approach

Advised to consider:

- It is WFP’s responsibility to consider what they are doing in a wider context of livelihoods but is not necessarily their role to ensure that NGO’s are coming up with livelihoods projects.

- WFP should internalize the findings and the recommendations of the TANGO report, which in the immediate term should inform smarter food aid interventions.
- Conduct advocacy in order to support livelihood efforts at the policy and institutional level (as well as local level projects), especially in the West.
- WFP should incorporate livelihoods analysis into the ANA.

Advised to debate:

- Is WFP merely a food aid agency or a food security agency?
- While WFP cannot be expected to do everything, it should participate and define its role in the coordination process of ensuring there is a collective process of the GNU, international community, UN, NGO's, etc to ensure the provision of basic services and ensuring livelihoods and food security (especially in Three Areas).

Supporting the Establishment of a Strategic Reserve

Advised to debate:

- Should WFP assist in the establishment of strategic reserve mechanisms/storage facilities in strategic areas? How can WFP support the bolstering of linkages between federal and state levels?

Advised to research:

- What are the implications of supporting State level Strategic Grain Reserves in eastern Sudan through the provision of food (both in political and economic terms)?

Cash Interventions

Advised to consider:

- Cash interventions can be a good idea depending on market capacity, cultural factors, relevant targeting, appropriate policy/market environment. Further analysis is needed, and WFP has to have a role in that analysis.
- Interagency coordination is key to successful cash interventions.

Advised to debate:

- Could cash intervention be the alternative to food aid? The market capacity to absorb cash intervention depends on causal factors. Cash interventions could distort the urban/rural market.

Examples and Ideas

As part of an Exit Strategy, the WFP should make plans to attract the Sudanese Diaspora through head-hunting and creating favorable grounds for the return, such as making UN jobs available. WFP should also support the transfer of skilled Sudanese workers into relevant governmental structures. An agreement with the government could be made for WFP to recommend ex-UN staff, both Sudanese, Sudanese Diaspora, and non-Sudanese who would like to live in Sudan. Advocacy for these types of partnerships should begin.

Key Area: Partnerships

Strategy Development

Advised to consider:

- WFP should develop a “Partnership Strategy” based on an understanding of a stakeholder analysis, that is, who the partners are, roles, capacities, and relationships at all levels. The strategy should include prioritizing areas of interventions based on stakeholder groups. It should lay out clear objectives and related actions for all partnerships.

Advised to debate:

- Should the Government or WFP lead in developing such a strategy?
- To what extent should Millennium Development Goals (MDG’s) and the UN reform process guide WFP?

Advised to research:

- What is WFP’s current capacity to foster partnership?
- What is WFP’s role and capacity in harnessing social capital among the Sudanese Diaspora?

Communication

Advised to consider:

- WFP should put in place mechanisms to improve accountability, transparency, and two-way communication.

Advised to research:

- WFP needs to further assess and build on successful examples of improving two way communications between communities and all partners.

Joint Assessments and Evaluation (see also information section)

Advised to consider:

- There should be increased joint assessments and evaluations such as TANGO and the Nuba Mountains Programme Advancing Conflict Transformation (NMPACT).
- There need to be some external evaluations of WFP that prioritize participation of national and local stakeholder groups.
- WFP could foster “National Coalitions” of stakeholders to address specific issues such as fortification. Example in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Advised to research:

- Is WFP too expensive, and can someone else in the market can deliver the same product at a lower cost?

Key Area: Protection

Defining Protection

Advised to consider:

- WFP needs to agree on a common definition of protection, especially in terms of its direct link with programming. At the moment, a lot of issues seem to come under protection (for example, gender). WFP should consider existing laws that apply to food assistance to help prepare a definition.
- The focus by WFP now seems to be focusing on “human rights” issues such as the distance covered by women to collect water and firewood.
- WFP needs to acknowledge that insisting on community participation has had a very positive impact on protection.
- WFP should consider protection in a preventive way as was done in Somalia.

