



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the United
Nations

Office of Evaluation

Supporting Food Security, Nutrition and Livelihoods in Sub-Saharan Africa - GCP /RAF/454/GER

Final Evaluation Report

January 2014

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Office of Evaluation (OED)

This report is available in electronic format at: <http://www.fao.org/evaluation>

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO 2013

FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO's endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way.

All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request or addressed to copyright@fao.org.

For further information on this report, please contact:

Director, OED
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 1, 00153
Rome, Italy
Email: evaluation@fao.org

Acknowledgements

The Evaluation of the project “Supporting Food Security, Nutrition and Livelihoods in Sub-Saharan Africa” (GCP/RAF/454/GER) was made possible thanks to the support and the information provided by FAO staff at the headquarters (HQ), at the Regional Office for Africa (RAF), at sub-regional and at country level. In particular, the evaluation team would like to thank the project officer Charlotte Dufour and the Regional Senior Nutrition Officer Mohamed Ag Bendeck, as well as other staff members and consultants at HQ and RAF for providing information and links to the numerous stakeholders and for organizing the mission to RAF.

Moreover, the team benefitted extensively from the discussions held with the many stakeholders partnering with the project, such as the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), the Renewed Efforts against Child Hunger (REACH), African Union (AU) and partners in Ghana. In addition, the evaluation team is grateful to the donor, the Federal Ministry of Food Agriculture and Consumer Protection of Germany, for sharing their views on the project.

Finally, the evaluation team would like to thank the Office of Evaluation for their kind support and administrative assistance to the evaluation.

Composition of the evaluation team

Evaluation team

Pernille Nagel Sørensen (Team Leader)

FAO Office of Evaluation

Luisa Belli (Evaluation Officer)

Sara Holst (Evaluation Analyst)

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Acronyms..... | vi |
| Executive summary | ix |
| 1 Introduction..... | 1 |
| 1.1 Background and purposes of the evaluation | 1 |
| 1.2 Methodology of the evaluation | 1 |
| 1.3 Constraints | 2 |
| 2 Context of the project/programme | 3 |
| 3 Analysis of project concept and design..... | 4 |
| 3.1 Project relevance | 4 |
| 3.2 Project design | 5 |
| 3.3 Logical Framework | 6 |
| 4 Analysis of the implementation process..... | 7 |
| 4.1 Project/programme Management | 7 |
| 4.2 Staff management..... | 9 |
| 4.3 Financial resources management | 10 |
| 4.4 Institutional Set-up | 12 |
| 4.5 Coordination..... | 13 |
| 5 Analysis of results and contribution to stated objectives | 15 |
| 5.1 Achievements at Outputs level..... | 15 |
| 5.1.1 <i>Output 1: Advocacy</i> | 15 |
| 5.1.2 <i>Output 2: Technical support to project management and policy formulation</i> | 17 |
| 5.1.3 <i>Output 3: Capacity building</i> | 18 |
| 5.1.4 <i>Output 4: Coordination and joint programming</i> | 19 |
| 5.1.5 <i>Output 5: Lessons-learning and knowledge-sharing</i> | 20 |
| 5.2 Achievements at outcome level | 22 |
| 5.2.1 <i>Indicator 1: regional initiatives</i> | 23 |
| 5.2.2 <i>Indicator 2: national policies reflecting FSNL</i> | 26 |
| 5.2.3 <i>Indicator 3: projects integrating FSNL</i> | 26 |
| 5.2.4 <i>Indicator 4: global initiatives</i> | 27 |
| 5.3 Gender equality | 27 |
| 5.4 Capacity development | 28 |
| 5.5 Human Rights Based Approach | 28 |
| 5.6 Partnership and alliances | 29 |
| 6 Analysis by evaluation criteria..... | 30 |
| 6.1 Relevance | 30 |
| 6.2 Relevance | 30 |
| 6.3 Efficiency | 31 |
| 6.4 Effectiveness | 31 |
| 6.5 Sustainability..... | 31 |
| 6.6 Impact | 32 |
| 7 Conclusions and recommendations | 34 |
| 7.1 Conclusions..... | 34 |
| 7.2 Recommendations | 35 |
| Annex 1 Evaluation terms of reference | 37 |
| Annex 2 List of Outputs..... | 49 |
| Annex 3 CAADP Mainstreaming Workshops | 62 |
| Annex 4 List of documents reviewed..... | 71 |
| Annex 5 List of institutions and stakeholders met during the evaluation process..... | 76 |

| | | |
|-----------------|--|------------|
| Annex 6 | List of consultants contracted under the project..... | 78 |
| Annex 7 | FAO Involvement in Nutrition at Country Level..... | 79 |
| Annex 8 | Sample of Country Information taken from the Nutrition Country Paper and Action Plan..... | 82 |
| Annex 9 | CAADP Workshops Country Teams' members | 111 |
| Annex 10 | Profile of team members..... | 128 |

Acronyms

| | |
|--------|--|
| AAHM | Action Against Hunger and Malnutrition |
| AFNSD | Africa Nutrition Day Commemoration |
| AGA | Animal Production and Health Division |
| AGN | FAO Nutrition and Consumer Protection Division |
| AGNA | FAO Nutrition and Consumer Protection Division Nutrition-Assessment and Planning Service |
| Ag2Nut | Agriculture to Nutrition |
| AGPM | FAO Plant Production and Protection Division |
| AGS | Rural Infrastructure and Agro-Industries Division |
| AOS | Administrative and Operative Support |
| APO | Associate Professional Officer |
| AU | African Union |
| BASF | The Chemical Company |
| BH | Budget Holder |
| CAADP | Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme |
| CD | Capacity Development |
| CFS | Committee on World Food Security |
| CGIAR | Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research |
| CIDA | Canadian International Development Agency |
| CILLS | Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel |
| COMESA | Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa |
| COP16 | Conference of the Parties 16 |
| CSO | Civil Society Organizations |
| DRC | Democratic Republic of Congo |
| DRM | Disaster Risk Management |
| ECHO | European Community Humanitarian Office |
| ECOWAS | Economic Community of West African States |
| ECSA | East Central and Southern African |
| ERCU | Emergency Rehabilitation and Coordination Unit |
| ES | FAO Economic and Social Development Department |
| ESA | FAO Agricultural Development Economics Division |
| ESN | FAO Nutrition Division |
| EQ | Evaluation Questions |
| EU | European Union |
| FAFS | Framework for African Food Security |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization |
| FI | Fisheries and Aquaculture Department |
| FIPM | Fisheries and Aquaculture Department. Products, Trade and Marketing |
| FISHED | Food Security Information System for Households Enhancing Decision Making |
| FOEP | FAO Forest Policy Service |
| FOEM | Forest Assessment, Management and Conservation Division |
| FRA | France |
| FSNL | Food Security, Nutrition, and Livelihoods |
| FSN | Food Security, Nutrition |
| GER | Germany |

| | |
|---------|---|
| GIZ | Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit |
| GNF | Global Nature Fund |
| HGSF | Home Grown School Feeding |
| HLWP | High Level Work Plan |
| HRBA | Human Rights Based Approaches |
| HQ | Head Quarters |
| ICN | International Conference on Nutrition |
| IFAD | International Fund for Agricultural Development |
| IFPRI | International Food Policy Research Institute |
| ILRI | International Livestock Research Institute |
| INGO | International Non-Governmental Organization |
| IP | Investment Plans |
| ISFS | Information Systems for Food Security |
| ITT | Internal Task Team |
| KCE | FAO Knowledge Exchange & Capacity Building division |
| LoA | Letter of Agreement |
| LTO | Lead Technical Officer |
| LTU | Lead Technical Unit |
| MDG | Millennium Development Goals |
| MDG-F | Millennium Development Goals- Fund |
| METASIP | Medium-Term Agriculture Sector Investment Plans |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MoV | Means of Verification |
| MR | Management Response |
| NAFSIF | National Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plans |
| NCP | Nutrition Country Paper |
| NEPAD | New Partnership for Africa's Development |
| N-GLEE | Nutrition- Global Learning and Exchange Event |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organizations |
| NIT | New Information Technologies |
| NMTPF | National Medium-Term Priority Framework |
| NPCA | NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency |
| NPFS | National Programme for Food Security |
| OCE | FAO/Office of Corporate Communications and External Relations |
| ODG | FAO Office of Director General |
| OED | FAO Office of Evaluation |
| OEDD | FAO Office of Evaluation Division |
| OEKM | FAO Office of Knowledge Exchange and the Library |
| OEKR | FAO Research & Extension Branch |
| PAIA | Priority Areas for Interdisciplinary Action |
| PANI | Pan African Nutrition Initiative |
| PCD | Partnership for Child Development |
| PIF | Agriculture Sector Policy and Investment Framework |
| PMAC | Project Management Advisory Committee |
| PPMD | Planning, Policy, Monitoring and Evaluation Department |
| PSTA | Strategic Plan for Agricultural Transformation |
| PTF | Project Task Force |
| RAF | Regional Office for Africa |
| REACH | Renewed Efforts Against Child Hunger |
| REC | Regional Economic Communities |

| | |
|--------|--|
| ROPPA | Network of Farmers and Agricultural Producers' Organizations of West Africa |
| RR | Regional Representative |
| SADC | Southern Africa Development Community |
| SAFO | Strategic Alliance for the Fortification of Oil & Other Staple Foods |
| SAKSS | Strategic Analysis & Knowledge Support Systems |
| SCN | Standing Committee on Nutrition |
| SDC | Swiss Development Corporation |
| SETSAN | Technical Secretariat for Food Security and Nutrition |
| SFE | FAO Sub-regional Office for Eastern Africa |
| SFW | FAO Sub-regional Office for West Africa |
| SISAN | Symposium International sur la Sécurité Alimentaire et Nutritionnelle |
| SMART | Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-bound |
| SO | Strategic Objective |
| SPRING | USAID project Strengthening Partnerships, Results, and Innovations in Nutrition Globally |
| SUN | Scaling-Up Nutrition Network |
| SWOT | Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats |
| TCE | FAO Emergency and Rehabilitation Division |
| TCI | FAO Investment Centre Division |
| TCP | Technical Cooperative Programme |
| TCS | South-South and Resource Mobilization Division |
| TCSP | FAO Policy Assistance and Support Service |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |
| UEMOA | West African Economic & Monetary Union |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNEG | United Nations Evaluation Group |
| UNFCCC | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change |
| UNJP | United Nations Joint Programme |
| UNICEF | United Nations Children's Fund |
| UNSCN | United Nations Standing Committee on Nutrition |
| USAID | United States Agency for International Development |
| USD | US Dollars |
| WAHO | West African Health Organization |
| WFP | World Food Programme |
| WHO | World Health Organization |

Executive summary

Information about the evaluation

ES1. This report presents the final evaluation of the project “Supporting Food Security Nutrition and Livelihoods in Sub-Saharan Africa” (GCP/RAF/454/GER). The project started on the 1 June 2010 with a budget of 2.189.680 USD and was completed on the 31 December 2013 including a no-cost extension. As stated in the Terms of Reference (ToR), the purpose of this evaluation is to ensure the accountability to the donor and the project partners and to identify the lessons learned that can be considered in formulating and/or implementing similar projects and for FAO strategic planning (definition and implementation of the Strategic Objectives and the management of the decentralization process). This evaluation was implemented between October and December 2013.

ES2. The evaluation included three types of data collection tools/methods: 1) Review of existing documentation (project documentation/outputs, CAADP documents, corporate documents); 2) Interviews (semi-structured) during visits to HQ, Rome and RAF, Accra; moreover Skype and telephone interviews were conducted. 3) CAADP case study. The support to the CAADP process of mainstreaming nutrition into agricultural investment plans constituted a major activity in 2012-2013.

ES3. The execution of this evaluation was hampered by several constraints: 1) Due to the revocation of the contract of a regional consultant (allocated 15 days) the evaluation team overall had less time to the evaluation than originally planned. 2) The assessment of the output achievement was impeded by not well-developed output indicators. Thirdly, the project activities increasingly throughout the project period were conducted in collaboration with other partners and it therefore became problematic to fully attribute the achievements to the project itself. Fourthly, some informants were not available for the interviews.

Key findings

ES4. The project is considered highly relevant to the needs of the population in Sub-Saharan Africa. Both long-term and emergency food security responses tend to focus on either staple food production and export production or quick and life-saving health interventions. In both cases the nutrition requirements are not adequately addressed, leading to malnutrition of the targeted population. Supporting mainstreaming nutrition into agriculture is therefore hugely important. The project was moreover highly relevant to the initiative of NEPAD and the CAADP, REACH and SUN aiming at strengthening the mainstreaming of nutrition into agriculture. The project proved to be very timely; politicians were to a larger extent than previously responsive to advocacy promoting nutrition-sensitive agriculture and the project could tap into this new development. At corporate level, the project likewise demonstrated a high level of relevance and timeliness; it was e.g. implemented parallel/shortly after the Evaluation of FAO’s Role and Work in Nutrition and the subsequent formulation of the Nutrition Strategy as well as the formulation of the new Strategic Framework 2014-2018.

ES5. The project applied a unique approach with nine elements, some of which are inter-related: 1) Linking nutrition and agriculture by promoting nutrition-sensitive agriculture and applying a multi-sectorial approach. 2) Operating simultaneously at global, regional and national levels in order to maximize the influence on processes at each of these levels. 3) Combining work on the ground with advocacy at high-level, mainly targeting high level

politicians. The project also addressed the policy level; previously, nutrition projects mainly focused at operation at community level. 4) Targeting the country level through regional organizations; e.g. NEPAD and ECOWAS. 5) Adding value through supporting on-going policy and programming processes such as the CAADP and Home Grown School Feeding. 6) Applying a demand-driven and opportunistic approach, responding to country-level requests and seizing opportunities, e.g. in emergency contexts. 7) Working through existing coordination mechanisms, e.g. multi-sectorial and inter-agency collaboration initiatives such as the SUN and REACH partnerships, and regional working groups on nutrition and food security. 8) Seeking synergies with other FAO projects and development partners and maximizing opportunities for co-funding in order to obtain additional resources and increase ownership of nutrition issues. 9) Project invisibility – staff visibility, by promoting the “issue” rather than the project; this was made possible due to the very flexible attitude of the donor. The project was very much associated with the Food Security, Nutrition and Livelihood (FSNL) expert, and it is difficult to distinguish the contribution of the project from the personal contribution of the FSNL expert.

ES6. The Logical Framework overall had a relatively good intervention logic, however, the outcome and impact levels suffered from the lack of indication of targeted areas. Moreover, the impact indicators and Means of Verification (MoV) were not well-defined. The outcome and the associated indicators were relatively well prepared; the same was the case with most of the outputs. The output indicators were for the main part formulated as activity rather than output indicators. During the project implementation, indicators were revised or cancelled or new indicators were included. The revision of indicators reflected the challenge of applying a demand-driven and opportunistic approach at the same time as formulating very precise indicators in the project preparation phase.

ES7. The project was generally well-implemented. The majority of the activities were delivered as planned. Due to the need to respond from requests (e.g. from country level) while at the same time seizing opportunities, there was an increased pressure on the project team. As a solution, consultants were contracted for specific assignments, mainly production of documents. e.g. the Guiding Principles and the Key Recommendations.

ES8. Project monitoring was thorough and systematic; nevertheless, the monitoring at output level suffered from the lack of well-defined indicators. In consequence, even though the reports were thoroughly prepared, they were only partly reporting on output achievements and only partly providing the right information. The communication component and country request were not properly reported. The latter is a missed opportunity to present evidence on support provided to country/sub-regional offices.

ES9. The collaboration between the project team and the donor, the Federal Ministry of Food Agriculture and Consumer Protection, Germany, were by both sides described as close, very good and constructive.

ES10. The budget allocation appeared to be sufficient for the planned activities; however, due to the very flexible and demand-oriented approach of the project, there was a need for frequent (annual) budget revisions. Project revisions took place three times; in addition, a no-cost extension (extending to December 31, 2013) was requested (and granted). All budget revisions seem justified. The financial management of the programme appears to have been done relatively effectively and there appeared to be a very good (virtual) communication between the financial teams (RAF and HQ) and the project staff located at HQ.

ES11. The project under evaluation had a very unique institutional set-up: the project staff was located at HQ, whereas it was administered by RAF. The project team received technical back stopping from the ESN division group leader until her retirement in March 2013. The project was administered as part of the regional project portfolio and thus also benefitted from the contribution of RAF; it is e.g. estimated that the Senior Nutrition Officer devoted approximately 15-20 % of his time to the project.

ES12. Several factors appear to have contributed to this unique institutional set-up. 1) At the time of the launch of the project, it was assessed that RAF had the management capacity to administer the project, whereas it was equally judged that the technical capacity was not in place. 2) The positioning of the FSNL expert at HQ rather than regional level was regarded necessary in order to mainstream nutrition at corporate level. 3) The donor favoured funding a project implemented at regional level rather than at HQ.

ES13. The institutional set-up was reported by all involved parties to have functioned very well. Several traits of the mode of collaboration between the project staff and RAF appeared to have contributed to its success: 1) Good and well-defined division of labour/task. 2) Flexibility. 3) Transparency and consensus. 4) Regular contact (Skype).

ES14. At HQ the project was located in the ESN division. Collaboration between the project and other ESN groups took place to a certain extent and the work done under the project was partly shared within the division, e.g. with regard to the Key Recommendations and Fact Sheets. In relation to intra-division collaboration, the absence of a director and thus of regular meetings affected collaboration within ESN in general. With regard to communication, the project communication officer seemed to have filled a gap within the division by occasionally assisting other groups with communication activities. The perceived added value of the project within ESN has been relatively limited, apart from the communication aspects and the sharing of some outputs, e.g. the Key Recommendation. This appears to a large extent to be the result of intra-division problems.

ES15. In contrast, the added value of the project to inter-division collaboration was reported to be high. The project collaborated with and contributed to a number of other FAO projects, e.g. the Global Governance for Hunger Reduction programme as well as TCI and TCE with regard to investment and emergency projects respectively.

ES16. The assessment of the achievement of the five outputs was hampered by the fact that most of the associated indicators were activity and not output indicators. In order to enable a partial assessment, for each output, the main results have been selected, which best illustrate the potential achievement of the output. **Output 1 (advocacy)** focused on enhanced commitment. In this case the process of the formulation of the corporate Nutrition Strategy and the new Strategic Framework indicated a higher level of commitment at corporate level. Several informants emphasized that the project team was instrumental in bringing on board the nutrition aspects in both processes. Overall, there appeared to be a change from “pushing” for nutrition inclusion to other divisions “requesting” for technical support with regard to nutrition. **Output 2 (technical support)** focused on the integration of nutrition within agriculture in FAO projects. The project contributed significantly in this regard; e.g. with regard to formulation of an ECHO project and integration of nutrition and resilience, and combining the Right to Food and nutrition. With regard to **Output 3 (capacity development)**, the indicators (regional workshops; country-level/trainings organized/supported, etc.) are all pre-conditions for capacity development; but they are not evidence that capacity has been developed. However, there were other indications; several informants for example

highlighted that the workshop February 2012 in Accra for decentralized staff in Sub-Saharan Africa created a higher level of awareness and some capacity with regard to nutrition sensitive agriculture. The main achievement under **Output 4 (coordination and joint programming)** is the Letter of Agreement (LoA) signed with the NPCA Food and Nutrition Unit regarding the implementation of the CAADP workshops and other activities. The support to REACH was also crucial; due to the support from the project, agriculture has now become an integrated part of nutrition within REACH. It was conveyed that having a broader collaboration with FAO (not only working through the nutrition focal points) would be desirable to broadening the areas of collaboration. Under **Output 5 (lessons learning)** the preparation of the Key Recommendations was crucial. The document was widely used and taken up by different stakeholders, e.g. the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in relation to Feed the Future Programme; the Key Recommendations were also central in the CAADP process.

ES17. The outcome of the project appears to have been achieved based on the four indicators, although the number of actual projects integrating FSNL (indicator 3) was less than planned. The project outcome is formulated in the following way: “FAO and its partner organizations (United Nations (UN) sister agencies, government institutions, NGOs/CSOs and private sector stakeholders) have integrated food security, nutrition and livelihoods objectives and activities in regional, national and local policies and programmes”. As the project activities increasingly were conducted in collaboration with others and it was not possible to attribute the outcome to the project, the text was changed from “as a result of the project” to “with significant contribution from the project”.

ES18. With regard **indicator 1) regional initiatives**, the main achievement was the support to the CAADP nutrition mainstreaming process. USAID and NEPAD invited FAO to facilitate and provide technical advice to the CAADP workshops, and the project signed a LoA with NEPAD with a total amount of 110,000 US dollars. The LoA included as the main output follow-up to the West African workshop and organization of workshops in Central, Eastern Africa and Southern Africa. With regard to assessing the increased awareness and capacity developed through the three CAADP workshops with the contribution of the project, unfortunately information is not available. However, according to interviews carried out by both the project and the evaluation team there was no doubt that the project raised awareness of the nutrition-agriculture linkages. NEPAD also reported from NEPAD that without the financial support and the collaboration with the project, the Global Governance programme and RAF, NEPAD would not have been able to deliver in terms of mainstreaming nutrition into the CAADP process. The project furthermore supported the mobilization of ECOWAS institutions for a Hunger Free Initiative.

ES19. With regard to **indicator 2) national policies reflecting FSNL objectives and activities**, the target has been achieved almost threefold thanks to a significant contribution from the project. The target was 5 national policies; the project contributed in total to 13 national policies. This was mainly the result of the CAADP process.

ES20. In the case of **Indicator 3: projects integrating FSNL**, the target was not fully achieved. The target was 10 projects; the project supported approximately five projects integrating FSNL. The main reason for the non-achievement appeared to be the change of project approach in 2012-2013. During this period the project mainly focused on supporting the CAADP nutrition mainstreaming process and there was less focus on backstopping individual projects.

ES21. **Indicator 4 (global initiatives)**, which was added in 2012, did not have any targets and its accomplishment can therefore not be assessed. However, according to the progress reports, the project had contributed significantly to various global initiatives, e.g. REACH, SUN, and various initiatives in relation to agricultural investment including e.g. USAID Feeding the Future, and CAADP.

ES22. The project is partly aligned with “FAO’s Policy on Gender Equality: Attaining Food Security Goals in Agriculture and Rural Development” (2013). The project is coherent with the goal of FAO’s gender equality policy, but the project is not promoting all aspects of the Gender Equality Policy (the policy was prepared in the last year of the project). This being said, the project team to the highest possible extent aimed at mainstreaming gender into the project activities. Gender is moreover central to the Key Recommendations, for instance through emphasizing the importance of ensuring women’s access to productive resources and income opportunities. Regarding equal gender representation in trainings, workshops and capacity development, the challenge was to attract men rather than promoting female participation as nutrition for long has been largely dismissed as a woman’s issue. In the end a fairly even representation of men and women were achieved.

ES23. Partnerships are at the heart of FAO, and also at the heart of the project. Globally, the project contributed significantly to the REACH movement and ensured the integration of agriculture into the work of the movement. Regionally, the support to the CAADP mainstreaming nutrition process was absolutely critical as pointed out by representatives from AU and NEPAD. At country level, the project contributed to strengthening the partnership between FAO and REACH, in particular through the FAO Nutrition Focal Points. Through the support to the above-mentioned alliances, the project has significantly contributed to strengthening FAO’s partnership and alliances globally, regionally and in the member states with regard to the promotion of nutrition-sensitive agriculture.

ES24. Most of the project activities/outputs are hardly sustainable at this stage – a process has been started with regard to mainstreaming nutrition at global, regional and country levels, most notably the CAADP process; however the follow-up is pivotal. The approach of working through regional organizations (rather than working directly at country-level) contributes to the sustainability of the process. With regard to the achievements in relation to REACH, the project had a major impact and the introduction of agriculture into the work of REACH is probably sustainable, at least at secretariat level; however, the follow-up and implementation at country level is again critical. The work in relation to the preparation of the Key Recommendations; a co-owned statement based upon the consensus of development institutions involved in nutrition and agriculture, is absolutely significant in relation to the work of mainstreaming nutrition into agriculture, in particular at country level. However, again this is just the first step of a more unified and collaborative approach both at policy and programme levels; the next step is to actually implement this unified approach at country level.

