

Agenda Items 6-A/4, 5-D/5, 5-D/5/Add.1

Country Strategic Plan for Nigeria 2023 – 2027, evaluation of the Nigeria CSP 2019-2022 and the related Management Response

Mister President

I am speaking on behalf of the European Union and its Member States.

[XXX, XXXX, XXXX align themselves with this statement.]

We take note of the Country Strategic Plan for Nigeria 2023-2027 and welcome the evaluation of the previous CSP 2019-2022. We encourage WFP to factor in the evaluation findings and recommendations to a larger extent in the draft CSP.

We are highly concerned by the situation in the country, where 25.3 million people are estimated to be in acute food insecurity during the 2023 lean season, with difficult access conditions due to the on-going conflicts.

We note the general approach of this CSP, which aims to shift the role of WFP from an operational one to an enabling one. Given the current dire humanitarian situation, this does not appropriately address recommendation 1 of the evaluation that invites WFP to focus on humanitarian challenges building on its comparative advantage in managing large-scale emergency responses, while continuing to pave the

way for transition to a more development approach. We would appreciate clarification from WFP in this respect.

We appreciate that the new CSP foresees 91% of its resources for crisis response. Outcome 1/activity 1 represents 75% of the country portfolio budget. However, we are concerned that it encompasses a very wide range of actions, where the integrated package accompanying food assistance involves for instance also gender transformative, malnutrition prevention, social and behavioural change communication activities. In order to enhance programmatic transparency, we invite WFP to clarify robustly on which activities the CSP and its Outcome 1 will focus. Furthermore, we would appreciate a better and more streamlined description of the emergency response activities, and according to the different contexts of emergencies, as recommended by the evaluation. We would welcome more information on the transition process for beneficiaries under activity 1 to livelihood activities under Outcome 3 of the CSP, as the evaluation found that this was not clear during the previous CSP.

With reference to the dire undernutrition situation in Nigeria, we are concerned that WFP's related efforts are fragmented under 3 Outcomes, 3 outputs and 3 activities, while being mainstreamed in many others. This approach seems to be in contradiction with the evaluation, which recommends the consolidation of these activities under a single Outcome. We invite WFP to clarify the approach. In this regard, we also note that under Outcome 1, the only partnership mentioned is the one with the government. In this context, however, we would welcome a more detailed

description of the partnership and division of tasks with the nutrition-mandated agency, UNICEF.

With reference to Outcome 5, we appreciate the role that WFP plays in the country to facilitate access to the most difficult and dangerous areas of the country, including through UNHAS. In this respect, we fully support evaluation recommendation 2.2 regarding continued engagement with the government to advocate for and contribute to the negotiation of humanitarian access. On the other hand, we are concerned about the absence of concrete references to the humanitarian principles in the CSP, despite the clear recommendation 2.1 and the related evaluation finding, suggesting WFP could have been more robust in leveraging its positive relations with the government to ensure that the humanitarian needs of all conflict-affected populations are known and addressed. Reiterating a question we asked regarding several other CSPs, we invite WFP to explain how it intends to strike the crucial balance between the respect of humanitarian principles and peacebuilding and development activities. In a complex setting like Nigeria, it is essential that humanitarian organisations are independent and perceived to be independent.

We encourage WFP to fully implement recommendation 3 for a pro-active approach on protection and Accountability to Affected Populations. We invite WFP to share more detailed information on the planned related partnerships with other humanitarian organisations to make concrete progress on this aspect.

We underline the crucial importance of properly factoring in gender concerns and fully support recommendation 4. With reference to the gender-transformative actions mainstreamed along the entire CSP, we encourage WFP to clarify how it intends to ensure the “do no harm” principle, which according to its Gender Policy should guide the implementation of these activities.

In terms of the significant number of people in need that remained without assistance, as mentioned by conclusion 5 of the evaluation, we invite WFP to clarify what are the reasons behind the lack of clarity in the division of responsibility between WFP and other actors, and which measures are envisaged to address it.

Furthermore, we note conclusion 8 of the evaluation that found the decision to follow the Nexus approach in the previous CSP premature and overambitious in the evolving context of Nigeria. We would appreciate more information from WFP regarding how the new CSP will do justice to this finding and how the triple Nexus will be implemented in a context-sensitive manner in all programming.

Thank you.