Advised to research:

- Does WFP want to have the same role as UNHCR for everyone it provides assistance to? Do WFP and its implementing partners have a responsibility to raise awareness of protection issues?
- Is protection adequately covered in WFP’s policies? Should WFP just focus on doing no harm or should it be more actively involve in addressing protection issues.

Registration

Advised to consider:

- WFP should translate both bad and positive experiences with registration in Darfur into “best practice.”
- WFP needs a technical registration unit to support the NGO’s.
- WFP needs to de-link head counts from gathering of information. There are usually people left out of distribution. To ensure the vulnerable are included, registration could be linked with SFP’s to identify those populations.
- Ration cards were more effective than distribution through sheikhs in Darfur.
- Registration needs to include information campaigns, time for discussion and explanation, and sufficient numbers of staff.

Protection Programming

Advised to consider:

- WFP can address some protection issues through its programming, in assessment, planning, program design, and organizing distribution. WFP staff and partners need to be sensitized to this, to consider consequences of its actions.
- During the Darfur study, the researchers came across very interesting ways that protection activities are incorporated into regular programming. These should be documented. WFP should further assess food aid's protective impact (as presented in livelihood assessment of Darfur showing the reduction of damaging coping strategies).
- WFP should think about ways in which food aid and staff can be manipulated at each stage of the distribution and try and prevent its manipulation.
- WFP should monitor changes in coping strategies and risks that people have to take, in relation to changes in food rations (i.e., monitor protective impact of food aid).

Advised to debate:

- WFP should consider drawing-up a security protocol like World Vision did in Mershing.

Capacity of WFP

Advised to consider:

- Protection officers should be associated with WFP activities.
- There must be protection support for staff. WFP should build capacity of local staff to be aware of protection issues and to be neutral before throwing them into a difficult situation. This has implications for recruitment of local staff.

Advised to research:

- How does WFP fit into the numerous (too many) different working groups on protection in Darfur?

D. Advice from Experts

The following is a brief summary of the key pieces of Advice experts presented in their papers and presentations. The Advice takes into consideration the opinions of the experts after the Forum. The full papers and abstracts are available in the Food Aid Forum Resource Kit: <http://nutrition.tufts.edu/research/famine/>

Expert Opinions

“WFP’s Role in the Sudan: A Five-Year Perspective,” by Randolph Kent:

- WFP must find an appropriate niche when it comes to substantively changing global, regional, and national environments. Such changes will include the direct intervention of a small number of

external governments in the commercial growth and infrastructural developments of other states, the paradoxical decline of a growing number of governments to provide even the most minimal safety nets, and the replacement of most traditional government tasks in over 90 states through the emergence of new forms of “regionalization” based upon ethnic, syndicate and functional networks.

- WFP will need to determine how its own objectives and structure will accommodate food security innovations based upon remittances, commercial agriculture, regional networks, cash, social cash and insurance programs, local purchases, and technological innovations in crop production.
- WFP will need to explore its value-added and market niche when it comes to dealing with the corporate sector, strengthened regional organizations, and the military—all which can develop similar operational roles and capacities to those of WFP.
- WFP will need to determine the extent to which it can make a positive difference—itsself and in collaboration with other partners—for those whose livelihoods remain dependent upon “orphan agriculture” (that is, farming that is not directly affected by the changes noted above).

“Sub-Regional Integration: The Key to Food Security and Recovery,” by Brian D’Silva, and Olivia Tecosky:

- Though the CPA provides for a one-country, two-systems approach politically, food security must be approached from an agro-ecological perspective. WFP should reorganize analysis, programming, and logistics from a disjointed approach between the North and South to a unified approach for all of Sudan. In-depth research into sub-regional areas of surplus production relative to deficit areas is also required so that potential linkages can be explored.
- Because Sudan is increasingly approaching food self-sufficiency at an aggregate level, WFP should work with the Government to identify strategies to link areas of surplus with areas of deficit, recognizing the Government’s responsibility to feed its population.
- In addition to addressing physical and structural constraints to sub-regional integration, WFP should consider shifting to local purchases of food and other market-based interventions to ensure that food aid is delivered most efficiently and to build the linkages between surplus and deficit sub-regions for future integration.