ES25. The view of a need for a follow-up of the project activities is shared by the donor, who has agreed to fund a new project (“Mainstreaming Nutrition in CAADP and Agriculture Policies and Programmes in Sub-Saharan Africa”) based on the achievements of the current project. The donor is interested in funding a new phase of the project in particular due to the need for a continued support to the CAADP process. In line with the donor’s funding strategy, the project will be funded as it is considered innovative; at a later stage it is FAO’s responsibility to up-scale the project’s results and activities. As expressed by the donor, doing capacity development of FAO’s staff is not included within their role and objective. In

contrast to the current project, the FSNL expert will be located at regional level. The Logical Framework of the new project suffers from the same problems as the log frame of the current project.

ES26. The impact of the project, including the associated indicators, is not well-defined. Moreover, given that there is no indication of the targeted areas, the indicators are not very useful and the achievement of the expected impact is very difficult to assess. Moreover, there has been no reporting at impact level, which obviously makes it impossible to assess the achievement at impact level.

Conclusions

ES27. The unique institutional set-up (project staff located at HQ, but the project administered by RAF) worked effectively and contributed to a strong collaboration between HQ and RAF, with high level of achievement at both levels. The project had a very good grounding at the regional level; at the same time the project had easy access to and good understanding of the processes at HQ and RAF, e.g. formulation of the Nutrition Strategy and the new Strategic Framework. The added value appeared partly to be related to the strong level of technical expertise and commitment of the involved parties; and therefore the same institutional set-up might work less well for other projects.

ES28. The project was generally well-implemented and well-managed. In particular the approach applied by the project appeared to be highly successful and should be replicated in other projects. The following elements of the approach proved especially effective: 1) Combining work on the ground with targeting high-level politicians (combining technical and political work); 2) Adding value through supporting on-going policy and programming processes; 3) Working through existing coordination mechanisms; 4) Targeting the country level through regional organizations; and lastly 5) Seeking synergies with other FAO projects.

ES29. The project also applied a demand-driven and opportunistic approach; this approach worked well, in particular in terms of tapping into various processes at HQ level. The opportunistic approach however caused problems in relation to having a well-designed log frame with precise indicators; the log frame moreover suffered from not well-defined outputs/output indicators. Due to these two reasons the project only partly reported on the outputs of the project, which was indeed a missed opportunity. Despite the weaknesses in reporting, there is no doubt that the project has contributed significantly to various processes of mainstreaming nutrition into agriculture. e.g. the Key Recommendations, a co-shared statement by development institutions involved in nutrition and agriculture, constitute an important basis for concerted action in this field. At HQ, the project was instrumental in integrating nutrition-sensitive agriculture in both the Nutrition Strategy and the new Strategic Framework. At regional and country levels, the support to the CAADP process was critical and working through NEPAD was fundamental for commitment from the countries. The follow-up of the CAADP process is hugely challenging, and the continued support from the project is therefore critical.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: To FAO on project monitoring/reporting

The Project Task Force (PTF) should

- revise the project Logical Framework for the next phase to ensure a proper functioning as management and monitoring tool (indicators should be revised to be SMART and proper Means of Verifications should be included to ensure proper reporting on the indicators)
- develop and implement post-workshop/training questionnaires which also focus on new knowledge/ skills obtained as result of the workshop
- ensure that communication activities are properly reported; new indicators such as visits on website could also be included
- ensure that a system for reporting on country requests is established

Recommendation 2: To FAO on capacity development/sensitisation

The PTF should

- promote two types of capacity development, targeting different groups: 1) FAO nutrition officers and focal points; 2) FAO-Representatives, Assistant FAO-Representatives and Head of programmes. The latter type of capacity development/sensitization should aim at ensuring the support to nutrition-sensitive agriculture, in particular in countries with no nutrition focal points in place
- arrange a second workshop for FAO nutrition focal points in continuation of the workshop in Accra February 2012
- ensure that all FAO focal points are familiar with all information/advocacy materials, etc. produced (e.g. the Key Recommendations)

Recommendation 3: To FAO on coordination/collaboration at corporate level

The PTF should

- establish a mechanism for ensuring collaboration and sharing of activities/results within ESN (including also groups not involved in technical backstopping of the project); e.g. a Steering Committee with participation of group leaders. The project will be located at RAF in next phase, but the linking with ESN is still crucial.
- ESN should ensure the update of the ESN web-site; the web-site should moreover include link to the web-site of the project as well as a “space” for intra-division communication (invisible for external persons)

Recommendation 4: To FAO on coordination/collaboration with external partners

The PTF should

- promote collaboration between REACH/SUN and a broader segment of FAO (currently the collaboration is mainly between REACH facilitators and FAO nutrition focal points) in order to promote the participation of the Ministry of Agriculture in the work of mainstreaming nutrition

Recommendation 5: To FAO on replication of the project design/institutional set-up

FAO should

- ensure that the most effective elements of the project design are replicated in other Trust Fund projects and in the Regular Programme in coherence with the FAO operational work planning 2014-2015, e.g. 1) Combining work on the ground with targeting high-level politicians (combining technical and political work); 2) Adding value through supporting on-going policy and programming processes; 3) Working through existing coordination mechanisms; 4) Targeting the country level through regional organizations; and 5) Seeking synergies with other FAO projects.
- based on the experiences of the current project, test different institutional set-ups as part of the decentralization process in order to enhance the delivery mode of corporate results.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and purposes of the evaluation

1. This report presents the final evaluation of the project “Supporting Food Security Nutrition and Livelihoods in Sub-Saharan Africa” (GCP/RAF/454/GER).
2. The main purpose of the evaluated project was to add value to the ongoing work supported by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), governmental institutions or development partners in the field of agriculture and food security in order to maximise the nutritional impact of their interventions. The project started on the 1 June 2010 with a budget of 2.189.680 USD and was completed on the 31 December 2013 including a no-cost extension.
3. As stated in the Terms of Reference (ToR) in Annex 1, the purpose of this evaluation is to ensure the accountability to the donor and the project partners and to identify the lessons learned that can be considered in formulating and/or implementing similar projects and for FAO strategic planning (definition and implementation of the Strategic Objectives and the management of the decentralization process). This evaluation was implemented between October and December 2013.

1.2 Methodology of the evaluation

4. The evaluation of the above-mentioned project critically applied the five internationally accepted evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.
5. The methodology of the evaluation is evidence-based applying mixed methods approach and using different evaluation tools. The Evaluation Questions (EQ) of the ToR were explored using a triangulation of methods, mainly focusing on qualitative data collection tools as well as applying quantitative data collection tools, e.g. in relation to the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) case study. The set of methods has been selected in order to ensure a high level of data reliability and validity of the conclusions. The evaluation includes three types of data collection tools/methods as outlined below:
 - a. **Review of existing documentation.** The Evaluation Team conducted a documentation review including the project documentation (e.g. project proposal, progress reports, Back to Office reports, financial reports), documents/various outputs produced by the project (e.g. Key Recommendations, Fact Sheets), related corporate documents (e.g. Evaluation of FAO’s role and work in Nutrition, Strategy and Vision for FAO’s work in nutrition, Strategic Framework documents), and the documents related to the CAADP process (e.g. workshop reports).
 - b. **Interviews (semi-structured).** Interviews were conducted with project staff, staff of FAO HQ divisions (Nutrition (ESN), Agricultural Development Economics (ESA), Investment Centre (TCI), Emergency and Rehabilitation (TCE)), RAF, sub-regional offices and country offices (including FAO nutrition focal points), resource partner, representatives for regional

institutions (e.g. New Partnership for Africa's Development, NEPAD), former consultant preparing Nutrition Strategy/Key Recommendations, Renewed Efforts against Child Hunger (REACH) representatives, and government representatives (Ghana). The interviews took place during visits to HQ, Rome and RAF, Accra; moreover Skype and telephone interviews were conducted.

- c. **CAADP case study.** The project's support to the CAADP process of mainstreaming nutrition into agricultural plans constituted a major activity in the last two years of the project. It was therefore decided to prepare a case study of the CAADP process. The case study falls in two parts: the case study itself presenting the overall findings (section 5.2) and a detailed description of the background and the workshop processes (Annex 3).

The preparation of the case study was based on the interviews with the relevant stakeholders (e.g. the African Union, AU and NEPAD), the document review and the analysis conducted by the project intern, e.g. an analysis of a sample of 15 countries focussing on CAADP Country Paper and Action Plans. Lastly, as part of the CAADP case study, a list of participants (with position and institution) of the three CAADP workshops was prepared in order to analyse the participation in terms of political and technical representation.

6. As mentioned below, one of the main constraints of this evaluation was the lack of proper reporting at output level (most of the so called output indicators were actually activity indicators). In order to overcome this problem the assessment of the outputs' achievement did not only focus on the log frame indicators, but also included a broader discussion of results related to the outputs. A list of the five outputs achieved by the project is included in Annex 2 (as previously said this mainly gives an overview of the conducted activities).

1.3 Constraints

7. The execution of this evaluation was hampered by several constraints. Firstly, the evaluation was conducted without the participation of a regional consultant although this was originally planned and 15 days were allocated. The evaluation was thus carried out by the team leader with the support of an Evaluation Analyst of FAO Office of Evaluation, OED. Due to the revocation of the regional consultant's contract the evaluation team had to take over some of the duties originally assigned to the other consultant and had overall less time than originally planned.

8. Secondly, as mentioned in section 3.3, the output indicators included in the project's Logical Framework were not well developed as they represent activities rather than output indicators. Such weakness is also reflected in the progress reports, which give details on activities (e.g. number of persons trained, workshops conducted) rather than on the outputs. This obviously made the assessment of the output achievement very difficult. In order to overcome this problem an attempt was made to identify specific activities and results, which could prove (at least partly) the achievement of the outputs.

9. Thirdly, the problem of attribution hampered the analysis of the achievement of project outputs and outcome. As the activities of the project to a large extent – and increasingly throughout the project period – were conducted in collaboration with other partners, including for instance the Global Governance for Hunger Reduction Programme (GCP/INT/130/EC), it became problematic to fully attribute the achievements to the project

itself. The project hence changed the formulation of the outcome indicators from the previous formulation “as a result of the project” to “due to a significant contribution of the project”. This was a right decision and in line with the general development within the evaluation methodology, which progressively refers to contribution analysis due to a growing understanding that many factors are contributing to the outcomes.

10. Fourthly, some informants were not available for the interviews, e.g. representatives from the Scaling-up Nutrition Network (SUN) and the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), and a few FAO staff members from other divisions.

2 Context of the project/programme

11. Sub-Saharan Africa is the region with the highest rates of chronic malnutrition in the world: at the time of the launch of the project 43 percent of children under five had low height-for-age and suffered from associated diseases and impairment of physical and mental growth. From 90 million in 1970 the number of undernourished people (of all ages) increased to 225 million in 2008. Projections estimated that this number would reach 325 million by 2015, even before the food price crisis occurred. While malnutrition rates have tended to decrease in Eastern Africa, rates have increased or stagnated in West Africa and South-eastern Africa.

12. The project was prepared within the context of increasing food prices and the economic crisis in 2008, which further exacerbated the situation presented above. The poorest households were worst affected by the crisis in all countries. The response to the crisis primarily focused on increasing availability of staple foods (essentially rice and maize), and there also were increasing concerns that the impact on nutrition was not adequately addressed.

13. It is well recognised that malnutrition requires integrated programming combining food, health and care. Nevertheless, nutrition initiatives within crisis situations are usually focused on quick-impact life-saving public health interventions while food security projects aim at rapidly increase the availability of staple food.

14. As a consequence nutrition was likely to “fall through the cracks” of the current response to the crisis and no sustainable action to protect and improve the nutrition condition of affected populations was expected to be provided. There was then a urgent need to address the various facets of the crisis through integrated, multi-sectorial and people-centred programming, combining short term response with sustainable approaches within the present programmes and projects.

15. The project here evaluated aimed at incorporating food security, nutrition and livelihoods in the ongoing initiatives carried in Sub-Saharan African countries, prioritising the most affected countries by both the food price and the financial and economic crises. The project was in fact designed to add value to current programmes and projects, to improve coordination between the sectors of food, agriculture and health; to better articulate short- and long-term interventions, and to address the insufficient capitalisation, dissemination and use of lessons learned from past and current experiences at political level.

16. The project originated from the experience of another German-funded project in Afghanistan. Such experience proved that food security initiatives could benefit from a further attention to nutrition and livelihoods, with specific interest into diet diversity, consumer information and livelihood support in order to ensure people's right to food. The resource partner, the Federal Ministry of Food Agriculture and Consumer Protection of Germany, appreciated the approach applied in Afghanistan and more specifically its participatory approach (which also included training staff, creating awareness, and community nutrition interventions) combined with the provision of policy advice, and then agreed to fund the current project.

17. The donor generally funds innovative projects; e.g. projects, which are testing new tools or approaches. Moreover the donor only provides ear-marked funding; i.e. it does not provide funding to the regular programme of multi-lateral organizations. The funding strategy is to support the testing of new approaches; the up-scaling is then the responsibility of the organization. The donor, who has relatively limited funds (8.3 EURO in 2013), is also funding other Trust Fund FAO projects, e.g. the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and Sierra Leone projects mentioned later.

3 Analysis of project concept and design

3.1 Project relevance

18. The project is considered highly relevant to the needs of the population in Sub-Saharan Africa. As noted above there has previously been a tendency for both long-term and emergency food security responses to focus on either staple food production and export production or quick and life-saving health interventions. In both cases the nutrition requirements (e.g. diet diversity) are not adequately addressed, leading to malnutrition of the targeted population. By advocating for and supporting mainstreaming nutrition into agriculture, the project therefore served a very important purpose.

19. As further detailed below, the project to a great extent supported existing and on-going initiatives and structures, most notably NEPAD and the CAADP, REACH and SUN. The project is highly relevant in relation to all these initiatives. The support to the CAADP process through the Letter of Agreement (LoA) with NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency (NPCA) aims at strengthening the mainstreaming of nutrition into Agricultural Investment Plans thereby counteracting the problems of a narrow-minded focus on staple food and export production. With regard to REACH, the project's focus on mainstreaming nutrition into agriculture is highly relevant. REACH initially mainly promoted and interpreted nutrition as a health issue; by enhancing FAO's capacity to support REACH at global and country level, the project contributed to strengthening the multi-sectorial approach of REACH. It is important to highlight the fact that the project proved to be very timely. The project was implemented at a time with a global momentum with regard to nutrition, and also to some extent increased focus on nutrition-sensitive agriculture. Politicians were to a larger extent than previously responsive to advocacy promoting nutrition-sensitive agriculture and the project could tap into this new development, for instance through supporting the CAADP mainstreaming nutrition process.

20. At corporate level, the project likewise demonstrated a high level of relevance and timeliness. The project was implemented parallel/shortly after the Evaluation of FAO's Role

and Work in Nutrition and the subsequent formulation of the Nutrition Strategy as well as the formulation of the new Strategic Framework 2014-2018. As outlined in the Nutrition Evaluation report, nutrition for long suffered from the “silo” effect within the organization and was treated as a distinct issue, only analysed in terms of “undernourishment” and not mainstreamed and integrated into the Strategic Objectives (FAO 2011: 12-13). Within FAO, the project could similarly tap into the process of renewed focus on nutrition. The promotion of mainstreaming nutrition into agriculture was well-received within the organization, which might not have been case just a couple of years earlier. The project to a large extent became instrumental in mainstreaming nutrition at corporate level as discussed later.

3.2 Project design

21. The project theory of change and the causal pathways were relatively well-planned and well-articulated, particularly at the higher levels (impact and outcome). Thus, it is likely that integration of food security, nutrition, and livelihoods in regional, national and local policies/programmes can lead to improved food security, nutrition, livelihoods as well as resilience vulnerable communities and households. The weakness of the theory of change was the lack of indication of targeted areas/groups (outcome and impact level), which means that in principle the project was targeting the entire Sub-Saharan Africa, which of course was not feasible. The project included five outputs. The outputs were relatively well-formulated and expected to lead to the planned outcome with the exception of output 3 (capacity building) which was formulated as an activity rather than an output.

22. The project duration, three years, seems reasonable as duration of a first phase of a project. Promotion of nutrition-sensitive agriculture and the related activities (sensitization and capacity development) is, however, a long-term process, and the follow up of the project is therefore critical. On the other hand, designing a first phase of a project with a longer duration would not have been feasible as the project to a large extent was testing a new approach and the lessons learnt should be identified before the project is continued. The project budget seemed reasonable to implement the proposed activities. The project applied a unique approach, which appeared to be one of the reasons behind the success of the project. The approach, which was partly based on the project in Afghanistan (as mentioned under 2) comprised several elements, some of which are inter-related, as mentioned below.

23. **Linking nutrition and agriculture** by promoting nutrition-sensitive agriculture and applying a multi-sectorial approach. According to many informants, one of the strength of the approach applied by the project was the ability of the project team (in particular the FSNL expert) to bridge nutrition and agriculture, for instance by simplifying issues concerning nutrition when addressing agriculturalists.

24. Operating simultaneously at global, regional and national levels in order to maximize the influence on processes at each of these levels. The project was perceived by many informants as being a catalyst in bringing together these three levels.

25. Combining work on the ground with the advocacy at high-level, mainly targeting high level politicians. The fact that the project also addressed the policy level – inviting/requesting high-level politicians to participate in for instance the CADDP workshops - was recognized by many informants as the most innovative part of the project (and the main reason for its success). Previously, nutrition projects mainly focused at operation at community level.

26. Targeting the country level through regional organizations (NEPAD; ECOWAS, etc.). This approach was also applied by the earlier mentioned Global Governance for Hunger Reduction Programme, for instance through the joint support to the CAADP mainstreaming nutrition process.

27. **Adding value through supporting on-going policy and programming processes** such as the CAADP and Home Grown School Feeding. “Supporting” is thus a key term of the project approach.

28. **Applying a demand-driven and opportunistic approach**, responding to requests from e.g. countries in the targeted area, Sub-Saharan Africa. The project pursued an “opportunistic strategy” – responding to and seizing opportunities, e.g. in emergency contexts. Due to the very flexible approach, the project was not always restricting itself to working within Sub-Saharan Africa – support was also provided to global initiatives such as SUN and REACH, and Afghanistan.

29. Working through existing coordination mechanisms. This refers in particular to multi-sectorial and inter-agency collaboration initiatives such as the SUN and REACH partnerships, and regional working groups on nutrition and food security.

30. Seeking synergies with other FAO projects and development partners, and maximizing opportunities for co-funding in order to obtain additional resources to achieve the project objectives and increase ownership of nutrition issues within FAO and amongst partners.

31. Project invisibility – staff visibility. Project visibility was not an objective by itself (for the project staff). The focus was generally on promoting the “issue” rather than the project; moreover, the project staff considered it difficult to collaborate with other partners when pursuing a very strong project identity. The project approach was made possible due to the very flexible attitude of the donor, focusing on the issue and achievements. On the other hand, as also reported by the donor, there is a need to show how the tax payers’ money is being used and some level of project visibility should be achieved. In principle all documents related to the project should include the logo of the donor and a reference to the donor should be made in the foreword. However, this was not the case for most documents reviewed, e.g. the Key Recommendations. The project was very much associated with the Food Security, Nutrition and Livelihood (FSNL) expert, and partly because of the lack of the project’s visibility it is difficult to distinguish the success and contribution of the project from the personal contribution of the FSNL expert, who was described as possessing the necessary skill-set for this type of project: “strategic thinker”; “good in finding opportunities”, “systematic approach”, “having the overview”, “ability to coordinate and collaborate across all levels – bringing people together”. Other words mentioned about the FSNL expert: “trustworthy”, “knowledge broker”, “good at communicating with people in the field/agriculturalists”.

3.3 Logical Framework

32. The Logical Framework overall had a relatively good intervention logic; however, the outcome and impact levels suffered from the lack of indication of targeted areas, as said earlier. This was probably related to the project’s flexible approach, which made it very difficult to indicate the targeted areas beforehand. Moreover, the impact indicators were not well-defined (not specific): “prevalence of chronic and acute under-nutrition”, “improved

family food consumption (dietary diversity and feeding practices); “households’ livelihoods are diversified and income is increased”. The Means of Verification (MoV) at impact level were likewise not specific; this is obviously related to the fact that the countries were not selected beforehand and the sources of information available could not be identified.

33. The outcome was relatively well-defined; this is also the case with the associated indicators. The five outputs were relatively well-formulated with the exception of output 3 (capacity building) which was formulated as an activity rather than an output. The associated indicators (of all outputs) were for the main part formulated as activity rather than output indicators (as discussed under 3.3.). The lack of output indicators hampered the assessment of output achievement of outputs. The outputs and associated indicators are further discussed in section 5.

34. During the project implementation, indicators were revised or cancelled or new indicators were included; this obviously contributed to the challenge of assessing the output achievement. In addition, some of the new indicators did not include targets. The revision of indicators reflected the challenge of applying a demand-driven and opportunistic approach at the same time as formulating very precise indicators in the project preparation phase.

35. The Assumptions and Risks were relatively well-formulated and relevant, and were generally holding true. The only exception was the Assumptions and Risks in relation to output 1: Advocacy: “political situation in country is sufficiently stable to allow continuity in advocacy efforts”, this might not hold true for countries like Mali, North and South Sudan. This was a quite ambitious assumption given that the project in principle was targeting the whole of Sub-Saharan Africa due to the lack of indication of targeted countries.

36. The project proposal included a Stakeholder Analysis, mapping relevant country-level initiatives and projects (including for example a list of countries with relevant ongoing or planned projects), relevant regional initiatives (regional coordination and planning mechanisms), and to some extent global initiatives. The proposal moreover identified the direct beneficiaries and partner institutions as well as the country selection criteria. The country selection criteria were, however, quite broad and fitting a high number of countries. At the time of the project formulation, the project also planned to focus on EU Food Facility projects; though this type of projects were in the process of being phased out when the project was launched and were therefore never included in the project. In sum, the project proposal did not provide much indication of the countries to be targeted, which is also in line with the demand- oriented and opportunistic project approach.

4 Analysis of the implementation process

4.1 Project/programme Management

37. The project was generally well-implemented. As mentioned above, the project applied a very flexible and “opportunistic” approach; this led to frequent update of the work plans and several budget revisions as discussed below. Thanks to the frequent updates in work plans and to the budget revisions, the majority of the activities were delivered as planned. This was made possible also thanks to the flexible approach of the donor. However, some activities were delayed or could not be completed. For example, the brochure for country representatives and guidance for integrating nutrition into the Country Programming

Frameworks has never been produced; according to the progress report (January-June 2013), this was not achieved as it required input from colleagues, who were fully occupied with the strategic planning process. Moreover, the NEPAD workshops process was delayed due to lack of funding. The workshop for Central and Eastern Africa, which was originally planned for November 2012, was postponed to February 2013; this also caused the delay of the Southern Africa workshop. The problem was resolved due to a grant from the Gates foundation, facilitated by the project among others. Another issue arose: due to the need to respond from requests (e.g. from country level¹) while at the same time seizing opportunities, there was an increased pressure on the project team. Hence with numerous management and institutional responsibilities, the project team found it difficult to focus on production of documents or to follow-through specific processes. As a solution, consultants were contracted for specific assignments, mainly production of documents such as the Guiding Principles and the Key Recommendations, the REACH Nutrition Action Guides, and to manage the preparation of the CAADP at country level (for further information on the specific assignments please consult Annex 6).

38. Project monitoring was thorough and systematic; nevertheless, the monitoring at output level suffered from the lack of well-prepared indicators. Progress reports were prepared on a bi-annual basis. The progress reports followed the FAO standards and were generally well-prepared, reporting at outcome, output and activity level. However, unfortunately, most of the indicators at output level were activity rather than output indicators. In consequence, even though the reports were thoroughly prepared, they were only partly reporting on output achievements and only partly providing the right information. The progress reports included work plans and descriptions of the expected outputs for the new reporting period as well as a list of reports and documents prepared under the period being reported. The work plans focusing on activities under each of the five outputs were generally well-prepared, realistic and gave a good overview of the planned activities. The actions taken to resolve the problems reported in the progress reports generally seemed reasonable, e.g. the funding constraints in relation to the NEPAD workshops. In this case the project team assisted NEPAD in applying for funds.

39. With regard to the communication component, this appears to be only partly included/ reflected in the monitoring system. Three types of communication activities exist: 1) Knowledge management (identifying gaps); 2) Advocacy and awareness raising (internal and external sensitization); and 3) Capacity development/support in using communication (tools) in promotion of nutrition at country or sub-regional level. With regard to activity 3) capacity development, no system for reporting on requests for communication support received from countries and sub-regions is in place, either at corporate level or in the project. This renders it impossible to get an idea of the scale of the communication support offered by the project. The absence of a reporting system is a missed opportunity to present evidence on support provided to country/sub-regional offices. The same lack of a corporate system for reporting on country requests was mentioned in the Nutrition Evaluation. (FAO 2011: 27).