“Global Trends in Food Aid Paper,” by Daniel Maxwell:

- WFP must come to grips with the rapidly changing global governance mechanisms for food aid and ensure that its programs remain in line with new developments in the WTO, the renegotiation of the FAC, and in deepening its commitment to codes of conduct.
- WFP must understand and not only work within existing donor trends but also develop an advocacy strategy to influence these trends.
- Key areas of emerging best practices in food aid programming include improved information systems and analysis capacity; improved program management, including improved targeting; and supply chain management. In order to address the more context-specific issues these emerging global best practices must be adopted by WFP Sudan.

“Food Aid and Trade Under WTO,” by Hamid Faki, Mohamed A. Dingle, and Eltigani Elamin:

- WFP must understand its interaction with WTO negotiations on food aid and trade.
- WFP must ensure cooperation with Sudan’s relevant authorities on procedures for declaring emergency situations.
- WFP should reassess food aid types, procurement procedures, and monetization.

“Food Aid and Development in Southern Sudan (Post-CPA),” by Buzz Sharp:

- Over the next 5 years, WFP will need to consider who should hold the responsibility for monitoring and analyzing food security and livelihoods. WFP will need to be part of more independent livelihoods analytical support during this period.
- In a time of peace and with improving food access, WFP should consider alternatives to food aid if contributing to improved nutrition and supporting the rehabilitation of social and economic infrastructure remains the goal.
- Some impact monitoring should be established to allow cost/benefit analysis with other proposed responses.
- WFP should consider supporting the purchase of local surpluses in order to develop and national food reserve and emergency response capacity.
- WFP should review its distribution systems and timing of deliveries to ensure greater impact of their food aid.

“From Food Aid to Livelihoods Support—Rethinking WFP’s Role in Eastern Sudan,” by Sara Pantuliano:

- WFP should discuss and identify the main elements required to develop an appropriate exit strategy from contexts where the provision of food aid can be replaced by alternative responses.
- WFP should review the efficacy of Food for Work (FFW) and Food for Recovery (FFR) activities in a context where communities are scattered and partially mobile. Consider the place of food aid as one possible element among alternatives within the development of safety nets.
- WFP should work in collaboration with other actors to address underlying causes of vulnerability.
- WFP should advocate for appropriate policies, e.g., land tenure and access, which can strengthen people’s livelihoods and reduce their reliance on food aid.

“The Future of Food Security in the Three Areas of Sudan,” by Jason Matus:

- WFP should consider how much it should contribute to the wider economic, political and social analysis.
- WFP needs to assess how it can address food needs while supporting or at least not undermining the expanding and conflict-prone market.
- WFP needs to assess how it can work with the community and emerging government structures so they can eventually take over WFP’s current role.
- The objectives of recovery strategy should be guided by the informed choice of the people and support their increased participation in the new and democratic government structures.
- The distribution of assistance should be equitable and therefore prioritize the least developed areas and poorest people so that their level of development is in parity with the rest of country.

“Food Aid and Livelihood Support in the Darfur States, Western Sudan,” by Helen Young:

- WFP needs to address issues of effective partnership, strategic capacity development of national stakeholders (including issues of national capacities including the strategic grain reserve), and prioritizing community relationships and participation.
- WFP needs to prioritize its strategic planning processes for saving lives and supporting livelihoods along how food aid can be better

combined within a wider range of livelihood support initiatives, particularly where the situation is constantly evolving.

- While strategies to ensure adequate and efficient logistics and the safe delivery of food assistance are a prerequisite for successful food aid programming, so are strategies for assessing needs and strategic planning for targeting and distribution based on an understanding of how the conflict has affected both lives and livelihoods.
- WFP must carefully consider how their own interventions either escalate or reduce the risks faced by the population and actively seek ways to minimize these risks.