¹ Technical assistance was according to the project team requested by e.g. FAO Burkina Faso, FAO Rwanda and FAO Tanzania. Yet, reporting of country requests does not take place; this makes it impossible to distinguish between country-level support taking place as result of a request (demand-driven) and country-level support, which takes place at the initiative of the project (seizing opportunities)

4.2 Staff management

40. The project had a very unique institution set-up: the project staff was located at HQ whereas the project was administered by RAF. The following discussion of staff management focuses on the project staff at HQ; management issues related to the particular institutional set-up is discussed under 4.5.

41. The project team located at HQ is very small consisting of one FSNL expert and one communication officer. The project team however received support and collaborated closely with a number of other staff members mainly within the division, ESN. The division group leader, head of the interagency collaboration group (under which the project belongs) provided technical backstopping to the project team and strongly influenced the project until her retirement in March 2013. In particular, the group leader was involved in designing the overall project approach. As earlier mentioned the project was inspired by an Afghanistan project's design, which was to a large extent based on the group leader's experience. During the implementation, the group leader was playing a daily mentoring and guidance role. The group leader to a large extent also functioned as a "door opener" both outside and inside FAO, introducing the project to the key partners, and moreover ensured that the project was fully embedded in the SUN and REACH process. From mid-2012, the involvement was less intense as most of the networks, etc. had been handed over. The project team also benefitted from the presence of an Associate Professional Officer (APO), employed in ESN since November 2011. The APO was not directly involved in the project, yet her work did indirectly contribute, for example the liaising (together with the group leader) with the Standing Committee on Nutrition (SCN), SUN and REACH ensured that the project activities were known within these partnerships. The project gained from the APO's work on several products; e.g. the mapping of nutrition officers. The APO's work on the two papers, Gender and Nutrition and Social Protection and Nutrition, influenced the thinking of the project as well as the content of the related trainings and conference presentations. At inter-division level, the project team has a very close collaboration with the nutrition mainstreaming focal point of the earlier mentioned Global Governance for Hunger Reduction, in particular regarding the CAADP mainstreaming nutrition process. As earlier mentioned the project contracted a number of consultants because of the high pressure on the project team and due to the need for production of documents and support to specific processes, e.g. in relation to the CAADP process (see Annex 6 for a list of the specific assignments).

42. Regarding the collaboration between the project team and the donor, the Federal Ministry of Food Agriculture and Consumer Protection, Germany, both sides described the collaboration as close, very good and constructive. The project team updated the donor on a frequent basis; and meetings were held on a bi-annual basis. The donor representative related that the donor has a high level of trust in the project staff (in particular the FSNL expert); a trust which has never been dishonoured. It is the view of the donor that FAO's role in nutrition-sensitive agriculture should be strengthened and the project under evaluation is seen as being highly instrumental in this process.

43. The project will be followed by a new project: "Mainstreaming Nutrition in CAADP and Agriculture Policies and Programmes in Sub-Saharan Africa" funded by the same donor and managed by RAF. The project is based on the achievements of the current project and will be continuing many of its activities, e.g. the support to the CAADP mainstreaming nutrition process. An exit strategy for the project has not been prepared; however, the project has assured various types of follow up activities to be initiated by the project as mentioned below:

- Two projects are underway, which are supporting follow up in West Africa: the “West Africa Hunger Free Initiative” and the project “Supporting Mainstreaming Nutrition and the Right to Food in the Small Holder Commercialisation Programme in Sierra Leone”; both projects are funded by the same donor as the project under evaluation.
- Follow-up at regional level and in selected countries is also supported by the European Union (EU)/FAO Programme on Global Governance for Hunger Reduction (Uganda, South Sudan, Niger, Ethiopia), through a UN Joint Programmes (e.g. Rwanda, Ethiopia) and through EC-funded programmes (e.g. in Mozambique).
- NEPAD and FAO submitted a Letter of Intent to the Gates Foundation to support the follow-up at regional level and in several countries, in response to a call for Letter of Interest on agriculture-nutrition linkages in sub-Saharan Africa – a response is expected soon.
- A new project: “Capacity Development on Food Security and Nutrition Programming”, funded by the European Union Humanitarian Office (ECHO) is supporting regional trainings using the Joint Planning Guidelines developed through the project.

44. The new German-funded project called “Mainstreaming Nutrition in CAADP and Agriculture Policies and Programme in Sub-Saharan Africa” aims at ensuring that the above-mentioned follow-up activities are implemented in a coherent and strategic manner. This project furthermore aims at ensuring continued support to NEPAD and the Regional Economic Communities (RECs), mainstreaming nutrition in policies, as well as a more in-depth technical support on nutrition education and nutrition in information systems.

45. At global level several activities that were supported by the current project (e.g. promotion of Key Recommendations, support to SUN) have been incorporated in FAO’s Operational and Work Plan for 2014-2015 involving ESN and other divisions (e.g. TCI, ESA, TCE).

4.3 Financial resources management

46. The budget allocation appeared to be sufficient for the planned activities; however, due to the very flexible and demand-oriented approach of the project, there was a need for frequent (annual) budget revisions. Project revisions took place three times in total in order to facilitate the implementation of the work plan. In addition, a no-cost extension (extending to December 31, 2013) was requested (and granted). The no-cost extension shifted funds from other budget lines to salaries in order to fund the two project staff for the extended project period.

47. All budget revisions seem justified. The third budget revision (24/5-2012) in particular involved a relatively extensive revision and was primarily related to the project’s involvement in the CAADP mainstreaming nutrition process. Based on the secondment of the project staff, totally 253,514 dollars was saved on professional salaries². The savings on the professional salaries were re-invested in the budget lines for consultants (113,627 dollars),

² The savings on professional salaries were possible due to the secondment of the FSNL expert to the following assignments: 2 missions to Afghanistan on GCP/AFG/069/GER and GCP/AFG/075/GER; Rwanda backstopping mission in November 2010; Cape Verde (inception mission) in April 2011; and the Chad Emergency project formulation in July 2011. In addition, the ESN regular programme reimbursed a part of the time of the FSNL expert and communication officer given their support to normal HQ functions (i.e. communication, and support to nutrition mainstreaming and strategic planning).

contracts (185,341 dollars), and travel (10,159 dollars). Due to the growing demand for technical assistance at sub-regional and country level, in particular as a result of the first CAADP workshop in West Africa, a need for consultancies evolved as earlier mentioned. Furthermore, there was a need for preparing the training materials and the guidelines to disseminate technical advice (to be prepared by consultants).

48. With regard to contracts, NEPAD formally requested the project to support the planned CAADP workshops as well as other activities, and a Letter of Agreement (LoA) was signed with NEPAD (Budget Revision, 24/25/4-2012). The LoA amounted to 110,000 USD and covered the period July 2012 to November 2012 (including a no-cost extension). The LoA included the delivery of four outputs, the main one being the follow-up to the West African workshop and the organization of three workshops in Central Africa, Eastern Africa and Southern Africa. Due to funding problems, some delay in the implementation of the workshops occurred and the workshops for Eastern and Central Africa were merged. Under the LoA a consultant was employed to assist in the implementation of the LoA. The consultant functioned as assistant to the CAADP Advisor for Food and Nutrition Security. The consultant was employed during the entire period of the LoA and is now funded by the Gates foundation (until January 2014). When this contract ends, the above-mentioned CAADP Advisor for Food and Nutrition Security will be the only person with the task of mainstreaming nutrition into CAADP within NEPAD. Originally an administrative officer was also planned; the funds were later moved to another budget line (travel).

49. The request for a no-cost extension was justified by the attention around SUN and the preparation for the International Conference on Nutrition 2 (ICN2) planned for 2014, in particular the ICN meeting held in November 2013 (the project is involved in both). The need for a no-cost extension was also related to delays in the implementation of the CAADP mainstreaming workshops and the need for follow-up. The no-cost extension was possible due to savings on the salaries (both project started the assignment as consultants); moreover several activities in the project were cost-shared with other FAO projects and thus there were savings on salaries and travel.

50. Overall, the delivery in relation to the work plans was relatively good and the need for a budget revision was not related to delay in delivery apart from the delay in the implementation of CAADP workshops, which was beyond the control of the project. The need for budget revision was rather the result of the very flexible and demand-oriented approach of the project.

51. The financial management of the programme appears to have been done relatively effectively despite the unique institutional set-up of the project. There appeared to be a very good (virtual) communication between the financial teams (RAF and HQ) and the project staff located at HQ; this was partly due to the “openness” of the project staff at HQ according to the financial management team at RAF. The Funding Liaison officer at HQ communicated directly with the donor - in collaboration with the FSNL expert and the Senior Nutrition Officer, RAF. In sum, no particular problems appeared to have been encountered in administering the project notwithstanding its unique set-up.

52. The administration percentage of the project is 13% of which RAF receives 50% in Administrative and Operative Support (AOS) upon delivery. The remaining 50% goes to the HQ.

53. At the time of the evaluation, the Final Financial report (as well as the Narrative Terminal report) had not been finalized and could therefore not be analysed.

4.4 Institutional Set-up

54. The project under evaluation had a very unique institutional set-up: it was classified and managed as a regional project; yet, the project staff was located at HQ. Several factors appear to have contributed to this particular institutional set-up:

55. Firstly, at the time of the launch of the project, it was assessed that RAF had the management capacity to administer the project; however, it was equally judged that the technical capacity was not in place. An agreement was reached with ESN (previously AGN) that the division should provide technical back-stopping to the project (through the group leader). From the time of the employment of the Senior Nutrition Officer at RAF (June 2011), technical back-stopping was also provided from RAF – and a close collaboration between the regional Senior Nutrition Officer and the project staff started.

56. Secondly, the positioning of the FSNL expert at HQ rather than regional level was regarded necessary in order to mainstream nutrition at corporate level. Also from the regional perspective (RAF) the location of the project staff at HQ was considered essential in order to partner with global actors and promote nutrition at corporate level. There is now a common understanding that the time has come for the project staff to be located at regional level. In the new project (“Mainstreaming Nutrition in CAADP and Agriculture Policies and Programmes in Sub-Saharan Africa”) the project staff will be positioned at regional level. The project proposal of the next project was thus developed in close collaboration with the regional Senior Nutrition Officer.

57. Thirdly, the donor favoured funding a project implemented at regional level rather than at HQ.

58. Within RAF, the project was administered as part of the project portfolio by the Senior Project Officer. The project funded an Operative Assistant at RAF during the period November 2011-February 2013. The work of the Assistant consisted e.g. of support with regard to recruitment of consultants; this task has then been taken care of by the same person in her position as Technical Cooperative Programme Assistant (not funded by the project). The change does not seem to have caused problems with regard to operative assistance.

59. The project portfolio at regional level (administered by the Senior Nutrition Officer) includes, apart from the project under evaluation, five other projects/partnership and the Regular Nutrition Programme activities. The project was administered as part of the regional project portfolio and thus also benefitted from the contribution of RAF; it is e.g. estimated that the Senior Nutrition Officer devoted approximately 15-20 % of his time to the project; moreover, occasionally travel expenses were covered by RAF.

60. The unique institutional set-up was reported by all involved parties to have functioned very well. The informants highlighted an exceptionally good and constructive collaboration between project staff and RAF; furthermore it was recounted that the special set-up had not caused problems in administering the project. Several traits of the mode of collaboration between the project team at HQ and RAF appeared to have contributed to its success:

61. **Good and well-defined division of labour/task:** The division of labour was clearly defined; for instance the FSNL expert would prepare the progress reports and the regional Senior Nutrition Officer would do the technical clearance. The technical clearance was previously done by the group leader at ESN. When the group leader retired in February 2013, the regional Senior Nutrition Officer took over the role as technical advisor.

62. **Flexibility:** The involved parties reported a high level of flexibility to be one of the contributing factors to the good collaboration (flexibility was also one of the main characteristic of the project approach).

63. **Transparency and consensus:** The collaboration between the project team and the RAF staff was described as being very transparent. All decisions regarding the project were taken in consensus by the FSNL expert, the RAF Senior Nutrition Officer and previously the group leader.

64. **Regular contact (Skype):** Despite the distance, the involved parties had very regular contact primarily through Skype and in relation to the many activities carried out. The regular contact was mentioned as one of the contributing factors to the success of the collaboration between the involved partners (referred to as a virtual team).

4.5 Coordination

65. At HQ the project was located in the ESN division. The ESN is generally a fragmented division with very small teams, which tend to work as separate entities. Collaboration within ESN is thus not conducive, and the level of intra-division collaboration and coordination is generally low as also mentioned in the Nutrition Evaluation report (FAO 2011: 101). One of the contributing factors to the limited collaboration at intra-division level is presumably the lack of management (Ibid). A new Director started in October 2013. One of her primary objectives is to promote and foster intra-division collaboration and bring the division to work as an entity.

66. Collaboration between the project and other ESN groups took place to a certain extent. For instance, the project team worked closely with the Nutrition Education Group in strengthening FAO's collaboration with the World Food Programme (WFP) and the Partnership for Child Development on Home Grown Schools Feeding, building on the experience of the United Nations Joint Programme (UNJP) on School Nutrition in Cape Verde. The FSNL expert had been hired as a consultant to support the project formulation during the pre-project period (January 2010) and continued to provide technical backstopping to the project.

67. The work done under the project was partly shared within the division; the Key Recommendations and Fact Sheets produced under the project were for instance regarded very useful by other groups in ESN. The project team also sought contributions from the division when preparing the agendas for the CAADP workshops, and involved other units in the preparation of the Letter of Intent for the Gates Foundation on agriculture-nutrition linkages and the design of the German-funded follow-up project on Mainstreaming Nutrition in CAADP. Nevertheless, it was indicated by part of ESN staff that the work in relation to CAADP was not adequately shared with other ESN teams. In relation to intra-division collaboration, it should be mentioned that the absence of a director and thus of regular meetings for sharing ideas and information on teams' respective areas of work affected

communication within ESN in general. Furthermore, the ESN web-site is not updated and does not have a link to the project's web-site; this would obviously have made dissemination of outputs within the division easier. The project communication officer offered to manage the division web-site; however, the offer was turned down.

68. One team within ESN raised dissatisfaction with the project, e.g. with regard to not being informed/involved in the project preparation (a feeling of being side-lined) and activities under the project (e.g. the preparation of the Key Recommendations)³, and duplication of work (e.g. in relation to the CAADP Country Profiles and the ICN 2 Country papers)⁴. The team raised the issue with the senior management, but no action was taken⁵. The conflict appeared partly to be a result of the general understaffing and underfunding of the division and the contrast with the project having sufficient funds for travelling, and a clash between different cultures, the Regular Programme and the project approach.

69. With regard to communication, the project communication officer seemed to have filled a gap within the division by occasionally assisting other groups with communication activities (the ESN does not have a communication officer). The communication officer for instance assisted other groups with regard to “packaging” nutrition in a comprehensible way, supporting the dissemination of ESN materials through various media and key events (e.g. the World Food Day and the Committee of Food Security (CFS) week), and facilitating linkages with FAO corporate communication procedures (e.g. representing ESN on the ES Department communication team). Making nutrition, in general, and agriculture-nutrition linkages, in particular, understandable for a broader audience is particularly important in a context where nutrition is receiving considerable political attention and becoming a multi-sectorial issue rather than just a health issue.

70. In sum, the perceived added value of the project within ESN has been relatively limited, apart from the communication aspects and the sharing of some outputs, e.g. the Key Recommendation. This appears to a large extent to be the result of intra-division problems. In the words of the Nutrition Evaluation: “there is a distinct lack of understanding, cooperation and collaboration between the Nutrition and Consumer Protection Division (AGN) groups responsible for nutrition resulting in work being undertaken in a piece meal manner disconnected from other relevant activities”⁶ (2011, p.101).

71. In contrast to the intra-division collaboration, the added value of the project to inter-division collaboration was reported to be high. As discussed in the section about output achievement, the project collaborated with and contributed to a number of other FAO

³ According to the information from the project team, significant efforts were made to ensure participation of all ESN groups in the preparation of the Key Recommendations (Synthesis): a divisional meeting was called at the beginning of the literature review. All groups provided lists of references over several rounds of consultations. Two versions of the draft synthesis were circulated to ESN for comments and another consultant based in HQ went door to door to seek inputs from ESN colleagues given the low feedback rate through email. Similarly, various versions of the Key Recommendations were circulated by the Principal Officer for Nutrition for comments, but comments were mostly received from other divisions.

⁴ The project team reported that CAADP Country Profiles served as references and basis for the elaboration of the Nutrition Country Papers for the International Conference on Nutrition 2 (ICN2) in November 2014. Several meetings were held in 2011 and 2012 between the project team and this unit to harmonize the templates to ensure one paper could be developed to meet the two purposes; the template used for the CAADP was based on the template prepared for the ICN2. RAF staff agreed that the two processes feed one other in synergy and complementarity. It was narrated that in several countries the drafted ICN2 Nutrition Country Papers were used as a basis for CAADP Country profiles and vice versa.

⁵ According to the project team, the management team responded that the team was contributing considerably to intra-division communication.

⁶ AGN has later been re-named ESN.

projects, and also collaborated extensively with ESA, in particular on the Global Governance for Hunger Reduction Programme (primarily in relation to the CAADP process) as well as TCI and TCE with regard to investment and emergency projects respectively. The support to and collaboration with other FAO projects constituted one of the important elements of the project approach as discussed under 3.2. As we shall see below (section 5), the project contributed significantly to the mainstreaming of nutrition at corporate level.

5 Analysis of results and contribution to stated objectives

5.1 Achievements at Outputs level

72. As previously mentioned the assessment of the achievement of outputs is constrained by the fact that the output indicators of the log frame are not well-formulated and in most cases are activity/meta-activity indicators rather than output indicators. In consequence the progress reports are reporting on activities rather than outputs. It will therefore not be possible to fully assess the output achievements. In order to enable a partial assessment of the output achievement, for each output the main results, which best illustrate the potential achievement of the output have been selected. In addition, an assessment of the reporting according to the progress reports has been included.

5.1.1 Output 1: Advocacy

73. Output 1 is formulated in the following way: “FAO staff, and other relevant policy-makers and programme planners at regional, national and local levels, are committed to integrating nutrition, food security and livelihoods objectives and activities in relevant policies and programmes”. The targets of the six indicators have been reached – or rather the targets have been overachieved, as seen from Table 1 below. Some indicators have no targets (5 and 6)⁷. A detailed list of the activities/outputs can be found in Annex 2.

Table 1. Output 1: Advocacy

| Nr. | Indicator | Target | Achieved |
|------------|--|---------------|----------------------|
| 1 | Number of sensitization sessions in workshops supported/organized by project | 12 | 32 |
| 2 | Number of international/regional conferences attended/presentation made | 3 | 24 |
| 3 | Number of FAO staff, programme planners and policy makers sensitized | 50 | 1559 ⁸ |
| 4 | Number of FAO staff, programme planners and policy-makers demonstrating commitment | 20 | Min. 56 |
| 5 | Number of advocacy materials that the project has developed/contributed to (new) | No target | 25 |
| 6 | Communication support to international/regional events (new) | No target | No info ⁹ |

⁷ The outline of indicators, targets and achievements are based on the progress reports (the various documents present the indicators in different order).

⁸ Global level: 797; regional level 383; and country level: 379

⁹ This output was not properly reported; yet, communication support was provided e.g. in relation to the following events: the West Africa workshop in 2011; the three CAADP workshops (website established for all these

74. With regard to assessing the achievement of the output, the critical issue is whether targeted (persons) are “committed” to integrate nutrition. Yet, the indicators focus on number of persons trained/sensitized; sensitization sessions; conferences attended (and presentations); advocacy materials produced/contributed to; and communication support (not measurable). These are all activities, which might lead to commitment of the targeted persons; however, they are not evidence that commitment has been achieved. Moreover, “commitment” is not a well-defined output as it is difficult to evaluate and measure.

75. In general, and based on the indicators, it is thus not possible to assess whether the output has been achieved. Other activities might, however, give an indication of whether a higher level of “commitment” has been achieved as discussed below.

76. The process of the formulation of the corporate Nutrition Strategy indicated a higher level of commitment at corporate level. The initiation of the preparation of the strategy was a result of the Nutrition Evaluation, which highly recommended the formulation of a corporate strategy for FAO’s contribution to nutrition-sensitive agricultural development (2011: 19). The process of formulation of the strategy was highly participatory and involved a high number of people (an Internal Task Team (ITT), of 50 persons); this is by itself a sign of a higher level of organizational commitment.

77. According to several informants (including staff from ESN), the project team contributed significantly to the formulation of the corporate Nutrition Strategy. The FSNL expert was referred to as one of the “key thinkers” behind the strategy as well as being “instrumental” in elaborating the strategy, e.g. with regard to structuring the workshops and activity plans of the extensive corporate process. Even if this was mainly a sign of the commitment of the FSNL expert, the process of the formulation of the strategy with participation of a high number of people indicated a corporate commitment towards mainstreaming nutrition into agriculture. This higher level of commitment cannot be attributed solely to the project; however, there is no doubt that the project contributed significantly to increasing the commitment. Indeed, the involvement of other divisions in the project activities (e.g. TCI and ESA) and collaboration of the project team with other divisions helped enhance ownership and thus participation of other divisions in the strategy’s formulation.

78. The process of formulation of the new Strategic Framework also indicates a higher level of corporate commitment towards nutrition-sensitive agriculture. The project team was instrumental with regard to bringing on board the nutrition aspects. Several informants at various levels (HQ, regional, country) thus emphasized the extensive contribution of the project to the New Strategic Framework, in particular to Strategic Objective 1 (SO1) (“shaped the thinking in SO1”). Nutrition is well-integrated in SO1 and SO3, but less so in the other SOs. With regard to SO1, the project (together with the Global Governance for Hunger Reduction Programme) contributed to the inclusion of support to nutrition in Agricultural Investment Plans (SO1. 1.4) and the harmonisation of mapping exercises (based on lessons learned from the CAADP country papers).

workshops + videos); World Food Day every year; the Committee for Agriculture 2012 (exhibition concerning sustainable diets); the Africa Food Security and Nutrition Day in 2012 and 2013; and the Symposium on Forests for Food Security and Nutrition.

79. More generally, several informants emphasised the fact that the project was instrumental in bringing nutrition higher at the agenda at corporate level. As also reported in the Nutrition Evaluation report (FAO 2011: 13), nutrition had largely been neglected in FAO. When nutrition was on the agenda globally, FAO was perceived as being a more marginal player compared to other agencies, and was not a very visible stakeholder in key processes and partnerships such as SUN and REACH. According to the informants, the project helped raising the visibility of and the demand for FAO support, in particular ESN. Overall, there appeared to be a change from “pushing” for nutrition inclusion to other divisions “requesting” for technical support with regard to nutrition. This was also an indication of a higher level of commitment towards mainstreaming nutrition at corporate level.

5.1.2 Output 2: Technical support to project management and policy formulation

80. The output is formulated as follows: “FAO officers **integrate** food security, nutrition and livelihoods considerations in programme/project design, implementation and evaluations and in the formulation of food security-related policies”. Table 2 below shows the indicators, targets and achievement. As seen from the table, in some cases the targets have been achieved (indicator 1); in other cases the targets have not been achieved (indicators 2 and 3). Despite the fact that some targets have not been achieved it should be mentioned that additional indicators (2, 4, and 5) have been added after the project formulation; this means that project had actually achieved more than originally planned. As in the case of output 1, the new indicators suffer from not having targets.

Table 2. Output 2: Technical support

| Nr. | Indicator | Target | Achieved |
|-----|---|-----------|----------|
| 1 | Number of FAO projects supported in project formulation (significant contribution) | 10 | 14 |
| 2 | Number of FAO projects supported during implementation (new) | 20 | 16 |
| 3 | Number of FAO projects supported for evaluation | 5 | 3 |
| 4 | Number of other FAO initiatives to which the project provides technical support (new) | No target | 10 |
| 5 | Number of FAO projects to which project has made some contribution (new) | No target | 17 |

81. Output 2 focuses on FAO officers integrating FSNL aspects. However, the selected indicators focus on the project’s support to project formulation processes, project evaluations, support to other FAO initiatives, etc. These activities (indicators) reflect the support of the project to various FAO projects and initiatives. This might lead to FAO officers integrating FSNL aspects in programmes, etc. Yet, the achievement of the output as defined by these indicators is not a verification that FAO officers are capable of integrating FSNL.

82. Keeping this in mind, there is however no doubt that the project contributed hugely to the integration of nutrition within agriculture in FAO projects. The project for instance collaborated with TCE with regard to the formulation of the ECHO project: “Building capacity for better food security programming in emergency and rehabilitation contexts” (indicator 1). According to the informants, the project contributed greatly to the project preparation, for instance with regard to mapping of tools (advocacy tools).

83. The project has moreover collaborated with TCE with regard to integrating nutrition and resilience (Indicator 4). The practical approach, extensive field experience as well as a constructive mind of the FSNL expert (e.g. the ability to offer good advice at the field level) was mentioned as one reason why the collaboration with TCE worked so well. The collaboration was perceived as very useful for TCE, and the FSNL expert was referred to as a kind of broker between the HQ and the field.

84. The project moreover worked closely with the Right to Food team with regard to combining Right to Food and nutrition; in particular in relation to the two projects; “Establishing a Hunger Free Initiative for West Africa” (GCP/RAF/476/GER) through ECOWAS and “Mainstreaming food and nutrition security and the right to food into the Smallholder Commercialization Programme of Sierra Leone” (GCP/SIL/042/GER). Both projects were approved; the ECOWAS project was originally planned to be jointly funded by the Federal Republic of Germany and ECOWAS; ECOWAS later withdrew its commitment and instead canalized the funding to Mali; the project will therefore be 100% funded by the Federal Republic of Germany. The project in Sierra Leone will likewise be 100% funded by the Federal Republic of Germany. The ECOWAS project will be further discussed under 5.2.

85. Several FAO Nutrition Focal Points (e.g. Ghana, Uganda) highlighted the technical backstopping from the project and the regional Senior Nutrition Officer to be critical, e.g. in relation to proposal development. Several focal points also mentioned that they had regular communication with the FSNL expert about nutrition issues, and that this was regarded extremely useful. On a more general note it was reported that the work of the project as well as the Regional Senior Nutrition officer helped translating normative work into action.

5.1.3 Output 3: Capacity building¹⁰

86. The output is formulated in the following manner: “FAO staff and local teams in partner institutions operating at regional, national, provincial and community levels are trained on integrated nutrition, food security and livelihood interventions”. This output is formulated as an activity rather than an output, which obviously constraints the assessment of its achievement. The associated indicators were likewise not well-developed (activity indicator rather than output indicators); the targets have however all been achieved with the exception of indicator 2 (country level workshop/trainings).

Table 3. Output 3: Capacity building

| Nr. | Indicator | Target | Achieved |
|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | Number of regional workshops organized/supported | 4 | 5 |
| 2 | Number of country-level workshops/training organized/supported | 8 | 5 |
| 3 | Number/profiles of practitioners participating in trainings/workshops | 360 | 616 |
| 4 | Percent of participants good/very good satisfaction with workshop content/methods | 90% | App.95% ¹¹ |

¹⁰ The correct corporate term is now “capacity development” rather than capacity building as the latter indicates that no capacity was present from the beginning (Corporate Strategy on Capacity Development, 2011).

¹¹ The response obviously varied in different workshops.

87. As in the case of the other outputs, the indicators (regional workshops; country-level/trainings organized/supported; practitioners participating in FSNL workshops; and percentage of participants expressing satisfaction with workshops) are all pre-conditions for the achievement of the output – in this case capacity development. However, the indicators are by no means evidence that capacity has been developed. Indicator 4 for instance illustrates that the workshop participants appreciated the workshops (content and methods); however, this is not an indication that capacity has been developed. In this case it would have been relevant in the post-workshop questionnaires to focus on whether the workshop participants had learned new skills/methods or achieved a higher level of awareness, which could be applied in the job (before-after workshop assessment). Unfortunately, these aspects were not covered in the post-workshop evaluations (e.g. in the February 2012 workshop in Accra for FAO decentralized staff or in the TCI sensitization workshop).

88. However, there are other indications that some capacity (awareness) has been developed as a result of for instance the RAF/AGN Nutrition workshop 14-16 February 2012 in Accra for decentralized staff in Sub-Saharan Africa (30 FAO staff from 21 country offices, RAF and HQ participated). This workshop, which was arranged by the regional Senior Nutrition Officer in collaboration with the project team, brought together decentralized and HQ nutrition staff for the first time. Several informants highlighted this workshop as being decisive in clarifying FAO's role in nutrition (integrating agriculture). Moreover, the discussion of the Nutrition Strategy was reported to be helpful in clarifying roles/responsibilities. The workshop displayed concrete forms of assistance to be offered as well as different methods on how to link agriculture and nutrition; both were regarded as highly useful by the informants. The workshop also appeared to be extremely important in terms of exchange of information; this exchange is still on-going according to many informants. The workshop in Accra included training in communication (e.g. knowledge management and fundraising); moreover, there was follow-up after the workshop with regard to communication aspects.

5.1.4 Output 4: Coordination and joint programming

89. The output is formulated as follows: "FAO teams are proactively engaged in inter-institutional and inter-sectorial collaboration and joint programming, in particular with UN sister agencies and their counterpart institutions". This output is formulated as an output and in this case the indicators are actually formulated as output indicators, as seen in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Output 4: Coordination and joint programming

| Nr. | Indicator | Target | Achieved |
|------------|---|---------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Number of agreements/commitments/declarations/collaboration agreements generated by regional interventions of project | 5 | 3 |
| 2 | Number of joint initiatives/programmes initiated/strengthened through project interventions | 6 | 13 |

90. The main achievement under indicator 1 is the LoA signed with the NPCA Food and Nutrition Unit regarding the implementation of the CAADP workshops and other activities (as further discussed under 5.2.). This is in itself a huge achievement – and in this relation measuring this as one agreement does not give it full justice. In general, the target appears to have been achieved – regardless of the number of agreements.

91. With regard to indicator 2, joint initiative/programmes initiated/strengthened, the main achievement is the contribution to REACH. According to the REACH secretariat, FAO has become the strongest partner within the network and has taken a strong lead in the REACH collaboration (described as “avant-garde”), most importantly through the integration of agriculture. The REACH network aims at developing nutrition governance at country level through a multi-sectorial approach. Until recently nutrition was mainly perceived as a health issue; it was reported that due to the support from the project agriculture has now become an integrated part of nutrition. The project (and other ESN staff) contributed to the preparation of the Nutrition Action Guidelines and various tools under REACH. The project furthermore contributed to REACH in relation to communication; e.g. by preparing a video on the REACH facilitator training held in Addis Ababa (2012), now available on the REACH web site.

92. The REACH facilitators participated (or were involved in the planning and preparation as well) in the CAADP workshops; this contributed positively to the integration of agriculture in the work of REACH. In some countries, e.g. Mozambique, the project moreover collaborated directly with the REACH facilitators at country level; for instance the project arranged a half-day workshop (December 2012) with high level politicians to start the CAADP dialogue in collaboration with the REACH facilitators. It was reported that in many countries there is now a good collaboration between REACH facilitators and the FAO Nutrition Focal Point, e.g. in Tanzania and Mozambique.

93. With regard to REACH, it was nonetheless conveyed that having a broader collaboration with FAO (not only working through the nutrition focal points) would be desirable to broadening the areas of collaboration. The same counts for other agencies; REACH should be introduced to a broader part of the organisation. FAO has direct collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture within the Member States; it is therefore important to get on board Ministry of Agriculture in relation to the work of REACH and mainstreaming of nutrition more generally. Merely addressing the FAO nutrition point is thus too narrow; the nutrition focal points for instance are not involved in the areas of extension and social protection, which are both crucial in relation to nutrition.

5.1.5 Output 5: Lessons-learning and knowledge-sharing

94. The output is formulated in the following manner: “Field tested good practices and lessons learned from food security, nutrition, and livelihoods policies, programmes and interventions are documented, inserted in a knowledge bank and disseminated”. As in the case of output 3, this output is formulated as an activity and the indicators are formulated as activity indicators rather than output indicators with the exception of indicator 6 and 7, in which case, however, the surveys have not been conducted. As seen from the list of indicators below, the targets have by and large been achieved, with the exception of indicator 1 (which was also reported under output 3) and indicator 6 and 7 (cf. Table 5 below).

Table 5. Output 5: Lesson-Learning and knowledge-sharing

| Nr. | Indicator | Target | Achieved |
|-----|---|--------|-----------------|
| 1 | Number of lesson sharing workshops project organized/contributed to | 12 | 2 ¹² |

¹² Workshops were also reported under output 3 (sensitization).

| | | | |
|---|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| 2 | Number of discussion forums/working groups in which the project participates (new) | No target | 11 |
| 3 | Number of good practices documented and made available by project team | 2 per country | 16 (in total) |
| 4 | Number of guidelines relating to FSNL, which the project produces/contributes to | No target | 10 |
| 5 | Number of audio-visual materials produced (new) | 1 video, 10 audios | 10 videos |
| 6 | Number of practitioners reporting they use of produced materials | Min.100 | Survey not conducted |
| 7 | Percentage of practitioners who express good/very satisfaction with materials produced | 90% | Survey not conducted |

95. As in the case of the other outputs (except output 4), the incorrect formulation of output and/or indicators renders it impossible to assess the achievement of the output. A correctly formulated output would have focused on whether the lessons-learning and knowledge-sharing initiated had led to change of practices (if the lessons learned had been adopted). If the surveys in relation to indicator 6 and 7 had been conducted as planned, this could have given some verification of achievement.

96. Interviews with a wide range of FAO staff (HQ, regional, sub-regional, country levels) and partners (e.g. REACH, WFP), however, confirmed that some of the good practices materials produced by the project are used widely, e.g. the Fact Sheets. The FAO focal points in Ghana and Tanzania for instance reported that the Fact Sheets are used to illustrate FAOs role in nutrition and for distribution to other stakeholders.

97. In relation to Indicator 4 (guidelines), it was reported from several informants, e.g. the REACH secretariat, that the preparation of the Key Recommendations was a huge achievement and that the Recommendations were widely used. The purpose of the Key Recommendations was to create consensus on what was already implicitly agreed on by the main stakeholders and to communicate the basics of how agriculture programs and policy could improve nutrition. The Key Recommendations were prepared by a consultant contracted by the project. The consultant pulled out 20 common themes regarding nutrition and agriculture of about 53 publications (guidelines, etc.) released from over 30 development institutions. The main conclusion was that there was a strikingly strong consensus among development institutions on principles of how nutrition can be improved through agriculture. The review were synthesized in the publication: “Guiding Principles for Linking Agriculture and Nutrition: Synthesis from 10 development institutions” (FAO 2012). This was followed by an extensive consultative process ensuring that the report’s conclusions were correct and representative. During this process, feedback was received from over 70 individuals from over 30 organizations. In order to improve the dissemination of the linking agriculture-nutrition message, it was agreed among the involved partners that there was a need to develop a more concise and co-owned statement. This led to the development of a two-page sheet termed Key Recommendations. The whole process, which was lengthy and included elaborated consultations with all stakeholders, took about 3 years.

98. The Key Recommendations have been taken up by different stakeholders, e.g. the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in relation to Feed the Future Programme; the Key Recommendations were also central in the CAADP process. At country level, e.g. in Ghana, Tanzania and Uganda, the FAO nutrition focal points reported that the

Key Recommendations are widely used and disseminated to other agencies. According to the informants, the strength of the Key Recommendations publication is that it in very concrete terms explains how nutrition can be integrated into agriculture. There is thus no doubt that the lessons learned have been documented and disseminated and are used widely, in particular the Key Recommendations.

5.2 Achievements at outcome level

99. The outcome of the project appears to have been largely achieved; although the number of actual projects integrating FSNL (indicator 3) was less than planned. As noted below, this could partly be explained by a change of the project approach in the second stage of the project (2012/2013). The project outcome is formulated in the following way: “FAO and its partner organizations (United Nations (UN) sister agencies, government institutions, NGOs/CSOs and private sector stakeholders) have integrated food security, nutrition and livelihoods objectives and activities in regional, national and local policies and programmes”. Four indicators were included at outcome level as presented in Table 6 below:

Table 6. Outcome achievement

| Nr. | Indicator | Target | Achieved |
|------------|--|---------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Number of regional initiatives that feature integrated FSNL approaches (e.g. agriculture projects including nutrition, health interventions including food-based approached) with a significant contribution from the project | 4 | 2 |
| 2 | Number of countries where national policies reflect FSNL objectives and activities (with significant contribution from the project) | 5 | 13 |
| 3 | Number of EU Food Facility projects, REACH projects; Millennium Development Goals (MDG)-Fund projects and other relevant national programmes featuring integrated FSNL approaches (as a result of the project and/or with significant contribution from the project) | 10 | 5 |
| 4 | Number of global initiatives that reflect FSNL objectives and activities, and to which the project has made significant contribution | No target | 6 |

100. The indicators are generally relatively well-formulated and SMART¹³. The indicators were partly revised during the project period. Given the growing momentum on nutrition in general and agriculture-nutrition linkages (and joint partnerships in this regard) in particular, the project in 2012 judged that it would not be possible to attribute the achieved outcome to the project and thus the text was changed from “as a result of the project” to “with significant contribution from the project”. This was a right decision to make and in line with the general development within the evaluation methodology as discussed in 1.1.1. The fourth indicator was added in 2012; the justification for including this new indicator was that the project regularly uses the field experience from Africa to inform global processes.

¹³ Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time bound.

5.2.1 *Indicator 1: regional initiatives*

101. With regard to regional initiatives, despite the fact that the target was 4 regional initiatives and “only” two have been achieved, in all fairness, due to the magnitude of the CAADP process in particular, the target is interpreted to have been reached. Apart from the CAADP mainstreaming process, the project also supported the mobilization of ECOWAS institutions for a Hunger Free Initiative (initiated by FAO’s Director General). The CAADP case will be presented in details below. The engagement in the CAADP process was a huge accomplishment of the project (and also constituted the main activity since 2011), and thus measuring this as one regional initiative does not pay justice to the project’s contribution.

102. In addition, the project contributed to the mobilization of ECOWAS institutions for a Hunger Free Initiative by formulating a sub-regional project for a “Hunger Free Initiative for West Africa” in collaborating with the Office of Director General (ODG) and ESA. The project (located at RAF) was planned to start in November 2012 and run for three years with a budget of approximately 5.4. Million USD. The project was planned to be jointly funded by ECOWAS and the Federal Republic of Germany, but was delayed as ECOWAS did not sign the project and withdraw their funding (canalized to Mali). The Federal Republic of Germany is now providing 100 % funding of the project, which will start in January 2014. The project will support ECOWAS and its government and non-government partners in working towards a hunger-free West Africa by promoting good nutrition, feasible technical solutions to food insecurity and the right to food as the ultimate goal. Even if the final outcome of the project is still to be seen, the launching of such a project is a very important achievement.

Case Study: Mainstreaming nutrition into CAADP

103. While many CAADP National Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plans include nutritional goals, most are lacking the concrete actions needed to facilitate nutrition security through improved agricultural practices. NEPAD therefore launched an initiative to strengthen capacity for addressing nutrition through the formulation and implementation of National Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plans.

104. Regional workshops are at the heart of this strategy, bringing together country teams composed of professionals from agriculture, health, finance, private sector, and civil society, to develop action plans and roadmaps for maximizing the nutritional impact of agriculture investment plans. CAADP is therefore an opportunity for agriculture to engage in the “nutrition momentum” and join forces with other sectors in the fight against malnutrition.

105. The workshops themselves were the highlight of the initiative; however, their success depended on the quality of the workshop preparation at regional and country level prior to the workshop, as well as the follow-up after the workshop. Succeeding a workshop organized by the project team and the Nutrition Working Group for West Africa in Dakar May 2011¹⁴, USAID and NEPAD approached the project team and invited FAO to facilitate and provide technical advice to the workshops. The project signed a LoA with NEPAD with a total amount of 110,000 US dollars covering the period July 2012 to November 2012 (including the no-cost extension) as earlier mentioned. The LoA included as the main output follow-up to the West African workshop and organization of three workshops in Central, Eastern Africa

¹⁴ The title of the workshop was: “Maximizing the nutritional benefits of food security interventions in West Africa”. One of the aims of the workshop was to strengthen the dialogue between health and agriculture staff and to share experiences on agriculture-nutrition linkages across the region.

and Southern Africa. Due to delay in implementation, the planned Central and Eastern Africa workshops were later merged to one workshop.

106. A strong priority of the workshops was to maximise opportunities for coordination and partnerships at different level: thus, not only horizontal inter-ministerial cooperation was sought, but also vertical, with the involvement of global, continental and regional partners at all stages of the process. The process was guided by a steering committee led by NEPAD, technically supported by FAO and USAID, and composed of representatives from relevant Regional Economic Communities, UN agencies (World Health Organization (WHO), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), WFP), NGOs, academics and donors. An essential requirement for enhancing the contribution of agriculture and achieving these objectives is that professionals working in agriculture develop a strong ownership of nutrition and engagement to work in cooperation with other sectors. In a context where nutrition is often under the aegis of health sector, the designation of a senior decision-maker from the agriculture sector - the CAADP Focal Point - as country team convener and leader of the process was instrumental in building ownership.

107. Annex 3 presents the details of the implementation of the CAADP workshops (preparation, main activities at the workshop and the follow-up process). Annex 8 moreover presents an overview of the status of 15 selected countries (five from each of the three workshops), more specifically a comparison of the Nutrition Country Papers, which each country presented in the beginning of the workshops and the Action Plans prepared during the workshops.

108. Table 7 below presents an overview of the status of implementation of the CAADP investment plans in the 54 AU member states¹⁵.

Table 7. CAADP implementation status

| Stages | Status of implementation | Countries |
|--------|--|---|
| 1 | Early stage. CAADP process launched and Focal Point appointed | Algeria, Namibia, South Sudan, Somalia |
| 2-3 | Government and RECs launch process and Steering Technical Committee instituted | Libya, Egypt, Chad, Congo, Angola, Zimbabwe, South Africa, Sao Tome & Principe |
| 4-5 | Stock taking and analysis done and Compact ¹⁶ in draft process | Sudan, Lesotho, Cameroun, Gabon, Equatorial Guinea |
| 6-8 | Roundtables and Compacts signed, Investment Plans (IPs) validated, financial secured review mechanisms agreed upon | Mauretania, Mali, Senegal, Niger, Burkina Faso, the Gambia, Sierra Leone, Guinea Bissau, Benin, Togo, Guinea, Cote d'Ivoire, Liberia, Seychelles, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Burundi, Tanzania, Zambia, Swaziland, DR Congo, Central African Republic |

¹⁵ It was not possible to obtain information on the CAADP implementation status of two AU members: Comoros and Rwanda.

¹⁶ The CAADP Compact: Common agreement and commitment on vision and strategy by all national (state and non-state) and international actors.

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 9 | Country Strategic Analysis & Knowledge Support Systems (SAKSS) established | Ghana, Nigeria, Uganda, Malawi, Mozambique, Cape Verde |
| | CAADP process not launched | Botswana, Tunisia, Western Sahara, Madagascar, Eritrea |
| | Non-AU Member states | Morocco |

109. As seen from Table 7, more than half of the countries (23) have reached stage 6-8, where Roundtables and Compacts have been signed, Investment Plans IPs validated and financial secured review mechanisms agreed upon. Out of these 23 countries, about half are West African Countries. The remaining countries are mainly located in Eastern and to some extent Southern Africa (Zambia and Swaziland); it is noteworthy that all of these countries are characterized by having quite strong donor communities. In six countries, the SAKSS has already been established; including Western, Eastern and Southern Countries.

110. Table 7 above outlines the status of the implementation of the investment plans at country level. With regard to the specific aspect of mainstreaming nutrition into the investment plans (to which the project contributed), NEPAD mentioned the following achievements:

- a. The interface of nutrition and agriculture has been clarified for the RECs and the countries. Some level of awareness has been created; namely that the ultimate goal should go beyond production and export; i.e. the objective of agriculture should (also) be to secure food security and there should be an increased focus on livelihoods. This kind of understanding is new.
- b. There is a realization that it is not only about funding – it is more a question about the above-mentioned understanding of the ultimate goal of agriculture.
- c. Nutrition is now high at the policy formulation process.

111. With regard to assessing the increased awareness and capacity developed through the three CAADP workshops with the contribution of the project, unfortunately information is not available. The documentation currently available mainly focuses on the technical implementation of the activities than the impact of these. The lack of information was partially filled by the interviews carried out by both the project (e.g. the three case studies presented in Annex 3) and the evaluation team as presented below.

112. During the mission of the evaluation team to Ghana, it was reported that the Action Plan is currently being reviewed and is being converted into a multi-sectorial plan and that high-level commitment and policy buy-in are in place. With reference to the project, statements such as: “Project raised awareness of the nutrition-agriculture linkages” and “project created momentum for nutrition” were uttered. Generally the visibility of agriculture has gone up, whereas previously nutrition was perceived as a health issue. This was clearly perceived as a result of the project.

113. The situation in Tanzania was reported to be considerably more challenging. Follow-up and implementation of the Action Plan was problematic due to a difficult policy environment. The high level of decentralization further hampers the process (difficult to target a high number of districts). In other countries, e.g. Mozambique, the decentralization process was reported to create new opportunities; thus in some cases, what could not be achieved at

national level could be achieved at provincial level. Therefore it is also important to include the decentralized levels in the work with the Action Plans.

114. As reported by NEPAD, with regard to the follow-up of the workshops, the focus should be: 1) on developing capacity at the ground; 2) the countries should own the process (country-led process). The gaps are generally well-known; however, the resources (funding and manpower) are insufficient at regional level to support the process, including the revision of the Country Action Plans. As stated by NEPAD: “We cannot hold the countries accountable if we are not accountable ourselves”.

115. According to NEPAD, the future work should focus on three areas:

- a. More clarity is needed – an understanding and analysis of what is required to support the process.
- b. Proceed with the implementation – the focus should be on being results oriented.
- c. Change of mind-set (high level) and capacity development of the political leadership of AU, RECs, and at country-level. REACH and SUN are very important for this process at country level.

116. The project contributed significantly to the above-mentioned process. It was thus reported from NEPAD that without the financial support and the collaboration with the project, the Global Governance programme and RAF (senior nutrition officer), NEPAD would not have been able to deliver in terms of mainstreaming nutrition into the CAADP process. From AU it was also recounted that the project as well as the Global Governance Programme contributed significantly to the CAADP process, primarily by facilitating and coordinating the workshops (where the two programme officers were the main facilitators). Moreover, the two projects made available materials and guidelines for the workshops. The contribution from the Regional Senior Officer was also reported to be critical.

5.2.2 Indicator 2: national policies reflecting FSNL

117. With regard to national policies reflecting FSNL objectives and activities the target has been achieved almost threefold thanks to a significant contribution from the project. The target was 5 national policies; the project contributed in total to 13 national policies. This was mainly the result of the CAADP process (described above). The delay of the ECOWAS/FAO Hunger Free Initiative affected the level of support and follow up after the CAADP process.

5.2.3 Indicator 3: projects integrating FSNL

118. The target with regard to national projects/programmes featuring FSNL approaches to which the project has made significant contribution was not fully achieved. The target was 10 projects; the project supported approximately five projects integrating FSNL, e.g. the Sierra Leone project mentioned earlier, the West Africa Hunger Free Initiative (both German-funded), the FAO Chad Emergency Programme for Kanem and Bahr-e-Gazal, and the ECHO-funded project: “Building capacity for better food security programming in emergency and rehabilitation contexts”.

119. Originally the project was supposed to focus also on Food Facility projects; however these were being phased out when the project was launched and were therefore never

included. The main reason why the target was not reached for this indicator appeared to be the change of project approach in 2012-2013. During this period the project mainly focused on supporting the CAADP nutrition mainstreaming process (cf. the case study above) and there was less focus on backstopping individual projects. Rather, through the CAADP process, the project was supporting FAO country offices, in particular Nutrition Focal Points, who were then (hopefully) influencing project design by integrating the FSNL aspect. However, this aspect was not monitored by the project, which is unfortunate (but it was hardly feasible) as it would have reflected the actual capacity development (not only the support from the project as discussed in relation to output 3).