“Food Security Policies in Sudan,” by Dr. Abdelrazig Elbashir and Dr. Adam Elhag Ahmed:

- WFP should support livelihoods of vulnerable groups and observe beneficiary taste and preference.
- WFP should refine targeting mechanisms and monitoring and evaluation.
- For cost-effectiveness WFP should persuade and encourage cash donations rather than food donations and buy food by tendering locally, regional and internationally (effectiveness, possibilities, and shortcomings).

“Brief Review of Sudan Economy and Future Prospects for Agricultural Development,” by Dr. Karrar A. B. Abbadi and Dr. Adam Elhag Ahmed:

- Strengthen level of coordination between the WFP and the Strategic Food Reserve concerning the purchase of food from the local market and distribution of food to vulnerable groups to overcome prices increase and overlapping in distribution.
- Exit strategies of vulnerable groups to pursue development work have to be properly delineated, e.g., if some segments of vulnerable groups in Sudan rejected the WFP’s FFW program, what are the alternative strategies for using food for development?
- In dispensing food aid and considering different climatic zones of Sudan, WFP has to take into consideration consumption patterns of vulnerable groups, that is, to encourage consumption of millet in areas of millet production and likewise for sorghum and wheat.

New Research

“Accelerating Progress Towards Universal Salt Iodization in Sudan: Time for Action,” by Ibrahim Bani:

- The IDD Control Program must be a top most priority if Sudan is to achieve USI by the year 2011. WFP must advocate for a national

policy and legislation on the production and consumption of iodized salt.

- WFP must ensure the micronutrient component of the food consumed by refugees, IDP's, and other vulnerable groups coping with emergencies.
- To assist the national capacities, WFP support system should watch over trends in salt production and marketing and over progress to USI and IDD elimination.

“The Continuing Livelihoods Crisis in Darfur,” by Margie Buchanan-Smith and Susanne Jaspars

- Over the course of the conflict, there has been little change in the livelihood strategies available to conflict affected people. In 2006, most are still dependent on a limited number of precarious and low-paying strategies.
- All population groups face restrictions in movement, which affects trade, livestock, and labor migration. Markets in local cereals have collapsed and have been replaced by food aid.
- Many of the strategies that people adopt are associated with risks of abuse or with payments for protection to Janjaweed or other Arab groups. The risk of attack, looting, and theft remains for all groups.
- Food aid has had a positive impact on livelihoods, as well as on nutrition, by reducing the adoption of damaging coping strategies and distress-sale of livestock and encouraging return to villages. The study found no evidence of disincentive effects on agricultural production.
- Food distribution should be complemented with appropriate livelihood support interventions. In the absence of alternative forms of livelihood support, or until the peace agreement is effectively implemented, food aid levels should remain at levels similar to those in 2005.
- Conditions for full-scale recovery of sustainable livelihoods are not met at the present time. Premature recovery could exacerbate conflict and lead to households being at increased risk of attack.

Part III: Analysis of End of Forum Evaluation Questionnaire

“What is your message to WFP about its strategy to 2011?”

At the end of the Forum, participants were asked to fill out an evaluation questionnaire. Over 130 questionnaires were completed. The following key points were recurrently mentioned in the questionnaires. For each key point, a percentile of the total demographic is also indicated. Key points are listed with subsidiary and related comments following. Subsidiary issues may contain as few as three appearances in feedback forms (cut off value for subsidiary category).

Subsidiary comments are labeled with their weighting and contributors listed in order of majority. Where general sentiments across demographics are mentioned, no such labeling is included.

Table Key:

- “Flagged by % of respondents”: The percentage of total feedback answers that specifically mention this key issue or subsidiary elements. As many respondents mentioned more than one issue, the summed percentages across all the questions add up to more than 100%.
- “Anon, NGO, Gov,” etc.: Percentage of total members of each category giving a particular response. Shown like this the data does not give undue influence to classes of respondents that contained few individuals.

1. Key Point: Implementation of Forum and Workshop Conclusions:

There was enthusiasm and concern as to how the conclusions drawn in the Forum would be implemented in policy and put into practice. A recurring concern was that it is common for such forums to be forgotten and seen only as PR exercises.