5.2.4 Indicator 4: global initiatives

120. This indicator, which was added in 2012, did not have any targets and its accomplishment can therefore not be assessed. Overall, however, it appeared that the project had contributed significantly to various global initiatives. According to the progress reports, the project made significant contribution to six global initiatives, e.g. to REACH, including the contribution to the preparation of the REACH Facilitator Manual and Nutrition Action Guides. As previously discussed (5.1.4), the project was highly instrumental in the integration of agriculture in the work of REACH. With regard to SUN, it was reported that the “Synthesis of Guiding Principles on Agriculture Programming for Nutrition” is used by several partners as an example of nutrition-sensitive agriculture. Other examples include various initiatives in relation to agricultural investment including e.g. USAID Feeding the Future, and CAADP.

121. Regarding the contribution to and use of normative products, the project was generally field-oriented and normative work was not the main objective of the project. The project focused more on dissemination of normative tools than on the production of these; and on sharing information from global to regional and country levels. However, the project has supported for example the preparation of the Key Recommendations. The Key Recommendations were perceived as an extremely important contribution to the work on mainstreaming nutrition as earlier mentioned.

5.3 Gender equality

122. The project is partly aligned with “FAO’s Policy on Gender Equality: Attaining Food Security Goals in Agriculture and Rural Development” (2013). The project is coherent with the goal of FAO’s gender equality policy, which is to achieve equality between women and men in sustainable agricultural production and rural development for the elimination of hunger and poverty. However, the project did not promote all aspects of the Gender Equality Policy (e.g. that all programmes should include gender analysis) in its work. The policy was not in place when the programme was designed (the policy was prepared in 2013, the last year of the project). Moreover, it would not have been realistic and feasible for the project to apply all the requirements/principles of the Gender Equality Policy; the main focus was rightly on mainstreaming nutrition into agriculture. Including too many other “messages” would have blurred the key message.

123. This being said, the project team to the highest possible extent aimed at mainstreaming gender into the project activities. More specifically, the project approached gender by ensuring that the importance of mainstreaming gender for making food and agriculture nutrition-sensitive was emphasized during presentations and trainings, as well as backstopping missions.

124. Gender is moreover central to the Key Recommendations, for instance through emphasizing the importance of ensuring women's access to productive resources, income opportunities, extension services and information, credit, and labour and time-saving technologies. The choice of case studies, during trainings and for the Fact Sheets, also emphasized experiences that sought to ensure gender equality.

125. Regarding equal gender representation in trainings, workshops and capacity development in general, the project did not focus on promoting female participation. The opposite was actually the case: for long nutrition has been largely dismissed as a woman's issue receiving very little attention from senior decision makers who are usually men. The challenge was therefore to attract men rather than promoting female participation. In the end there was a relatively good division of men and women in the workshops/trainings, etc. according to the project team.

126. The project contributed to the preparation of the paper on Gender and Nutrition (Draft October 2012) mainly in terms of comments and discussions around its preparation and revision. The project did not contribute financially to the preparation of the paper. The paper provides excellent recommendations on how to improve nutrition policies, programming and projects in order to increase synergy between gender and nutrition. These recommendations show a broader understanding of gender than the corporate Gender Equality Policy, which mainly focuses on women rather than the gendered roles of men and women.

5.4 *Capacity development*

127. One of the expected outputs of the project is capacity development (output 3) to be achieved through workshops and trainings at country and regional levels. There is no doubt that an increased level of awareness and understanding regarding nutrition-sensitive agriculture has been developed both globally, regionally and nationally (in the targeted countries). Unfortunately, evidence as such does not exist; the post-workshop reports mainly focused on the participants' satisfaction with the content and methods of the workshop/trainings and did not provide information on whether the participants acquired new knowledge or skills which could be used in their job. The log frame does not include any indicator on capacity development and this aspect is not being reported. Any capacity developed is thus mainly reflected through interviews or other personal accounts (as reflected in the discussion of the outputs).

5.5 *Human Rights Based Approach*

128. The Right to Food dimension and principles have partly been integrated in the project; e.g. through specific activities and areas of collaboration, although not consistently in all activities/results. However, this would also not have been realistic and feasible; the focus was on mainstreaming nutrition into agriculture and adding also the rights aspect in all activities would not have been realistic. The project collaborated with the Right to Food team in designing the Right to Food projects for Sierra Leone and ECOWAS (plus Togo). Generally, there has been a close collaboration with the Right to Food team at HQ. FAO also participated with 3 presentations on the "Towards African Renaissance: Achieving the Right to Adequate Food and Nutrition" in Niamey, Niger 30th October 2013, arranged by NEPAD and African Union (AU).

5.6 *Partnership and alliances*

129. Partnerships are at the heart of FAO, and also at the heart of the project. The project worked with partnerships globally, regionally and nationally. Globally, the project, for instance, contributed significantly to the REACH movement and ensured the integration of agriculture into the work of the movement. Regionally, the support (financial and technical) to the CAADP mainstreaming nutrition process was absolutely critical as pointed out by representatives from AU and NEPAD. At country level, the project contributed to strengthening the partnership between FAO and REACH, in particular through the FAO Nutrition Focal Points. In some countries, e.g. Burkina Faso and Gabon, the Nutrition Focal Points reported that the collaboration and partnership with SUN was stronger than the partnership with REACH (in Burkina Faso, for instance FAO contributed significantly to the formulation of SUN's Roadmap for developing capacity for a stronger collaboration and consultation of all food security stakeholders). Through the support to the above-mentioned alliances, the project has significantly contributed to strengthening FAO's partnership and alliances globally, regionally and in the member states with regard to the promotion of nutrition-sensitive agriculture.

6 Analysis by evaluation criteria

6.1 Relevance

130. The project is considered highly relevant to the final beneficiaries, poor households in Sub-Saharan Africa, as also outlined under paragraph 3.1. In most countries in Sub-Saharan Africa the national focus is on high production and productivity of staple food and export crops at the expense of food/crop diversity and the need for nutritious and safe food, leading to high level of malnutrition, in particular A-vitamin deficiency. This is the case even in countries with high level of production. Mono-diet and mono-cropping is thus prevalent in most countries in Sub-Saharan Africa; moreover, in many countries there is a tendency at community level that high-value food, such as vegetables and fruits as well as dairy products, is used for sale rather than for home consumption. Overall, there is a need for awareness raising/sensitization in relation to nutrition and nutrition-sensitive agriculture both at national political level, but also at community level. At national level agriculture should contribute to food and nutrition security, and nutrition should also be measured as part of agricultural production and productivity. In this context, the project, which aimed at mainstreaming nutrition into agriculture and advocating for a nutrition-sensitive agriculture, was highly relevant.

6.2 Relevance

131. The project is considered highly relevant to the final beneficiaries, poor households in Sub-Saharan Africa, as also outlined under paragraph 3.1. In most countries in Sub-Saharan Africa the national focus is on high production and productivity of staple food and export crops at the expense of food/crop diversity and the need for nutritious and safe food, leading to high level of malnutrition, in particular A-vitamin deficiency. This is the case even in countries with high level of production. Mono-diet and mono-cropping is thus prevalent in most countries in Sub-Saharan Africa; moreover, in many countries there is a tendency at community level that high-value food, such as vegetables and fruits as well as dairy products, is used for sale rather than for home consumption. Overall, there is a need for awareness raising/sensitization in relation to nutrition and nutrition-sensitive agriculture both at national political level, but also at community level. At national level agriculture should contribute to food and nutrition security, and nutrition should also be measured as part of agricultural production and productivity. In this context, the project, which aimed at mainstreaming nutrition into agriculture and advocating for a nutrition-sensitive agriculture, was highly relevant.

132. At regional and sub-regional levels, the project was highly relevant and greatly supportive to the process of mainstreaming nutrition into the CAADP as elaborated under section 5.2.

133. At corporate level, the project was hugely relevant and timely with regard to the promotion of nutrition-sensitive agriculture; the project was regarded instrumental by many informants in relation to the preparation of the Nutrition Strategy and the New Strategic Framework.

134. In relation to the approach of the donor, the Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Consumer Protection of Germany, the project was similarly highly relevant and aligned. As

earlier mentioned the donor focuses on funding projects testing new tools or approaches, and provide only ear-marked funding. The donor has a strong focus on nutrition-sensitive agriculture and is also funding other similar projects, e.g. the ECOWAS and Sierra Leone projects mentioned earlier as well as the continuation of the current project.

6.3 *Efficiency*

135. The project has been efficiently implemented and well-managed. The unique institutional set-up has worked well and has led to a closer collaboration between the HQ and the regional level. This was mainly the result of a very flexible and transparent (to some extent virtual) mode of collaboration between the involved parties, with regard to both programme and financial management. The number of activities implemented by the project is quite impressive. However, the achievement of project outputs is difficult to assess due to the poor formulation of outputs and the associated indicators. Some outputs have not been fully achieved, but this is also partly related to (in some cases) very ambitious outputs.

136. Generally, given the very broad scope of the project - working at different levels and in many different countries/context due to the opportunistic approach - some of the outputs appeared over-ambitious. One example is output 3, which is aiming at capacity development at global, regional and country levels. Had the project targeted a few countries and regional organizations, the expected output would have been more realistic. The demand-oriented and opportunistic project approach was obviously a challenge with regard to formulating very precise indicators and targets, however, even when applying a demand-oriented there is room for improvement with regard to formulation of outputs and indicators.

6.4 *Effectiveness*

137. The outcome of the project appears to have been achieved - with significant contribution of the project – and based on the four indicators, with the exception of indicator 3 (projects integrating FSNL), which was only partly achieved. With regard to projects integrating FSNL, the partial achievement could be explained by the new direction pursued by the project in 2012/2013, i.e. supporting the CAADP mainstreaming nutrition process rather than providing assistance directly to individual projects. The evidence of the effectiveness of the project was thoroughly discussed under section 5.2. Two factors appeared to have contributed to the effectiveness of the project: 1) the flexible project design, which enabled the project to respond to and utilize “windows of opportunity” arising; 2) the project proved to be highly timely being implemented at a time where there was a growing momentum on nutrition in general and nutrition-sensitive agriculture in particular.

6.5 *Sustainability*

138. Most of the activities/outputs are hardly sustainable at this stage – a process has been started with regard to mainstreaming nutrition at global, regional and country levels, most notably the CAADP process; however the follow-up is pivotal. The follow-up in relation to the CAADP process has been discussed in details elsewhere (CAADP case study under section 5.1). The approach of working through regional organizations (rather than working directly at country-level) contributes to the sustainability of the process.

139. With regard to the achievements in relation to REACH, the project had a major impact and the introduction of agriculture into the work of REACH is probably sustainable, at least at secretariat level; however, the follow-up and implementation at country level is again critical.

140. The work in relation to the preparation of the Key Recommendations; a co-owned statement based upon the consensus of development institutions involved in nutrition and agriculture, is absolutely significant in relation to the work of mainstreaming nutrition into agriculture, in particular at country level. However, again this is just the first step of a more unified and collaborative approach both at policy and programme levels; the next step is to actually implement this unified approach at country level.

141. The view of a need for a follow-up of the project activities is shared by the donor, who has agreed to fund a new project (“Mainstreaming Nutrition in CAADP and Agriculture Policies and Programmes in Sub-Saharan Africa”) based on the achievements of the current project (as earlier mentioned). The donor is interested in funding a new phase of the project in particular due to the need for a continued support to the CAADP process and referred to this as “windows of opportunity”. In line with the donor’s funding strategy, the project will be funded as it is considered innovative; at a later stage it is FAO’s responsibility to up-scale the project’s results and activities. As expressed by the donor, doing capacity development of FAO’s staff is not included within their role and objective.

142. The new project is expected to be signed in January/February 2014 and to start in April 2014. In contrast to the current project, the FSNL expert will be located at regional level. It is crucial that the strong linkage and collaboration between the HQ and regional level is continued and sustained; according to the project proposal, the project will continue collaborating with a number of divisions at HQ. The Logical Framework of the new project suffer from the same problems as the log frame of the current project; some outputs and output indicators are formulated as activity rather than output/output indicators.

6.6 *Impact*

143. The impact of the project, including the associated indicators, is not well-defined in the Logical Framework. The expected impact is formulated in the following way: “The food security, nutrition and livelihoods of vulnerable communities and households are improved and their resilience is strengthened through integrated and multi-sectorial policies and programmes”. No target group is indicated, which means that impact basically is expected in the whole of Sub-Saharan Africa. Since the project applied a demand and opportunistic strategy it is evidently difficult to define the target groups beforehand; yet, the project proposal did actually include selection criteria for selection of countries (even if very broad). No selection of focal countries took place during the project period.

144. There is thus a contrast between, applying a demand-driven approach, and expecting a high level of impact in targeted countries. Given the opportunistic approach of spreading the resources over many countries (and various types of partnerships) the expected impact appears over-ambitious.

145. As discussed above, the expected outcome of the project was the integration of FSNL objectives and activities in regional, national and local policies and programmes, for example mainstreaming of nutrition at policy level (e.g. through the CAADP process). The

mainstreaming of nutrition at policy/programme level is the first important step; however, the implementation of policies is a long-term process and the results might not be achieved within the life time of the project. In this respect the expected impact also appear quite ambitious.

146. The impact indicators are not well-defined (more precise indicators should have been indicated, e.g. stunting, wasting, etc.) and given that there is no indication of the targeted areas, the indicators are not very useful and the achievement of the expected impact is very difficult to assess. Moreover, there has been no reporting at impact level, which obviously makes it impossible to assess the achievement at impact level.

7 Conclusions and recommendations

7.1 Conclusions

147. The unique institutional set-up (project staff located at HQ, but the project administered by RAF) worked effectively for a number of reasons: i) Good and well-defined division of labour/tasks; ii) Flexibility of involved parties; iii) Transparency and consensus-seeking approach; and iv) Regular contact (Skype).

148. In this case, the unique institutional set-up contributed to a strong collaboration between HQ and RAF, with high level of achievement at both levels. The project was managed and implemented through collaboration between the project team and RAF and as part of the project portfolio of RAF. Therefore the project had a very good grounding at the regional level; at the same time the project had easy access to and good understanding of the processes at HQ and RAF, e.g. formulation of the Nutrition Strategy and the new Strategic Framework. In this case, the institutional set-up thus appeared to have added value to the project achievements. The added value appeared partly to be related to the strong level of technical expertise and commitment of the involved parties; and therefore the same institutional set-up might work less well for other projects. However, as part of the decentralization process, it might be worth testing different institutional set-ups in order to strengthen the collaboration and synergy upstream (HQ/Regional and sub-regional offices) and down-stream (regional, sub-regional, and country). The fact that the project was administrated at RAF contributed to an easier “access” to the sub-regional and country levels.

149. The project was generally well-implemented and well-managed. In particular the approach applied by the project appeared to be highly successful and should be replicated in other projects. The following elements of the approach proved especially effective: 1) Combining work on the ground with targeting high-level politicians (combining technical and political work); 2) Adding value through supporting on-going policy and programming processes; 3) Working through existing coordination mechanisms; 4) Targeting the country level through regional organizations; and lastly 5) Seeking synergies with other FAO projects.

150. The project also applied a demand-driven and opportunistic approach; this approach worked well, in particular in terms of tapping into various processes at HQ level. The opportunistic approach however caused problems in relation to having a well-designed log frame with precise indicators; due to this reason, but also because the log frame suffered from not well-defined outputs/output indicators (defined as activities), the project only partly reported on the outputs of the project, which was indeed a missed opportunity.

151. Despite the weaknesses in reporting, there is no doubt that the project has contributed significantly to various processes of mainstreaming nutrition into agriculture. As one of the main outputs, the preparation of the Key Recommendations, a co-shared statement by development institutions involved in nutrition and agriculture, constitute an important basis for concerted action in this field.

152. Moreover, at HQ, the project was instrumental in integrating nutrition-sensitive agriculture in both the Nutrition Strategy and the new Strategic Framework. At regional and country levels, the support to the CAADP process was critical as reported by representatives from for instance NEPAD and the AU. The work through NEPAD (working through the

CAADP focal persons) was fundamental for commitment from the countries. However, as earlier noted the follow-up of the CAADP process is hugely challenging, and the continued support from the project is therefore critical.

7.2 Recommendations

Recommendation 1: To FAO on project monitoring/reporting

The Project Task Force (PTF) should

- revise the project Logical Framework for the next phase to ensure a proper functioning as management and monitoring tool (indicators should be revised to be SMART and proper Means of Verifications should be included to ensure proper reporting on the indicators)
- develop and implement post-workshop/training questionnaires which also focus on new knowledge/ skills obtained as result of the workshop
- ensure that communication activities are properly reported; new indicators such as visits on website could also be included
- ensure that a system for reporting on country requests is established

Recommendation 2: To FAO on capacity development/sensitisation

The PTF should

- promote two types of capacity development, targeting different groups: 1) FAO nutrition officers and focal points; 2) FAO-Representatives, Assistant FAO-Representatives and Head of programmes. The latter type of capacity development/sensitization should aim at ensuring the support to nutrition-sensitive agriculture, in particular in countries with no nutrition focal points in place
- arrange a second workshop for FAO nutrition focal points in continuation of the workshop in Accra February 2012
- ensure that all FAO focal points are familiar with all information/advocacy materials, etc. produced (e.g. the Key Recommendations)

Recommendation 3: To FAO on coordination/collaboration at corporate level

The PTF should

- establish a mechanism for ensuring collaboration and sharing of activities/results within ESN (including also groups not involved in technical backstopping of the project); e.g. a Steering Committee with participation of group leaders. The project will be located at RAF in next phase, but the linking with ESN is still crucial.
- ESN should ensure the update of the ESN web-site; the web-site should moreover include link to the web-site of the project as well as a “space” for intra-division communication (invisible for external persons)

Recommendation 4: To FAO on coordination/collaboration with external partners

The PTF should

- promote collaboration between REACH/SUN and a broader segment of FAO (currently the collaboration is mainly between REACH facilitators and FAO nutrition focal points) in order to promote the participation of the Ministry of Agriculture in the work of mainstreaming nutrition

Recommendation 5: To FAO on replication of the project design/institutional set-up

FAO should

- ensure that the most effective elements of the project design are replicated in other Trust Fund projects and in the Regular Programme in coherence with the FAO operational

work planning 2014-2015, e.g. 1) Combining work on the ground with targeting high-level politicians (combining technical and political work); 2) Adding value through supporting ongoing policy and programming processes; 3) Working through existing coordination mechanisms; 4) Targeting the country level through regional organizations; and 5) Seeking synergies with other FAO projects.

- based on the experiences of the current project, test different institutional set-ups as part of the decentralization process in order to enhance the delivery mode of corporate results.

Annex 1 Evaluation terms of reference

1 Background of the Project

1. The project “Supporting Food Security Nutrition and Livelihoods in Sub-Saharan Africa” was designed to add value to ongoing work related to agriculture and food security supported by FAO, governmental institutions or development partners, so as to maximise the nutritional impact of these interventions. It was designed to address the following problems:

- a. The fact that most agriculture and food security interventions focus primarily on food production (especially of staples), and pay limited attention to dietary diversity, processing and preparation, and food distribution within households.
- b. Lack of coordination between health and agriculture sectors.
- c. Lack of articulation between short term and longer term responses.
- d. Very limited capitalization on lessons learned from experience.
- e. Limited awareness of FAO staff, counterparts and partner institutions regarding the role of food and agriculture sector in improving food security and nutrition.

2. The project aims to contribute to the following impact: “The food security, nutrition and livelihoods of vulnerable communities and households are improved and their resilience is strengthened through integrated and multi-sectorial policies and programmes.”

3. The project outcome is: “FAO and its partner Organizations (UN sister agencies, government institutions, NGOs/CSOs and private sector stakeholders) have integrated food security, nutrition and livelihoods objectives and activities in regional, national and local policies and programmes.”

4. The outputs are the following:

Output 1 (advocacy): FAO staff, and other relevant policy-makers and programme planners at regional, national and local levels, are committed to integrating nutrition, food security and livelihoods objectives and activities in relevant policies and programmes.

Output 2 (technical support to project management and policy formulation): FAO officers integrate food security, nutrition and livelihoods considerations in programme/project design, implementation and evaluations, and in the formulation of food security-related policies.

Output 3 (capacity building): FAO staff and local teams in partner institutions operating at the regional, national, provincial and community levels are trained on integrated nutrition, food security and livelihoods interventions.

Output 4 (coordination and joint programming): FAO teams are proactively engaged in inter-institutional and inter-sectorial collaboration and joint programming, in particular with UN sister agencies and their counterpart institutions.

Output 5 (lessons-learning and knowledge-sharing): Field-tested good practices and lessons learned from food security, nutrition and livelihoods policies, programmes and interventions are documented, inserted in a knowledge bank and disseminated.

5. The project has following institutional arrangements: although the project is regional, with RAF as budget holder, the project team (a Food Security, Nutrition and Livelihoods Expert – P4 – and Communication Officer – P3) are based in Rome. This set-up was established to ensure the project team could engage in numerous processes that were managed at HQ level, so as to support nutrition mainstreaming in various initiatives (CAADP, emergency programmes, overall FAO strategic planning for nutrition). The Rome based project team had a very strong working relationship with the Senior Nutrition Officer for Africa (in post since June 2011). As the project team frequently travelled to Africa and was very regularly liaising with RAF, it could help ensure HQ-driven initiatives were informed by the needs and priorities of decentralised offices.

6. The project **implementation strategy** applied following principles/approaches:

- a. Adding value to ongoing policy and programming processes, such as the CAADP and Home Grown School Feeding.
- b. Working through existing coordination mechanisms, in particular multi-sectorial and inter-agency collaboration initiatives such as the Scaling Up Nutrition Movement and REACH partnership, and regional working groups on nutrition and food security.
- c. Seeking synergies with other FAO projects and development partners, and maximizing opportunities for co-funding, as a means of leveraging additional resources to achieve the project objectives and increase ownership of nutrition issues within FAO and amongst partners.
- d. Operating simultaneously at global, regional and national levels so as to maximize the project's influence on processes at each of these levels.

2 Purpose of the Evaluation

7. This evaluation is a final evaluation and its main purpose is ensure accountability to the donor and project partners and identify and share lessons learnt that can be of interest in the formulation/implementation of similar projects and for FAO's strategic planning (definition and implementation of the Strategic Objectives; management of the decentralisation process).

3 Evaluation framework

3.1 Scope

8. The time frame covered by the evaluation is from the project design (end 2009 – inception was in June 2010) to the project end (December 2013).

9. The geographical scope of the evaluation will be focused on the African region, including activities at the regional and sub-regional levels, as well as in selected focus

countries where the project has provided more direct support (e.g. Sierra Leone, Ghana, Tanzania, and Rwanda). However, the evaluation will also assess achievements at the global level, through activities in Headquarters (including contribution to the definition of FAO's Nutrition strategy and new Strategic Framework) and global level partnerships (namely REACH, SUN and forums such as the Ag2Nut Community of Practice).

10. For several activities, the project partnered with other FAO projects, namely the EU-FAO Global Governance for Hunger Reduction Programme and the French-funded project GCP/GLO/330/FRA, such potential impact cannot be attributed to GCP/RAF/454/GER alone. In such cases, however, the project can be evaluated for the role it played in fostering synergies and working as a catalyst.

3.2 Evaluation criteria

11. The project will be critically assessed through the internationally accepted evaluation criteria, namely: **relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability**.

12. In line with the new FAO project cycle, the evaluation will assess compliance with the following UN Common Country Programming Principles: Human Rights Based Approaches (HRBA)/ Right to Food/ Decent Work; Gender equality, Environmental sustainability, Capacity Development and Results Based Management.

Note: as the project was essentially focused on advocacy, capacity development and knowledge management, the project's contribution to issues such as Human Rights-based approaches, gender equality and environmental sustainability was essentially through a role of *promoting* such issues as part of advocacy and capacity development efforts.

3.3 Evaluation issues

13. The evaluation will focus on the following issues:

I. Relevance of concept and design

- a. Project relevance to: national/regional development priorities, programmes, needs of the population (in particular CAADP); UN Joint Programming and multi-sectorial / inter-agency collaboration on nutrition (SUN, REACH, SCN, Alliances Against Hunger); FAO Global Goals and Strategic Objectives/Core Functions; other aid programmes in the sector;
- b. Robustness and realism of the theory of change underpinning the project;
- c. Clarity, coherence and realism of the Logical Framework of the project (*see Annex 2*) and of its design, including:
 - The causal relationship between inputs, activities, outputs, expected outcomes (immediate objectives) and impact (development objectives);
 - Validity of indicators, assumptions and risks;
 - Approach and methodology;
 - Resources (human and financial) and duration;
 - Stakeholder and beneficiary identification and analysis;

- Institutional set-up and management arrangements.

II. Effectiveness of outputs and outcomes

d. Overall effectiveness of the project, actual or potential, in attaining its intermediate/specific objectives:

- Description and analysis of the outputs produced, in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. Key outputs for the evaluation team to assess include:
 - Under output 1 (advocacy):
 - Relevance and quality of project team's participation in international, regional and national level conferences;
 - Relevance and quality of the sensitization sessions organised by the project team in HQ and in Decentralised Offices during missions.
 - Production of advocacy materials
 - Under output 2 (technical support to project management and policy formulation):
 - Number of projects the project team contributed to (in formulation, implementation or evaluation), and timeliness and relevance of support provided.
 - Under output 3 (capacity building):
 - Quality of the sub-regional and country-level workshops organised by the project team on integrating nutrition in food security and agriculture programmes and investment plans, in collaboration with other partners (in particular support to the NEPAD CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development initiative).
 - Under output 4 (coordination and joint programming):
 - Quality of the support provided by the project team to the REACH secretariat and facilitators at global, regional and country levels
 - Facilitation of greater engagement of FAO in the SUN Movement and of linkages between SUN and CAADP at regional and country levels
 - Backstopping support to UNJPs.
 - Under output 5 (lessons-learning and knowledge-sharing):
 - Quality, relevance and coverage of the products developed by the project (videos, brochures, project fact sheets, website)
 - Contributions to networks such as Ag2Nut Community of Practice, the FSN Forum and Secure Nutrition, as well as internal FAO networks on communication and knowledge management.
 - Quality, relevance and use of guidelines produced by the project, in particular the Key Recommendations for Improving Nutrition through Agriculture
- Description and analysis of the outcomes achieved, expected and unexpected, their robustness and expectations for further uptake and diffusion. In particular the evaluation will assess to what extent the project contributed to:

- FAO integrating more nutrition objectives and activities in its programmes at regional, country, but also global levels;
 - African countries integrated greater consideration for nutrition in their agriculture strategies and greater attention to food-based approaches in their nutrition strategies;
 - Regional institutions (e.g. NEPAD, ECOWAS, COMESA, SADC, etc.) have integrated nutrition in their regional food security and agriculture strategies and promoted greater agriculture-nutrition linkages at country level;
 - Strengthening linkages between agriculture-based coordination mechanisms and initiatives (e.g. CAADP; Zero Hunger...), and multi-sectorial processes for promoting nutrition (e.g. SUN, REACH).
- e. Use made by the project of FAO's normative and knowledge products and actual and potential contribution of the project to the normative and knowledge function of the Organization.

III. Efficiency and effectiveness of project implementation process

- f. The evaluation team will assess how the project was implemented, including overall efficiency of delivery and management of available resources. Any major issue that affected implementation should be mentioned here.
- g. Assessment of project management:
- Quality, realism and focus of work plans;
 - Assessment of delivery, causes and consequences of delays and of any remedial measure taken, if any;
 - Monitoring and feed-back loop into improved management and operations;
 - Staff management;
 - Development and implementation of an exit strategy;
- h. Institutional Setup:
- Administrative and technical support by FAO HQ, regional, sub-regional and country offices;
 - Institutional set-up, internal review processes, coordination, in particular review of strengths, weaknesses, and lessons learnt, from the (uncommon) project set-up of having a regional project team based in Rome;
 - Inputs and support by the Government/s and resource partner/s.
- i. Assessment of financial resources management, including:
- Adequacy and realism of budget allocations to achieve intended results;
 - Adequacy and realism of Budget Revisions in matching implementation needs and project objectives;
 - Rate of delivery and budget balance at the time of the evaluation and in relation to work-plans.

IV. Analysis of the application of the UN common country programming principles and cross-cutting themes

j. Analysis of gender mainstreaming for gender equality. This will include:

- extent to which gender equality considerations were reflected in project objectives and design to address the needs, priorities and constraints of both women and men, and in the identification of beneficiaries;
- extent to which gender equality considerations were taken into account in project implementation and management;

Note: the project did not implement direct field activities but promoted gender issues as part of its promotion of agriculture-nutrition linkages.

- extent to which gender relations and equality have been or will be affected by the project.

k. Analysis of the Capacity Development dimension in the design, implementation and results of the project, at individual, organizational and enabling environment levels.¹⁷ This will include CD on both technical and soft-skills, i.e. planning, budgeting, partnering and negotiating. This will be a fundamental component of the evaluation given the project's strong focus on capacity development and advocacy. The evaluation team will assess:

- The relevance and quality of the technical guidance and training provided by the project;
- The institutional arrangements and processes used to delivery capacity development activities, and their potential contribution to the effectiveness, impact and sustainability of these activities
- The uptake/use of knowledge, skills and approaches promoted through the project.

l. Analysis of the adoption of the Human-Rights Based Approach, namely:

- the integration of the Right to Food dimension and principles, in the design, implementation and results of the project;
- The integration of decent rural employment, will not be assessed in this evaluation since not relevant for this project

m. Analysis of Partnerships and Alliances, namely:

- how they were planned in the project design and developed through implementation;
- their focus and strength; and
- their effect on project results and sustainability.¹⁸

This will include a review of alliances and partnerships within FAO, and with partners at global, regional and country level. Particular focus will be given to partnerships around CAADP, the SUN Movement, the REACH Partnership and the Standing Committee on Nutrition.

¹⁷ See: <http://www.fao.org/capacitydevelopment/en/>

¹⁸ See: <http://www.fao.org/partnerships/partners-home/en/>

- n. Analysis of environmental impacts: given the nature of the project (i.e. focus on capacity development and advocacy), the evaluation of the project's environmental impact is not relevant. However, the evaluation team can assess to what extent the project's advocacy and capacity development activities included environmental issues that are related to food and nutrition security.
- o. In the case of emergency projects, analysis of the extent to which the programme has effectively adhered to the principles promoted in the Humanitarian Charter and to the Minimum Standards as defined in the Sphere handbook.¹⁹

V. Impact

- p. Overall impact of the project, actual or potential, positive and negative, produced directly or indirectly, intended or unintended; and
- q. Overall contribution of the project to FAO Country Programming Frameworks, Organizational Result/s and Strategic Objectives, as well as to the implementation of the corporate Core Functions.

VI. Sustainability

- r. The prospects for sustaining and up-scaling the project's results by the beneficiaries and the host institutions after the termination of the project. The assessment of sustainability will include, as appropriate:
 - Institutional, technical, social and economic sustainability of proposed approaches and processes;
 - Expectation of institutional uptake and mainstreaming of the newly acquired capacities, or diffusion beyond the beneficiaries or the project;
 - Environmental sustainability: the project's contribution to sustainable natural resource management, in terms of maintenance and/or regeneration of the natural resource base.
14. Based on the above analysis, the evaluation will draw specific conclusions and formulate recommendations for any necessary further action by FAO, Regional institutions, Governments and/or other parties to ensure sustainable development, including any need for follow-up or up-scaling action. The evaluation will draw attention to specific good practices and lessons to be learned as they are of interest to other similar activities. Any proposal for further assistance should include specification of major objectives and outputs and indicative inputs required.

¹⁹ In the Humanitarian charter, humanitarian agencies jointed expressed their conviction that all people affected by disaster or conflict have a right to receive protection and assistance to ensure the basic conditions for life with dignity. See: <http://www.spherehandbook.org/>

4 Evaluation methodology

15. Any constraints faced by the evaluation will need to be explored and mitigating measures should be identified as appropriate.

4.1 Approach and tools

16. The evaluation will adhere to the UNEG Norms & Standards²⁰.

17. The evaluation will adopt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. Triangulation of evidence and information gathered will underpin its validation and analysis and will support conclusions and recommendations.

18. The evaluation will make use of the following methods and tools: review of existing reports, semi-structured interviews with key informants, stakeholders and participants, supported by check lists and/or interview protocols; direct observation during field visits; surveys and questionnaires.

19. The evaluation team will do so through a visit in Rome, to the Regional office in Accra and visit with local partners in Ghana, and through phone and Skype interviews.

20. The evaluation will also be able to draw upon existing documentation from the project, in particular the results of the follow-up interviews carried out with participants having attended the CAADP Nutrition workshops (follow-up survey for West Africa carried out by FAO consultant in October 2012; follow-up to all three workshops carried out amongst a sample of participants and partners in September 2013 by an intern; and follow-up with all country teams from East, Central and Southern Africa to be carried out by NEPAD in October/November 2013).

21. Particular attention will be devoted to ensure that women and other under-privileged groups will be consulted in adequate manner. Insofar as possible and appropriate, interaction will also take place with non-participants to canvass their opinions. The Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) framework can be used for assessment of project results.²¹

4.2 Stakeholders and consultation process

22. The evaluation team will discuss in detail with the key stakeholders of the project and will take into account their perspectives and opinions. Key stakeholders will include:

- FAO divisions with which the project has partnered, namely: ESA, TCI, TCE, former members of TCSP; former consultant responsible for the formulation of the FAO Nutrition Strategy; members of the SO1 and SO5 Core teams.
- FAO colleagues in the Regional Office for Africa (RAF)

²⁰ United Nations Evaluation Group, <http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards>

²¹ SWOT is a widely used strategic planning tool, useful also in the assessment of development interventions, to canvass their strengths and weaknesses, as well as future perspectives. It is particularly used in focus groups, but it can be adapted to individual interviews as well.

- Representatives of regional institutions, including: NEPAD, African Union, COMESA, SADC, ECSA, (potentially ECOWAS but had no direct contact since former nutrition focal point left – maybe Mohamed can advise)
- Government representatives from countries having benefitted from the project support, in particular in Sierra Leone; government representatives having participated in the CAADP Nutrition workshops.
- the resource partner;
- FAO Representatives in the participating countries;
- Other partners, in particular NGOs and representatives of Civil Society Organisations; and
- (If possible) Participants in communities, including farmers, processors, exporters, organizations and cooperatives, service providers, etc.

23. The evaluation team will maintain close liaison with: the FAO Office of Evaluation, and Project staff at headquarters, regional, sub-regional or country level. Although the mission is free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment on behalf of the Government, the donor or FAO.

24. The team will present its preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations to the project stakeholders in the visited country/ies and insofar as possible, in the relevant FAO Decentralized Office and in HQ, to obtain their feedback at the end of the data-gathering phase.

25. The draft ToR will be circulated among key stakeholders for comments before finalisation; suggestions will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by OED. The draft evaluation report will also be circulated among key stakeholders for comments before finalisation; suggestions will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by the evaluation team.

5 Roles and responsibilities

26. FAO Budget Holder (BH), the Lead Technical Officer (LTO) and the Project Manager of the project to be evaluated are responsible for initiating the evaluation process, drafting the first version of the Terms of Reference, and supporting the evaluation team during its work. They are required to participate in meetings with the team, make available information and documentation as necessary, and comment on the draft final terms of reference and report. Involvement of different members of the project team will depend on respective roles and participation in the project.

27. The BH is also responsible for leading and coordinating the preparation of the FAO Management Response and the Follow-up Report to the evaluation, fully supported in this task by the LTO. OED guidelines for the Management Response and the Follow-up Report provide necessary details on this process.

28. FAO Office of Evaluation assists the BH and LTO in drafting the ToR, in the identification of the consultants and in the organization of the team's work; it is responsible

for the finalization of the ToR and of the team composition;²² it shall brief the evaluation team on the evaluation methodology and process and will review the final draft report for Quality Assurance purposes in terms of presentation, compliance with the ToR and timely delivery, quality, clarity and soundness of evidence provided and of the analysis supporting conclusions and recommendations.

29. The Office of Evaluation has also a responsibility in following up with the BH for the timely preparation of the Management Response and the Follow-up to the MR.

30. The Evaluation Team is responsible for conducting the evaluation, applying the methodology as appropriate and for producing the evaluation report. All team members, including the Team Leader, will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs for the final draft and final report.

31. The Team Leader guides and coordinates the team members in their specific work, discusses their findings, conclusions and recommendations and prepares the final draft and the final report, consolidating the inputs from the team members with his/her own.

32. The Evaluation team will be free to expand the scope, criteria, questions and issues listed above, as well as develop its own evaluation tools and framework, within time and resources available.

33. The team is fully responsible for its report which may not reflect the views of the Government or of FAO. An evaluation report is not subject to technical clearance by FAO although OED is responsible for Quality Assurance of all evaluation reports.

34. As a contribution to the OED Knowledge Management System:

- the Team Leader will be responsible for completing the OED quantitative project performance questionnaire, to be delivered at the same time with the final evaluation report;
- OED will ask all team members to complete an anonymous and confidential questionnaire to get their feedback on the evaluation process.

35. For further details related to the tasks of the Team leader and team members, please refer to template TORs provided in annex.

6 Evaluation team

36. The evaluation team will be comprised of two evaluators:

- A team leader, with strong experience and skills in evaluation and in nutrition programming. S/he should have a very good understanding of the institutional context in which the project has operated, including the internal FAO context and broader inter-institutional collaboration on nutrition and food security.

²² The responsibility for the administrative procedures for recruitment of the team will be decided on a case-by-case basis.

37. A nutrition expert from the Africa region, with good understanding of FAO's work in nutrition and good knowledge of the institutional context at regional and sub-regional level.

38. The team work will be supported by the work of an evaluation analyst, who will undertake focused desk studies and analysis.

39. Mission members will have had no previous direct involvement in the formulation, implementation or backstopping of the project. All will sign the Declaration of Interest form of the FAO Office of Evaluation.

40. Furthermore, to the extent possible, the team will be balanced in terms of geographical and gender representation to ensure diversity and complementarity of perspectives.

Evaluation deliverables

41. The following text should be used, with appropriate time frames indicated for report preparation deadlines. Any other expected deliverable will be listed and described in this section.

42. The evaluation report will illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation issues, questions and criteria listed in the ToR. It will include an executive summary. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report.

43. The recommendations will be addressed to the different stakeholders and prioritized: they will be evidence-based, relevant, focused, clearly formulated and actionable.

44. The evaluation team will agree on the outline of the report early in the evaluation process, based on the template provided in Annex I of this ToR. The report will be prepared in English/French/Spanish²³, with numbered paragraphs, following OED template for report writing. Translations in other languages of the Organization, if required, will be FAO's responsibility.

45. The team leader bears responsibility for submitting the final draft report to FAO within two weeks from the conclusion of the mission. Within one week additional weeks, FAO will submit to the team its comments and suggestions that the team will include as appropriate in the final report within maximum two weeks.

46. Annexes to the evaluation report will include, though not limited to, the following as relevant:

- Terms of reference for the evaluation;
- Profile of team members;
- List of documents reviewed;
- List of institutions and stakeholders interviewed by the evaluation team;
- List of project outputs;
- Evaluation tools.

²³ Select as appropriate

7 Evaluation timetable

47. This section should provide a tentative work-plan and time-table for the whole evaluation including timing for clearance of both ToR and draft evaluation report.

48. The evaluation is expected to take place during October and November 2013. The country visit phase is expected to last approximately one week. The timetable in the box below shows a tentative programme of travel and work for the evaluation team. It will be finalised upon the recruitment of the evaluation team.

Box 1 Timetable of the evaluation

| Task | Dates | Duration | Responsibility |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| ToR finalization | 15th – 4th October | 2 weeks | Charlotte Dufour - OED |
| Team identification and recruitment | 20th September – 15th October | 3 weeks | OED, RAF |
| Mission organization | 5th-20th October | 2 weeks | Charlotte Dufour |
| Reading background documentation | 10th - October to mi-d-November | 1 month | Evaluation team |
| Briefing in Rome | 21-28 October | 1 week | Charlotte Dufour and OED |
| Travel to Accra (briefing by RAF + meetings with key stakeholders – debriefing in Accra) | 3 – 7 November | 1 week | Mohamed Ag Bendeck |
| Preparation of draft report | 9th-13th November | 1 week | Team leader and regional expert |
| Circulation of report for comments | 15th – 30th November | 2 weeks? | OED |
| Finalisation of report | 1st – 15th December | 2 weeks? | Team leader and regional expert |

Annex 2 List of Outputs

Output 1: Advocacy

FAO staff, and other relevant policy-makers and programme planners at regional, national and local levels, are committed to integrating nutrition, food security and livelihoods objectives and activities in relevant policies and programmes.

| <i>Number of sensitization sessions held in workshops organised/supported by the project conducted at regional and national levels (T=12): 32</i> | |
|---|---|
| Global level: | |
| 1 | REACH facilitator training 19th-22nd July, Rome; (7 participants) |
| 2 | Session on Nutrition and Urban/Peri-urban Horticulture in Symposium “Growing Greener Cities”, Dakar, 8 th December. (10 participants) |
| 3 | TCE: Session on nutrition in TCE Agents of Change workshop Rome, October 2011. |
| 4 | TCI Investment Days: Presentation on “Mainstreaming Nutrition in Agriculture Investment : where are we at ?” delivered for TCI – Investment days (1st session dedicated to nutrition) |
| 5 | FAO Emergency staff (TCE): 1.5 hour sensitization session on the causes of malnutrition in emergencies (part of “Hot Topics in Emergencies and Rehabilitation” seminar series), Jan 24th |
| 6 | FAO Investment Centre staff (TCI): 1 day sensitization session on Mainstreaming Nutrition in Agricultural Investments, 3rd April |
| 7 | Contribution to preparation and implementation of REACH facilitator training, held in Addis Ababa from November 5th-10th including several inputs on the role of agriculture |
| 8 | Follow-up to TCI sensitization session on nutrition (that was held in April 2012): a half-day workshop was held with TCI staff on November 21st to review the guidance checklist for mainstreaming nutrition in agriculture investment plans (dual objective: training of TCI staff and obtaining feedback to improve the guidance checklist for use in CAADP workshops and agriculture investment planning missions) |
| 9 | Advocacy and dissemination of the Synthesis of Guiding Principles on Agriculture Programming for Nutrition at SUN High Level Meeting in New York. |
| 10 | ES/TCE Seminar on Nutrition and Resilience “building blocks for joint programming” organized in FAO HQ for FAO staff and permanent representations, on January 31st - (approx. 50 participants) |
| 11 | Debriefing session on the CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development Initiative held by ESN, ESA and TCI in FAO HQs for Strategic Objective Core Teams and the Internal Task Team on Nutrition (April 18th) – (approx. 40 participants) |
| 12 | Secure Nutrition “Brown-Bag Lunch” seminar on Operationalizing the concept of mainstreaming nutrition in agriculture: A perspective and experiences from FAO” on June 11th in Washington, DC (includes information on CAADP process and on Afghanistan projects) - (approx. 20 participants) |
| Regional level | |
| 13 | Sierra Leone, Uganda and Tanzania : Training session on Nutrition, Food Security and the Right to Food for FAO staff and government counterparts involved in GCP/INT/087/GER (“Mainstreaming the Right to Food into Sub-national Plans and Strategies”), during Inwent training in Feldafing, Germany (9th September) (30 part.) |
| 14 | West Africa: Session during WHO training for ECOWAS Nutrition and Food Security focal points on “Translating Intersectoral Nutrition Policies Into Operational Programmes”, Abidjan 16-18th September (before ECOWAS Nutrition forum) (26 part.) |
| 15 | West Africa: Group work session on food security and nutrition during ECOWAS Nutrition forum, 23rd September (Abidjan) (about 25 participants) |
| 16 | West Africa: Sensitization of Nutrition Working Group for West Africa/Sahel members on FSNL and FAO’s work in nutrition, 19th October; (10 attendees) |
| 17 | Africa region: Session on the Role of FAO in addressing nutrition during the RAF/TCE Regional meeting for FAO Representatives and Emergency Coordinators in Africa, Naivasah, Kenya, 20-22nd September 2011. |
| 18 | West Africa: CAADP Nutrition Program Development Workshop; Dakar-9th – 12th November 2011; Preparation and facilitation of session: “Mainstreaming Nutrition in Agriculture Investment Plans: Why and How?” |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| | |
|---|--|
| 19 | Support to the preparation of the ECOWAS Nutrition Forum and presentation on: (1) The Hunger Free Initiative in West Africa and (2) The Role of the West African Alliance Against Hunger and Malnutrition (WAAAHM) in leading food and nutrition advocacy and policy dialogues to support the scaling up of country national nutrition programs. |
| 20 | CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development Workshop for East and Central Africa, held in Tanzania, from February 25th-March 1st – see output 3 |
| <u>Country level:</u> | |
| 21 | Mauritania: Training workshop on Food Security and Nutrition Linkages with REACH partners, 18th October (25 participants) |
| 22 | Mauritania: training workshop on nutrition impact assessment of food security programmes (December 15 th). (23 participants) |
| 23 | Rwanda: Sensitization of agriculture sector partners on FSNL linkages during Working Group meeting on Agriculture and Nutrition (11th November) (11 attendees) |
| 24 | Rwanda: Sensitization of UN heads of agencies and nutrition related officers on integrated nutrition programmes, during mission debriefing (12th November) |
| 25 | Sierra Leone: sensitization / group work session on how to strengthen the contribution of the agricultural sector to nutrition in the Sierra Leone National Nutrition Forum (March 10th and 11th) |
| 26 | Chad: Session on “From food production to improving nutrition”, during the FAO workshop « Strengthening the role of agriculture, livestock, and fisheries for improving food and nutrition security in the Sahel region of Chad », N’Djamena, 4th August 2011. (see also output 3) |
| 27 | Ethiopia: sensitization and discussion meeting with nutrition (REACH) partners (including Mohamed Ag Bendeche) and FAO staff on the “Role of food and agriculture for improving nutrition” 17th May. |
| 28 | Kenya: discussion meeting with FAO Kenya staff on strengthening FAO Kenya’s role in nutrition, 29th June. |
| 29 | Burkina Faso: contribution to a workshop on the National Programme for Rural Development, to support the integration of nutrition (by consultant Nanthilde Kamara) |
| 30 | South Sudan: 2 day workshop on integrating nutrition in food security and livelihoods interventions and multi-sectorial planning for nutrition, organized with the Food Security and Livelihoods cluster in collaboration with the nutrition cluster, in Juba, November 13th and 14th |
| 31 | Mozambique: Half-day workshop on agriculture-nutrition linkages organized jointly by REACH and FAO, November 27th, Maputo. |
| 32 | Awareness session on Nutrition sensitive agriculture at the Agricultural Joint Sector Review in Ghana, 29 - 31 May, 2013 (approx. 100 participants) |
| <i>Number of international and regional conferences attended and presentations made in those conferences (T=3): 24</i> | |
| <u>Global level:</u> | |
| 1 | First meeting of the National Alliances Against Hunger, Rome 22 - 24 June, 2010 |
| 2 | IFPRI and ILRI workshop on the CGIAR Mega Program 4 "Agriculture for Improved Nutrition and Health", in Addis Ababa on 29th and 30th July 2010. |
| 3 | Committee on Food Security 2010 side event “Nutrition and Food Security: Making the Connection” (contribution to the organization, FAO presentation and display of material) |
| 4 | Presentation made on “Supporting social synergies to make agriculture, nutrition and health work for each other” using examples from Afghanistan and Mauritania, in the IFPRI conference Leveraging agriculture for improved nutrition and health, in the session on “Social levers” Delhi, 10th- 12th February (travel costs paid by IFPRI) (around 100 participants) |
| 5 | SAFO Conference, Berlin, 10th May: participation in the Strategic Alliance for the Fortification of Oil organized by BASF and GIZ (to bring in experience of other food-based approaches in Africa) |
| 6 | Participation in technical Meeting for the preparation of “High Level Expert Forum on Food Security in Protracted Crises: Presentation on “The negative impacts of under-nutrition and key issues for addressing malnutrition in protracted crises”, 28-29th June. |
| 7 | Home Grown School Feeding (HGSF): participation in the workshop organized by the Partnership for Child Development (PCD) and WFP to review HGSF case studies for the production of source books and other reference materials (promotion of nutrition and inputs in African case studies), London, October 8th-9th October |