Flagged by % of respondents	Anon	NGO's	NGO's ?	WFP	Gov	Other UN	Presenters
11%	11%	15%	0%	13%	10%	0	17%

Related/Subsidiary Comments:

- The WFP should continue listening to advice and criticism. (3)
(Anon, NGNU)

- Workshops should be arranged for WFP only, in which forum suggestions are subjected to feasibility studies by professionals. (3) (Anon, WFP)

2. Key Point: Partnerships

There was a general calling for WFP to strengthen partnerships with the following institutions and individuals:

- Other NGO's present in Sudan
- Stakeholders
- GONU
- GOSGNUS
- State/Government
- Other UN agencies

Flagged by % of respondents	Anon	NGO's	NGO's ?	WFP	Gov	Other UN	Presenters
20%	17%	38%	16%	30%	10%	0	%17

Related/Subsidiary Comments:

- Government involvement is needed in both policy making and state level planning. It was felt this would better aid food security and development. In particular it was suggested that Government priorities be kept in mind and that policy be consistent with them. (8) (Anon, WFP, Gov, NGO)
- Stakeholders: (12) (NGO, Gov, Anon, Presenters): A general revision on the way the WFP sees its relationship with stakeholders. Stakeholders should be kept informed and involved in local operations. It was mentioned that there should be process time in development to allow for this communication (1). Cultural causes of malnutrition and consumer habits were also mentioned as key motives for stronger ties with stakeholders (4) (NGO, Gov, Anon).

3. Key Point: WFP's Current Assets:

3.1 Information-Sharing, Prior Experience, Influence

The WFP's experience in Sudan should be noted and valued, both in terms of institutional experience and on an individual and practical level. It would be beneficial to develop a system for sharing local, regional and general knowledge. Some suggestions involved a public database or network. There was frequent mention that such experience and the WFP's capacity to influence put the WFP in the best position to lead a general change in policy for NGNU in Sudan (see "Policy" Section).

Flagged by % of respondents	Anon	NGO's	NGO's ?	WFP	Gov	Other UN	Presenters
6%	10%	0%	0%	9%	0%	0%	%17

Related/Subsidiary Comments:

- There was mention of a need for the WFP to develop an “institutional memory” and to avoid repeating past mistakes.

Flagged by % of respondents	Anon	NGO's	NGO's ?	WFP	Gov	Other UN	Presenters
10%	11%	0%	17%	17%	10%	0	%6

3

.2 Employees, Capacity, Expertise

Related/Subsidiary Comments:

- Capacity-building: At local and regional level, WFP should increase capacity for local involvement, including additional improvement of computing/technical facilities. (9) (Anon, WFP, Gov)
- Concerns over employee expertise: It was asked that the WFP take experience and qualification more into account when selection new employees. Training for existing employees was also mentioned. (5) (Anon, WFP, UN)

4. Key Point: Strategy and Policy

4.1 Call for change in strategy

WFP should move away from distribution and food aid towards development, rehabilitation, and livelihoods, whilst being prepared for emergency response. In doing so, an exit strategy must be produced, possibly employing professional help.

Flagged by % of respondents	Anon	NGO's	NGO's ?	WFP	Gov	Other UN	Presenters
14%	15%	15%	0%	30%	6%	0	%33

Related/Subsidiary Comments:

- It is felt that closer ties with the local government would help to ensure food security.
- The WFP must allow for a stronger role of other NGNU in achieving such a change, but it was generally felt that WFP would lead the way.
- There was also a call for WFP to reduce its strategy to a state level (5) (WFP, NGO)

4.2 Clarity and flexibility of policy

WFP policy must be more concisely stated, in terms of both priorities and focus. There was a general sentiment that current policies are too broad and lack structure. A more precise agenda would also be a more effect means of inducing donors to back the WFP.

Flagged by % of respondents	Anon	NGO's	NGO's ?	WFP	Gov	Other UN	Presenters
10%	9%	15%	0%	13%	6%	0	%33

Related and Subsidiary Comments

- There was also a call for flexibility for policy across demographics. Re-evaluation sessions were cited as a solution to both a clear policy and malleability. (Anon, NGO, Gov, Presenter)