| | |
|---|---|
| 8 | Scaling Up Nutrition Senior Officials Meeting, in Brussels, 14th & 15th March – no presentation but participation in debates to share ongoing efforts on mainstreaming nutrition in agriculture and strengthen agriculture contributions to multi-sectorial efforts on nutrition in Africa. |
| 9 | “Meeting of the Minds” on Food and Agriculture Systems and Nutrition, organized by the SCN in Geneva, 25-27th March. Presentation on the CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development Initiative (joint presentation with NEPAD) + contributions to design of country case studies on nutrition-sensitive agriculture policies. (approx. 50 participants) |
| 10 | UNICEF International Conference on Child Malnutrition, Paris, 14th - 15th June – Presentation on the CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development Initiative, on the panel on Nutrition-sensitive agriculture. (approx. 40 participants) |
| 11 | Bread for the World event on “Sustaining Political Commitments to Scaling Up Nutrition” – facilitation of the working group session on Nutrition-sensitive agriculture (with Anna Herforth, independent) – (approx. 30 participants) |
| 12 | Launch of the Lancet Series on Child Malnutrition in Washington D.C.: discussant on the panellist on Papers 3 (Nutrition sensitive development) and 4 (Enabling Environment). – (approx. 200 participants) |
| Regional level | |
| 13 | African Union Side Event on Nutrition, Kampala, 24th July 2010 |
| 14 | 12th ECOWAS Nutrition Forum, Abidjan 20th – 24th September 2010. |
| 15 | Niger/ Sahel: Presentation made on “From food security to food and nutrition security – what’s the difference” in the Symposium International sur la Sécurité Alimentaire et Nutritionnelle (SISAN), in Niamey, Niger (28th-30th March). Preparation of sensitization and awareness raising working papers. |
| 16 | East and Central Africa: support to the preparation of a presentation made by Eleni Asmare (FAO Ethiopia nutritionist) in the Technical Donor Consultation on Nutrition held in Nairobi on April 27th |
| 17 | FAO/WHO Regional Consultation on Nutrition in Preparation for the ICN+21, for Francophone Africa, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, 4-6th July |
| 18 | Attendance of the Global Nutrition Foundation meeting on Home Grown School Feeding, Addis Ababa, May 16th-18th) (meeting organized through a partnership between GNF, WFP, the World Bank and the Partnership for Child Development) |
| 19 | Participation in the UNICEF regional meeting on “Scaling Up Nutrition in East and Southern Africa” (Nairobi, 14-15th June): presentation on “The Contribution of the Food and Agriculture Sector in the Fight Against Malnutrition |
| 20 | Key note presentation and participation in the USAID SPRING Nutrition-Global Learning and Exchange Event (N-GLEE) for Africa, December 10th-13th 2012, Kampala, Uganda. |
| 21 | Presentation on “From food security to nutrition security and the role of social protection” in SADC/France/UNICEF Seminar on Regional integration for Nutrition in Gaborone, Botswana (29th November) |
| 22 | Participation in the preparatory meeting for the High Level Meeting on the AU/FAO/Lula Foundation supported “Renewed Partnership for Ending Hunger and Malnutrition in Africa”, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 7-9th May: presentation on the CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development Initiative. – (approx. 30 participants) |
| 23 | Participation, with a presentation on the nutrition situation in Sub-Saharan Africa, in the training on simple food-based tools in food and nutrition security assessments. Accra. Ghana, 9-11th April. (26 participants) |
| 24 | Participation in the FAO-SFW 6th Multidisciplinary and Management Team Meeting with a presentation on ECOWAS Hunger Free Initiative/Project. Accra, Ghana, 15-18th April 2013. (approx. 60 participants) |
| Number of FAO staff, programme planners and policy-makers sensitized by the project on the importance of integrated food security, nutrition and livelihoods (T=50): <i>approx. 1640</i> | |
| Global level: | |
| 21 | (ESA, AGP, TCS, TCI, OCE, TCE, and REACH Secretariat) |
| 111 | (FOEP, FOEM, FIPM, TCE, OCE, OEKM, OEKR; participants in Delhi session on Social levers) |
| 105 | (TCI Investment Days, TCS) |
| 70 | <i>description not reported by project report</i> |
| 60 | <i>description not reported by project report</i> |
| 430 | <i>description not reported by project report</i> |

| | |
|--|---|
| 797 | |
| <u>Regional level</u> | |
| 44 | (ECOWAS country Nutrition and Food security focal points; members of Nutrition Working Group for West Africa and the Sahel; participants in Seminar on Nutrition and Urban/Peri-Urban Horticulture in Dakar Symposium "Growing Greener Cities") |
| 66 | (regional participants to the Dakar Workshop for West Africa in May, briefing of out posted officers in HQs, e.g. FAO Emergency Office for Africa, Nairobi; FAO sub-Regional Office for Central Africa) |
| 7 | (briefing of out posted officers in HQs, FAO regional officers attending FAO/TCE workshop in Naivasha) |
| 50 | <i>description not reported by project report</i> |
| 100 | <i>description not reported by project report</i> |
| 116 | <i>description not reported by project report</i> |
| 383 | |
| <u>Country level:</u> | |
| 86 | (Uganda, Ethiopia, Sierra Leone, Mauritania, Chad, Congo DRC, Rwanda, Tanzania; Regional Emergency coordinator for Southern Africa) |
| 44 | (FAO country officers briefed in HQs for Chad, Malawi, Rwanda, Ghana, Mauritania, Congo DRC; FAO staff in Sierra Leone and Niger; country level participants from Dakar workshop) |
| 121 | (CAADP workshop country participants previously not attending May workshop, FAO Reps and Emergency coordinators attending RAF/TCE Naivasha meeting, FAO country officers briefed in HQs) |
| 17 | <i>description not reported by project report</i> |
| 92 | <i>description not reported by project report</i> |
| 100 | <i>description not reported by project report</i> |
| 460 | |
| Number of FAO staff, programme planners and policy-makers <u>demonstrating commitment</u> to integrated FSNL approaches as a result of the project (T=20): 57+? Difficult to track | |
| <u>Global level:</u> | |
| 19 | (AGPM, AGS, OCE, TCER, TCEO, REACH) |
| 10 | (OCE, OEKR, AGS, FOEP and FIPM, OCE, TCE, REACH) |
| 6 | (OCE, , TCI) |
| <u>Regional level</u> | |
| 2 | (FAO Regional Emergency Coordination Office for West Africa and the Sahel) |
| 2 | (UNICEF West Africa, REACH West Africa) |
| 3 | (RAF, Emergency Regional Office for Southern Africa). |
| 2 | <i>description not reported by project report</i> |
| <u>Country level:</u> | |
| 4 | (Rwanda, Mauritania, Congo DRC) |
| 8 | (ERCU staff and FAO-Assistant Reps Niger, Chad and Sierra Leone) |
| 1 | (FAO Ethiopia) |
| Number of advocacy materials that the project team developed or has contributed to: 25 | |
| A project brochure was prepared to advocate for FSNL approaches and introduce the project to partners. In French and English. | |
| Nutrition and the MDGs: accelerating progress towards 2015. UNSCN statement prepared for the UN MDG Summit in New York (20-22 September 2010) | |
| Assisting the food and agriculture sector in addressing malnutrition. FAO Brief prepared for the UN MDG Summit in New York (20-22 September 2010). In French and English (regularly used for sensitization, including by OCE). | |
| Climate change and nutrition security: message to the UNFCCC negotiators. UNSCN Policy Brief prepared for the 16th United Nations Conference of the Parties (COP16), Cancun, 29 November - 10 December 2010 | |
| 1 Website and 1 video spot (French and English) of the workshop on "Maximising the nutritional impact of food security interventions in West Africa" organized with support from the project (see outcome 3) | |
| 1 brochure on Nutrition and Biodiversity links for two sub regional meetings on GEF projects in West Africa, held in Dakar and Monrovia in July 2011 | |

| |
|---|
| 1 PPT basic presentation on agriculture's role in combating malnutrition, used for sensitization of non-expert publics and training of Good Will Ambassadors. |
| 1 Nutrition Video Playlist on the FAO YouTube channel |
| 1 draft brochure on the linkages between forestry, food security and nutrition (AGN/FOEP collaboration) and inter-departmental review and meeting on the subject (May-November 2011). |
| Regular update of the standard nutrition briefing kit for newcomers, FAO colleagues in HQs and in decentralized offices. |
| Preparation of a web story on Guinea Bissau MDG-F joint programme - school garden activities - to be featured as the first story on the new FAO website on Partnerships (to be released in March 2012) |
| Preparation of a brochure for FAO Representatives on the role of FAO in the fight against malnutrition and on inter-agency collaboration on nutrition. |
| Launch of the project website |
| Support to the preparation of web stories on FAO's role in the MDG-F UNJP on Nutrition in Guinea Bissau, for the FAO website on partnerships |
| CAADP Nutrition workshops website in French and English |
| Brochure presenting the summary findings of the "Synthesis of Guiding Principles for Making Agriculture Work for Nutrition, in French and English |
| Brochure introducing two issues papers relevant for nutrition-related work in Sub-Saharan Africa: Social Protection and Nutrition, and Gender and Nutrition (in French and English) |
| Prepared webpages to facilitate online access to new publications: Sustainable Diets and Biodiversity book and Guidelines for measuring household and individual dietary diversity |
| Preparation of 3 success stories on Gender and Nutrition, for the official launch in New York for the UN Women, FAO, IFAD and WFP Joint Programme on Accelerating Progress toward the Economic Empowerment of Rural Women. Posted also on the FAO Gender website |
| Preparation of a Nutrition Poster for the FAO Emergency regional office for Africa, in Nairobi. |
| Regular inputs in various e-newsletters, including the UNSCN and AAHM e-newsletters, and in the weekly ES Department Newsletter (ES E- Update) |
| 1 Leaflet on Key Recommendations for Improving Nutrition through Agriculture, available on the UNSCN website |
| Publications, leaflets and video are reported on in the section "Output 5: lessons-learning and knowledge-sharing". |
| <i>Communication support to international and regional events related to food and nutrition security (introduced in 2nd progress report of 2011)</i> |
| Africa Nutrition Day Commemoration (AFNSD): set of advocacy materials sent to FAO regional, sub-regional and country offices in Africa (RAF, SFE, SFW, FAO Ethiopia and FAO Ghana). The AU Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture issued a Letter of Appreciation of FAO's contribution to AFNSD, in particular for the Ethiopia events (see attachment). |
| Coordination of publications displays, exhibitions and video broadcastings to raise awareness and visibility of Agriculture-nutrition linkages through examples from Africa during conferences and events (World Food Week, Asia Nutrition Forum, Regional workshops, etc.). |
| Organization of a one week communication and advocacy event on "Fighting Hunger through Sustainable Smallholder Agriculture - From sustainable production to sustainable diets", targeting FAO Staff and Country and Partner Representatives during the FAO 2012 Committee on Agriculture week (interactive exhibitions in FAO's main Hall, video interviews and Intranet for FAO staff at decentralized level). See example on the event featured experiences from Africa and was attended by several African delegations. |
| Preparation of material for CFS Atrium exhibits and side events on Nutrition/Sustainable Diets, Food for the cities and UNSCN (3 roll-ups, publication stand, and featuring of Nutrition projects' films) |
| Support to communication in ECOWAS Nutrition Forum |
| Preparation of a Leaflet for the launch of the Food Safety and Nutrition Awareness Campaign for Africa at the Africa Food and Nutrition Day, and of an Action Plan for the campaign, in collaboration with RAF Staff. |
| Preparation and pouching of material to Addis Ababa, Nairobi and Accra for the Africa Food and Nutrition Day, as well as for a nutrition symposium in Nairobi and knowledge share fair in Addis. |

| |
|--|
| Preparation of briefing kits and distribution material for international conferences and regional workshop/conferences. |
| Coordinated contributions from the Nutrition Division and from out posted colleagues, to newsletters and information notes (Codex Africa, UNSCN e-update, AAHM, etc.) |
| CAADP Nutrition Workshop for East and Central Africa : Development and maintenance of a dedicated website in French and English; Provision of publications, brochures, posters, videos for the 2workshop, and technical communication guidance provided as requested by the NEPAD Communication Head |
| Launch of the publication Indigenous Peoples' food systems & well-being - Interventions & policies for healthy communities at the UN Permanent Forum for Indigenous Peoples' issues in NY, chaired by the Permanent Forum's Chair Myrna Cunningham. |

Output 2: technical support to project management and policy formulation

FAO officers integrate food security, nutrition and livelihoods considerations in programme/project design, implementation and evaluations, and in the formulation of food security-related policies.

| <i>Number of FAO projects to which the project team has made significant contributions* in terms of technical support (total compiled from list below) (T= at least 35)</i> | |
|--|---|
| For project formulation (T=at least 10): 13 | |
| 1 | Regional Emergency Coordination Office for West Africa and the Sahel: preparation of concept notes for ECHO and OFDA for sub-regional DRM programme for improving food and nutrition security. (October) |
| 2 | Rwanda : Preparation of concept note for joint project between FAO, WFP, WHO and UNICEF on school nutrition (November) (AGN is LTU) |
| 3 | Mauritania: Contribution to the preparation of the formulation of a Food Security Strategy. Facilitated linkages with REACH and Nutrition Strategic planning processes |
| 4 | Sierra Leone: formulation of a concept note in response to the EU Call for Proposals on Innovative Approaches to Food Security in Sierra Leone (in consultation with AGN, AGA, ESA and FI) |
| 5 | Chad (ERCU): formulation of a programme strategy and concept note for an integrated programme on food and nutrition security in the Kanem and Bahr-e-Gazal region (technical support mission 24th July-5th August) |
| 6 | Formulation of the German-funded project on “Mainstreaming food and nutrition security and the right to food into the Smallholder Commercialization Programme of Sierra Leone” (GCP/SIL/042/GER) – in collaboration with ESA |
| 7 | Formulation of the German-funded project on “Hunger Free Initiative for West Africa” (GCP /RAF/475/GER) |
| 8 | Contribution to the formulation of the EU funded MDG 1 Joint Programme in Mozambique (contribution to FAO component; other agencies include WFP and IFAD). |
| 9 | Formulation, together with TCE of the nutrition component of the ECHO-funded project “Building capacity for better food security programming in emergency and rehabilitation contexts” à Funding confirmed € 877.690,00 and project expected start date August 2013. Targeted regions and countries include the Horn of Africa (Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, South Sudan) and the Sahel (Burkina Faso, Niger and Chad) |
| 10 | Response to a call for a Letter of Inquiry from the Gates Foundation to establish a consortium on Agriculture Development and Nutrition in Africa, together with NEPAD and the Earth Institute. USD 25 million requested for the consortium, for a total of 5 years. Programme would support efforts to mainstream nutrition in agriculture in 7 countries (Burkina Faso, Mali, Ghana, Ethiopia, Uganda, Tanzania and Kenya). Response on success of applications expected in August. |
| 11 | Preparation of a concept note for German funding on “Mainstreaming Nutrition in CAADP and Agriculture Interventions in Sub-Saharan Africa” – accepted and proposal to be developed by 31st July. |
| 12 | Contribution to formulation of two projects UN Joint Projects in Rwanda (formulation coordinated by REACH): SDC Joint project on “Effectively Fighting against Chronic malnutrition in Nyamagabe and Rutsiro District” (approved) |
| 12 | “Accelerating stunting reduction among under-two children in Rwanda” to be funded by The Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands (approval pending). |

| During implementation (T= at least 20): 16 | |
|--|--|
| 1 | Mauritania: Support to « Mise au point et expérimentation pilote d'un protocole d'évaluation de l'impact nutritionnel des programmes de sécurité alimentaire » (OSRO/MAU/001/EC). (Facilitated 2 workshops see output 3). |
| 2 | Mauritania: Support to MDG-F on Children, Nutrition and Food Security. Support to annual review workshop, strengthened synergies between food security and nutrition components, and collaboration with AGS for backstopping FAO post-harvest activities. |
| 3 | Mali: MDG-F Improving Child Nutrition and Food Security in the most vulnerable municipalities in Mali (UNJP/MLI/032/SPA). Technical backstopping on FNSL and communication, and facilitation of technical backstopping from other units and divisions, has resulted in more integrated and cross-sectorial approaches. |
| 4 | Mozambique: MDG-F Children, Food Security and Nutrition in Mozambique (UNJP/MOZ/097/SPA). AGN is LTU. Contribution: preparation of TOR for a full-time international nutrition consultant to support National Nutrition planning, facilitation and strengthening of FAO Mozambique participation in REACH and support to nutrition education work. |
| 5 | Global: "Developing a Response Analysis Framework for Food Security Emergencies". (OSRO/RAF/910/EC). Support to mainstreaming nutrition in response analysis |
| 6 | Cape Verde : FNSL expert was team leader for the FAO/WFP joint inception mission for the UNJP on School Nutrition and Food Security in Cape Verde (UNJP/CVI/042/UNJ) – 4th-15th April |
| 7 | Niger: Provided desk-based assistance and organized a technical support mission (with consultant Farah Ali) to the MDG-F UNJP on Children, Food Security and Nutrition with the objective of assisting FAO Niger in strengthening the nutritional impact of its activities in the MDG-F (mission co-funded with the UNJP) |
| 8 | EU-FAO Improved Global Governance for Hunger Reduction Programme GCP/INT/130/EC: support to mainstream nutrition across the programme outputs; participation in several country task teams (Somalia, Sudan, Niger, and support to Ethiopia and Kenya teams) |
| 9 | Sahel crisis response: contribution to the formulation of FAO's response to the Sahel crisis; support to TCE for fielding and backstopping a nutrition consultant based in the Sub-regional Emergency Office for West Africa, Dakar; participation in the Sahel Task Force. |
| 10 | Support to the Nairobi-based Food Security and Nutrition Working Group on addressing nutrition in the FSNWG and its sub-groups, in particular the livestock sub-group (includes mission to support the FSNWG strategic planning workshop held in Nairobi on May 31st). |
| 11 | Technical Support to the Somalia Food Security and Nutrition Analysis Unit (participation in the Project Management Advisory Committee (PMAC) on May 15th in Nairobi). |
| 12 | Support to the coordinator of the Brazil-WFP-FAO project "Purchase from Africans for Africa" (OSRO/RAF/202/BRA) |
| 13 | Desk-based, occasional support to the German-funded project "Mainstreaming Nutrition and the Right to Food in Sierra Leone's Smallholder Commercialisation Programme" |
| 14 | EU Global Governance for Hunger Reduction: support to mainstreaming nutrition in the programme outputs and support to linkages between the programme and ongoing in-country nutrition work in African countries. |
| 15 | Initiative des 3N in Niger (les Nigériens Nourissent les Nigériens): promotion of the Zero Hunger approach, in the context of the Renewed Partnership for Ending Hunger and Malnutrition in Africa. |
| 16 | Tanzania: in-country briefing and support to newly appointed APO on food and nutrition security in Tanzania, in particular with regards to the follow-up to the CAADP Nutrition workshop (4-5th March) |
| For evaluation (T=at least 5): 3 | |
| 1 | Rwanda : Evaluation of FAO School Garden project (part of Joint UN programme) |
| 2 | REACH Mauritania: Participation in the REACH evaluation mission in Mauritania from January 30th – February 4th 2011. (travel costs funded by REACH) |
| 3 | Contribution to the evaluation of the regional project "Addressing HIV and Gender inequities through a food security and nutrition response in Eastern and Central Africa" (OSRO/RAF/010/SWE) – technical support to address recommendations of evaluation and finalize management response. |
| Other FAO initiatives to which the project provides technical support: 11 | |
| 1 | TCER: Continued participation in strategic planning on Disaster Risk Management at corporate and regional levels |
| 2 | AG intra-departmental collaboration: participation in the AG workshops on strengthening intra-departmental collaboration (16th June) and follow-up action |

| | |
|--|---|
| 3 | ITT: Participation in the International Task Team on Mainstreaming Nutrition in FAO |
| 4 | Contribution to the preparation of the ICN regional consultation meeting in Ouagadougou (4th-6th July) |
| 5 | Active participation to the 2011 AG Communication Review workshops and meetings and inputs in the draft communication strategy for the AG Department. |
| 6 | Contribution to the FAO Nutrition Strategy (participation in strategic planning workshops, Internal Task Team meetings, and regular discussions with nutrition advisor in charge of the strategy formulation) |
| 7 | FAO Country Programming Frameworks: provided inputs on nutrition mainstreaming for the sub-regional workshop on the CPF organized by TC in East Africa (for SFE) |
| 8 | Contribution to the FAO Nutrition Strategy (continued from previous reporting period) Technical assistance mission to South Sudan in support of the Food Security Livelihoods Cluster, on integrating nutrition in FSL assessment and interventions, multi-sectorial collaboration on nutrition, and support to FAO South Sudan on integrating nutrition in the FAO programme |
| 9 | Strategic Framework of FAO: Contribution to the Strategic Objective 5 (resilience) High Level Work Plan (HLWP) to ensure nutrition is well incorporated; support to the ESN focal points for Strategic Objective 1 (eradicating hunger and malnutrition); and support to RAF focal point on SO3 HLWP to on social protection and nutrition component |
| 10 | Contribution to FAO's inputs in the post-2015 Development agenda preparation: support to the promotion of food-based approaches to nutrition and agriculture-nutrition linkages in the post-2015 Development Framework. |
| 11 | Inputs provided on food and agriculture contribution to nutrition for the finalization of the SADC Food and Nutrition Security Strategy |
| Number of FAO projects to which project team has made some contribution (e.g. review and technical clearance project documents and plans of action): 18 | |
| 6 | projects for Côte d'Ivoire, Madagascar, DRC and Mali, and TCE Country Plan of Action for Sudan |
| 5 | emergency response projects for Côte d'Ivoire, TCE Country Plan of Action –POA- for Guinea Bissau, PoA for Chad, PoA for Niger; project on non-wood forest products Benin |
| 1 | Contribution to the development of a concept note on social protection, agriculture and nutrition in Africa; |
| 1 | Technical review of the project document for the EU-funded "Food Security Information System for Households: Enhancing Decision Making (FISHED)" |
| 1 | Review of Zimbabwe Country Programming Framework |
| 1 | Contribution to preparation of communication materials for the regional workshop ENACT project (Capacity Building of Professionals in Nutrition Education in Africa) |
| 2 | Technical clearance of proposals for the EU in Madagascar and in Mauritania |
| 1 | Burkina Faso: technical support on the integration of nutrition in the National Programme for Rural Development and on the development of a nutrition curriculum for the rural agricultural college |
| 18 | |

Output 3: capacity-building

FAO staff and teams in partner institutions operating at the regional, national, provincial and community levels are trained on integrated nutrition, food security and livelihoods interventions.

| | |
|---|--|
| Number of regional workshops organised and/or supported by the project (T=4) 5 | |
| 1 | Sub-regional workshop on "Maximising the nutritional benefits of food security interventions in West Africa" organized through the Nutrition Working Group for West Africa in collaboration with the REACH partnership and Action Contre la Faim International. (Dakar, May 24th-27th) |
| 2 | Technical partner for the NEPAD West Africa workshop on Mainstreaming Nutrition in CAADP Investment Plans - Dakar-9th-12th November 2011. |
| 3 | Ghana, 14-16 February 2012: RAF/AGN Nutrition Workshop for FAO decentralized staff in sub-Saharan Africa, organized to share information and experiences in the perspective of a better coordination in 2012-2013. (30 participants) |

| | |
|--|---|
| 4 | CAADP Agriculture-Nutrition Capacity Development workshops: • Follow-up to the West Africa workshop (supported by the project in November 2011) • Technical and Financial Support to NEPAD for the organization of the workshops for East, Central and Southern Africa: sponsored preparation meeting held in Tanzania on March 22-23; lead partner to coordinate the technical content of the workshop; management support to the steering committee. (next workshop planned for East and Central Africa from November 12-16th in Tanzania) |
| 5 | CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development Process |
| Number of country-level workshops and trainings organized and/or supported by the project team (T=8): | |
| 1 | Mauritania: Training workshop on Food Security and Nutrition Linkages with REACH partners, 18th October (25 participants) |
| 2 | Mauritania: training workshop on nutrition impact assessment of food security programmes (December 15th). (23 participants) |
| 3 | Sierra Leone: Support to the preparation, and facilitation of the National Nutrition Forum in Sierra Leone (March 10th-12th) |
| 4 | Chad: half-day workshop on « Strengthening the role of agriculture, livestock, and fisheries for improving food and nutrition security in the Sahel region of Chad », N'Djamena, 4th August 2011. |
| 5 | South Sudan: 2 day workshop on integrating nutrition in food security and livelihoods interventions and multi-sectorial planning for nutrition, organized with the Food Security and Livelihoods cluster in collaboration with the nutrition cluster, in Juba, November 13th and 14th (joint mission with ESA, co-funded by EU Global Governance Programme) |
| Number and profiles of practitioners participating in trainings and workshops on integrated FSNL approaches (T=360): | |
| 55 | 7 participants in REACH facilitator training and 48 in training workshops in Mauritania. Profiles of participants in Mauritania were food and nutrition security professionals from UN, NGOs and Government |
| 57 | West Africa (Dakar) workshop: participants in the Dakar workshop. Participants included representatives of ministries of health and agriculture, national and international NGOs, UN, donors, research institutions (IFPRI, IRD), inter-sectorial coordination facilitators (REACH, MDG-F facilitators, government coordinators...). |
| 17 | Chad: 17 participants (President advisor to food security, NPFS M&E, UNDP, WFP, UNICEF, NGOs) |
| 180 | NEPAD regional workshop on Mainstreaming Nutrition in CAADP Investment Plans for West Africa : 180 participants including representatives of 17 west African countries (Ministries of agriculture, finance, health, planning, Civil Society, Private Sector), institutions / donors involved in the steering committee (NEPAD, ECOWAS including WAHO and CILSS, USAID, the World Bank, FAO, UNICEF, WHO, WFP, the Gates Foundation, Helen Keller International, Action Contre la Faim, the Red Cross, ROPPA, African Development Bank), research institutions (IFPRI, University of Benin, University of the North West Potchefstroom, Iowa State University, Sierra Leone Research Institute,...) |
| 30 | RAF/AGN Nutrition workshop: FAO staff from headquarters, RAF, Emergency Offices and 21 Country Offices, working in Angola, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Congo DRC, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Uganda and Zimbabwe. |
| 57 | South Sudan: participants from the Ministry of Agriculture, FAO, WFP, UNICEF, NGOs, and Civil Society Organisations (largely members of the FSL cluster and nutrition cluster) |
| 20 | Mozambique: participants from SETSAN, REACH, Ministry of Agriculture, USAID, CIDA |
| 200 | participants in the CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development Workshop, including professionals from government, civil society, donors, INGOs, academia and producer organizations working in agriculture, health, education and women's affairs. |
| 616 | |
| Percent of participants expressing a good to very good satisfaction with the workshop contents and methods (90%): | |
| Information was unfortunately not collected in Mauritania workshops. A training evaluation format underway for use in all future trainings to be organized / supported by the project. | |
| 100% of participants in Dakar workshop expressing good to very good satisfaction with the workshop content, methods, facilitation, and logistics | |
| 95% of participants in CAADP nutrition workshop for west Africa expressing good to very good satisfaction with the workshop content, methods, facilitation, and logistics | |
| RAF/AGN workshop: 96% of participants (out of the 26 who filled in the evaluation form) expressed high/very high satisfaction with the workshop content and methods | |

| |
|---|
| TCI sensitization workshop (see output 1): 78-92.5% “good” to “very good” satisfaction with the workshop (rating varies according to different aspects of workshop). Request for a more in-depth training on mainstreaming nutrition in agriculture investment plans (to be conducted as part of/or before the TCI Investment Days) |
| South Sudan: compilation of detailed workshop evaluation results to be completed (general results were very positive with a vast majority of participants expressing a high degree of satisfaction) |
| Mozambique: no formal evaluation was conducted by participants oral feedback was very positive |
| 30% participants found the workshop generally “very good” and 64% “good” (overall: 94% satisfaction rate). More detailed comments on the workshop available upon demand. |

Output 4: coordination and joint programming

FAO teams are proactively engaged in interinstitutional and intersectoral collaboration and joint programming, in particular with UN sister agencies and their counterpart institutions.

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>The number of agreements, commitments, declarations and collaboration agreements generated by the regional interventions of the project team (T=5): 3</i> | |
| 1 | Commitment by UNICEF to co-fund follow-up activities to the Dakar Workshop through an EU-funded programme on nutrition and food security (activities will include regional trainings + national level workshops / activities – plan of action under development). |
| 2 | Letter of Agreement signed with the NPCA (NEPAD Coordination Agency) Food Security and Nutrition unit, for the implementation of the CAADP workshops, the organization of the Africa Food and Nutrition Security Day, and lessons learning on linking school feeding to family agriculture. |
| 3 | Agreement for strengthening collaboration between UNICEF (Regional Office for East and Southern Africa) and FAO (RAF) in East and Southern Africa. |
| <i>The number of joint initiatives or programmes initiated and/or strengthened through the project's intervention (T=6): 14</i> | |
| 1 | Significant contribution of project team to the design of the CGIAR Research Program 4 "Agriculture for Improved Nutrition and Health", in Addis Ababa on 29th and 30th July 2010. |
| 2 | Rwanda: school gardens more effectively integrated in wider UN support to school nutrition related activities |
| 3 | Mauritania: Strengthened integration of food security and nutrition components as a result of technical support provided by project team. Supported collaboration between FAO and WFP on post-harvest management. |
| 4 | Brazil-FAO-Africa cooperation programme: Significant contribution to the design and preparation of the FAO-Brazil Cooperation Programme “Support to the development of projects for strengthening agriculture and the promotion of food and nutrition security – Linking Family Agriculture to School Feeding and Food Assistance – A Model for Africa” |
| 5 | FAO-WFP collaboration on school-based nutrition: Contributed to revival of FAO-WFP collaboration on school-based nutrition, in particular on Home-Grown School Feeding |
| 6 | Alliance Against Hunger: Contribution and active participation in the AAHM Advisory Group meetings |
| 7 | REACH: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in REACH missions when possible (e.g. Mauritania, Sierra Leone) • Briefings / desk-based support to countries where REACH is expanding (Niger, Ethiopia) • Desk-based support to the REACH operational research in Sierra Leone • Regular technical support to REACH secretariat on food-based approaches and agriculture-nutrition linkages |
| 8 | UN Joint Programme on School-based Nutrition and Food Security in Cape Verde: inception mission and regular backstopping support. (also mentioned in output 2) |
| 9 | Technical assistance missions to MDG-F UNJP on Children Food Security and Nutrition in Niger (also mentioned under output 2). |
| 10 | CAADP : The partnership with NEPAD, USAID and other partners for the preparation of regional workshops on Mainstreaming nutrition in Agriculture Investment plans has generated considerable interest within FAO (in particular TCI and TCS) and amongst Ministries of Agriculture, as well as selected Ministries of Finance in West Africa. This has contributed to raising commitment of agriculture sector professionals and decisions-makers to explicitly address nutrition, and has increased the interest and awareness of partners involved in REACH and SUN on the role of agriculture in fighting |

| | |
|----|---|
| | malnutrition. (The project team has facilitated the participation of the REACH Secretariat and SUN team in the NEPAD workshop preparation, and follow-up) |
| 11 | Contribution to the design of a process to launch a West Africa Hunger-Free Initiative (to be supported by GCP /RAF/475/GER) |
| 12 | Congo DRC, project TCP/DRC/3303 « Amélioration de la sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle et lutte contre le Konzo dans la province de Bandundu »: communication support to develop a communication strategy and tools for behaviour change communication among communities. |
| 13 | Partnership between FAO/WFP/Partnership for Child Development and the World Bank on Home Grown School Feeding at global and country level strengthened, in part due to contributions from the project (e.g. attendance and funding of FAO participants to go to HGSF conference in Addis in May 2012, support to Cape Verde UNJP, support to NEPAD activities on HGSF through LoA, and attendance in London PCD/WFP meeting). |
| 14 | The CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development workshop continues to strengthen the contribution of the agriculture sector to the SUN Movement and REACH partnership in participating countries, and the collaboration between the SUN and REACH secretariats through this process is also consolidated. |

Output 5: lessons-learning and knowledge-sharing

Field-tested good practices and lessons learned from food security, nutrition and livelihoods policies, programmes and interventions are documented, inserted in a knowledge bank and disseminated.

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Number of lesson sharing workshops which the project team organizes or contributes to (see also indicators for Output 3) (T=12): 2</i> | |
| 1 | Workshop of the FAO corporate Working Group on Good Practices (project team is part of the Working Group core members) |
| 2 | Participation to the second Agri-knowledge Share Fair (IFAD, 26-29 September 2011), and organization of 2 sessions, on Biodiversity and Art for nutrition (with AGNA) and on joint analysis and planning at local level for nutrition (based on the joint planning guidelines); participation to several sessions and discussions for networking. |
| <i>Number of discussion forums and working groups to which the project team participates and where members share experiences and materials on issues related to food security, nutrition and livelihoods and to communication and information: 11</i> | |
| 1 | Participation in the incipient Ag-Nut Community of Practice |
| 2 | Participation in the Communication Task Force for the FAO Corporate Strategy on Information Systems for Food Security (ISFS) |
| 3 | Participation in the FAO Communication community of practice |
| 4 | Participation in FSN Forum discussions |
| 5 | Facilitation of a Ag2Nut Community of Practice Discussion on “Nutrition-sensitive value chains vs. nutrition-sensitive food systems”, November 2011 |
| 6 | Participation to the design of the FAO DRM knowledge platform, to ensure proper visibility of agriculture-nutrition linkages and access to key resources |
| 7 | Contribution to collaboration between FAO and the World Bank on the WB-hosted Secure Nutrition Platform |
| 8 | Support to the facilitation of an online consultation on Making agriculture work for nutrition: Prioritizing country-level action, research and support on the FSN forum from the 11th September to 8th October 2012 |
| 9 | Contribution to the Post-2015 Development agenda consultation process on food and nutrition security |
| 10 | Indigenous Peoples’ Working Group, FAO |
| 11 | ES departmental communication Team |
| <i>Number of good practices documented and made available by the project team (T=at least 2 per country supported):</i> | |
| <u>Fact sheets</u> | |
| Preparation and finalization of a factsheet on the use of fuel-saving stoves in Lesotho | |
| 1 | on Water management in Tanzania |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6 other factsheets under preparation | |
| African Green Leafy Vegetable in Kenya - Re-insertion of local vegetables in food markets and consumption patterns (Biodiversity) | |
| FSNL Fact sheets : Regular updating of existing FSNL fact sheets and posting of these fact sheets on the project website + three factsheets under development | |
| FSNL Fact sheets : Regular updating of existing FSNL fact sheets and posting of these fact sheets on the project website + 1 factsheet under development | |
| Adaptation of the existing Factsheets to the format and aim (providing technical know-how to smallholders and grass-root actors) of the TECA database, and creation of a TECA Nutrition category to host 9 good practices for nutrition (http://teca.fao.org/technology-categories/nutrition) | |
| Chapter on the experience of the Cape Verde School Feeding and School Nutrition programme written in collaboration with WFP for the WFP/PCD/FAO Source book on School Feeding in Middle-Income countries (FAO added as a co-publisher as a result of adding Cape Verde case study and participation in PCD meeting in London mentioned under output 1) | |
| Contribution to a capitalization of lessons learnt from the 24 nutrition joint programmes funded by the Millennium Development Achievement Fund (MDG-F), based on an extensive desk review as well as in-depth interviews with field staff. The report highlights the added value, constraints and opportunities of FAO's engagement in joint programming on nutrition and gives recommendations for enhancing FAO's future role in inter-sectorial and inter-agency joint programming in ensuring that food and agriculture are adequately integrated in activities aiming to improve nutrition. It was one of the background documents for FAO's contribution to the MDG-F Madrid meeting on March 7th/8th 2013 | |
| <u>Other</u> | |
| MDG-F Newsletter (inter-country information exchange and coordination) – (2 issues: July and October 2010) | |
| MDG-F Newsletter (inter-country information exchange and coordination – 2 issues : February and July 2011 | |
| Survey of interesting food security and nutrition projects in West Africa initiated during the preparation of the Dakar workshop (to be continued) | |
| Number of guidelines relating to FSNL which the project team produces/contributes to: 10 | |
| 1 | Layout of the Joint Planning Guidelines for Food Security Nutrition and Livelihoods finalized |
| 2 | First report of the FAO corporate Working Group on Good Practices (Guidelines) |
| 3 | Guidelines for Joint Planning for Nutrition, Food Security and Livelihoods: soft version finalized and circulated; layout and printing planned in second half of 2011 |
| 4 | Adaptation of “Making horticulture projects work for food and nutrition security” |
| 5 | Initial drafting of guidelines on the role of food processing projects for improving food and nutrition security |
| 6 | Brief on FAQs on the documentation of good practices for field staff (finalisation ongoing in collaboration with OEKR, based on the result of project team video-conferences with the field staff) |
| 7 | 1 publication: Synthesis of Guiding Principles on Agriculture Programming for Nutrition + 1 brochure – in French and English. (counted in previous report – layout completed and document uploaded on FAO docrep) |
| 8 | New: REACH Nutrition Action Guides on food and agriculture under development in collaboration with REACH Secretariat |
| 9 | Core principles on Making Agriculture Work for Nutrition drafted (1 page statement based on the basis of the Synthesis of Guiding Principles on Agriculture Programming for Nutrition). This statement will be circulated for broad consultation by FAO and the SCN, with a view of making it a formal statement that can be endorsed by SUN members and used for advocacy (e.g. CFS, CAADP...) |
| 10 | Guidance checklist for mainstreaming nutrition in agriculture investment plans for use in CAADP workshops and agriculture investment planning under development in partnership with TCI (co-funded by EU Global Governance programme) |
| Number of audio-visual materials produced (T=1 video and 10 audios): 11 | |
| 1 | A 13min video on the Dakar workshop in English and French (available on YouTube) and shared with the Ag-Nut CoP |
| 2 | 5 min advocacy video on Agriculture for Nutrition, prepared for the UNGA side event on SUN, Washington, Sept.2011. available on FAO YouTube |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 | French version of the Agriculture and Nutrition Video (video prepared in English for SUN in 2011) for use in French-speaking Africa |
| 4 | Two (2) short videos on FAO's technical services and current challenges (prepared for CoAg meeting): |
| 5 | • Micro gardens |
| | • Natural resources |
| 6 | Support to the preparation of a video on Malawi complementary feeding project, in collaboration with the FAO Nutrition Education Group. |
| 7 | 1 Video and 1 website on Nutrition and Resilience "building blocks for joint programming" (Video also listed on the FAO Nutrition YouTube channel) |
| 8 | 1 Short version of the video Agriculture for Nutrition for use in training modules |
| 9 | 1 Spanish version of the Video Agriculture and Nutrition |
| 10 | 1 Video on REACH, focused on the Addis Ababa workshop (Nov. 2012) |
| 11 | 1 video (produced by USAID) with interview of FNSL officer sharing experiences on mainstreaming nutrition in agriculture, in particular CAADP and Feed the Future |
| <i>Number of practitioners reporting they use the produced materials (and institutions they work for) (T=at least 100)</i> | |
| | information still missing |
| <i>Percentage of those practitioners who express good to very good satisfaction with the materials produced (T=90%)</i> | |
| | information still missing |

Annex 3 CAADP Mainstreaming Workshops

Background

The project team organized together with the Nutrition Working Group for West Africa a workshop for “Maximizing the nutritional benefits of food security interventions in West Africa” in Dakar in May 2011. One of the aims of the workshop was to strengthen the dialogue between health and agriculture staff and also to share experiences on agriculture-nutrition linkages across the region.

Following the workshop, USAID and the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) approached the project team and invited FAO to be involved in a series of 3 workshops to be held to strengthen the nutrition component of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP).

CAADP was developed in 2003 at the initiative of the African Union (AU) and the New and NEPAD to address the agricultural crisis, and setting out a plan of action for achieving MDG1 in Africa through agriculture led growth. CAADP work falls under four pillars: 1) Land and Water management, 2) Market Access and Infrastructure, 3) Food supply and Hunger, 4) Implementing Agriculture Research. This four pillar framework guides countries in the development of their National Agricultural and Food Security Investment Plans (NAFSIPs) with a view to enhance the effective use of development resources.

The CAADP encourages countries to have a concerted approach to the development of the NAFSIP through national “roundtable processes” with the aim of aligning policies to the four Pillars framework, and to bring together key stakeholders for a joint analysis and a planning of investment priorities. The process is guided by four milestones: 1) Preparation and signature of a CAADP Compact - a joint commitment to the agreed priorities; 2) Drafting of the NAFSIP; 3) Technical review of the NAFSIP, and 4) Business meeting, during which stakeholders, including government, private sector and donors, endorse the NAFSIP, agree on financial mechanisms and commit resources for implementation.

The CAADP itself endorses, as part of the third pillar framework (Framework for Food African Security - FAFS), explicit food security and nutrition objectives: (a) improving risk management to strengthen response to food related shocks; (b) increasing supply of safe and affordable food; (c) increasing economic opportunities for the vulnerable; and, most notably, (d) increasing quality of diets, through diversification of food among target groups. Furthermore, each of other pillars offers additional entry points to integrate nutrition: as proposed by the Pan African Nutrition Initiative, main reference document for FAFS, the entire CAADP can be looked through nutrition lens (PANI, 2009).

The project team recognized that the support to such a process would provide a unique opportunity to influence the content of agricultural investment plans in a large number of African countries and strengthen FAO’s position as a key player in nutrition in the region. As a result the Project accepted to become an active technical partner within the workshop steering committee and workshop implementation, engaging also RAF and other FAO departments (TCS, TCI, ESA) in the process.

The FAO Investment Centre (TCI) also identified the CAADP as a key Challenge and Opportunity for their programme of “Capacity Development for Investment” in the Africa Region. Indeed, in June 2012 TCI started implementing a project called “CAADP Capacity Development Project for Investment and Policy” (CGP/INT/132/GER) in RDC, Cameroon and Lesotho, potentially in Chad and Tanzania.

Under the project GCP/RAF/454/GER, FAO has then reiterated and renewed its commitment to support NEPAD and the CAADP process, and more particularly in supporting CAADP Pillars III and nutrition capacity development initiatives by signing a Letter of Agreement with NPCA in July 2012.

Nutrition was identified as a key area of collaboration between FAO and NEPAD and the work to be carried out was part of a broader partnership between FAO and NPCA to support NEPAD in addressing food and nutrition security in the Africa region. Such work should also be considered as a complement to the services rendered under a separate LoA between FAO Agriculture Development Economics Division (ESA) and NPCA, which envisages on strengthening NEPAD/CAADP Pillar 3 for advancing Food Security through enhanced analytical works and related technical support and capacity building²⁴.

CAADP Agriculture Nutrition Capacity Development Initiative Workshops: Objectives, Process and key outcomes²⁵

In spite of CAADP's potential to address food and nutrition security, a technical review conducted by NEPAD with support of USAID in 2011 revealed that most NAFSIPs lacked explicit nutrition objectives and concrete actions to improve nutrition. In order to fill this gap, the AU and NEPAD, supported by USAID, the World Bank and FAO, launched the CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development Initiative.

The *overall purpose* of the initiative is to enhance the contribution of the agricultural sector to multi-sectorial strategies to improve nutrition in Sub-Saharan Africa. The specific goal of the workshops and follow-up process is to assist countries in integrating nutrition in their CAADP process – from design to implementation – and ensuring that nutrition interventions are planned, budgeted and implemented as a part of their NAFSIPs.

The *specific objectives* of the sub-regional workshop, the main capacity development tool of the initiative, include: 1) identify and integrate best practices and approaches for better integrating nutrition in the CAADP framework and its processes; 2) increase understanding of available tools, resources, and program experiences for mainstreaming nutrition in agriculture; 3) strengthen country-level and regional networks contributing to the achievement of CAADP and food and nutrition security goals; and 4) increase understanding of how policy and governance issues need to align for improved food and nutrition security programming.

Workshop process and main activities

The workshop methodology was designed in order to maximize stakeholder engagement and impact at country level, build ownership of nutrition amongst agriculture stakeholders, and facilitate inter-sectorial dialogue.

²⁴ Ref: *Letter of Agreement between the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations ("FAO") under GCP/RAF/454/GER Supporting Food Security, Nutrition and Livelihoods in Sub-Saharan Africa and The New Partnership for Africa's Development Planning and Coordinating Agency (NPCA) MidRand, South Africa For provision of "Advancing Food Security and Agricultural development in Sub-Saharan Africa with a specific focus on CAADP Pillar III Nutrition Capacity Building"*, July 2012.

²⁵ *Mainstream Nutrition in Agriculture Investment Plans in Sub-Saharan Africa: Lessons learnt from the NEPAD CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development Initiative (Draft)*, GCP/RAF/454/GER Project team, October 2013



Figure 1 Ref. CAADP Agriculture Nutrition Capacity Development Initiative 2011 – 2013 Objectives, Process and key outcomes
<http://www.fao.org/food/ifs/workshops/caadp-nutrition/en/>

The implementation modality used was the organization of three sub-regional workshops. The first workshop was held in Dakar, Senegal (November 2011), bringing together 17 West African Countries; the second workshop gathered 19 East and Central African countries in Dar-Es-Salaam, Tanzania in February 2013, and the last workshop took place in Gaborone, Botswana in September 2013, where 14 countries Southern African countries attended.

The project team has been very actively engaged in providing technical and financial support for the implementation of the first of these workshops together with development partners working at regional and global levels. This had a tangible impact of increasing country-level momentum and heightening the profile of agriculture as a key partner in nutrition. The main objective of the LoA is to support the NEPAD Planning and Coordination Agency in advancing Food Security and Agricultural Development in the continent with a focus on CAADP Pillar III Nutrition Capacity development initiatives on the technical and program design, management, and monitoring and evaluation across the Regional Economic Communities (Ref. LOA with NPCA, July 2012 mentioned above).

Before the workshop

The *preparation phase* of the workshop at country level was designed to maximise stakeholder engagement, building ownership of the issue, and initiating dialogue between participants *before* the workshop. This was seen as key for improving the quality of discussions during the workshop, and maximizing the likelihood of follow-up after the workshop.

The project team and the FAO nutritional focal points at country level were involved in the organisation of the CAADP workshops and in the support to Country representatives preparing the Nutrition Country Paper and the Action Plan. FAO has also significantly helped NEPAD in solving its logistical and organisational problems.

The selection of participants is essential for the success of the initiative. Guidelines were therefore provided to the CAADP focal points to help them facilitate the selection of participants from different sectors and institutions (including government, civil society and private sector), ensuring inclusiveness, diversity of expertise, and political authority to influence governments. CAADP focal points were encouraged to select participants in collaboration with existing nutrition coordination platforms (especially SUN country teams) as well as agriculture networks.

The workshops were conceived as an opening for deepening multi-sectorial dialogue, especially for those countries where platforms for coordination on nutrition are weakly linked to coordination networks in the agriculture sector. The initiative was therefore an opportunity to offer a temporary and neutral space for this policy dialogue amongst stakeholders who do not normally have an opportunity to interact (e.g. Directors of Agriculture Planning Departments and Directors of Nutrition Departments in health ministries).

Each workshop aimed at bringing together professionals from agriculture, health, education, finance, private sector, and civil society as well as representatives from Regional Economic Communities (RECs), CAADP Development Partners, Donors, UN and Non-Governmental Organizations, among others. SUN focal points, REACH facilitators, were present, and FAO representations, played a key role in supporting the CAADP focal points in coordinating preparation efforts.

However, this was the ideal representation of participants. Although all 49 countries were represented among the 3 regional workshops not all relevant stakeholders and concerned actors were represented at the workshops. The list of participants of the three workshops (Annex 8) gives an overview of the persons (position and institution) who have been sensitised on nutrition-sensitive agriculture.

First of all, it is interesting to notice that in the first workshop almost all country teams were relatively small (compared to the following workshops), but almost all of them show the presence of relevant high level stakeholders belonging to different institutions and sectors. The two workshops that followed have recorded bigger teams in terms of number of members although not all relevant institutions were represented among all countries taking part in the workshop activities.

Furthermore, as showed in the Annex 8, the size of each country team varied hugely (from 2 to 31 members) as well the participants. Among all three workshops, 11 countries out of the 49 were represented by small teams of 2-4 people (some of whom were not even relevant for the goal of the workshop), 7 country teams were composed of more than 10 people (i.e. Tanzania country team had 31 representatives and Botswana 25) and almost all the other countries show balanced multi-sectorial teams.

Besides the size of each team, it is interesting to look at the participants with regard to position and institution in order to verify whether the overall impact in concretely mainstreaming nutrition in the national agenda of each country is assured. Some country teams did include high representatives of the relevant ministries and staff of public and private institutions, and their participation in the workshop could concretely influence policy making at country and local level relevant for policy making at national level (in some cases that has already been shown such as Ghana and Sierra Leone). Some country teams included many technical experts (e.g. nutritionists); however, their involvement in the workshop would have no effect on policy making at national level.

There is a risk that the capacity development and advocacy of the key actors will not be transferred to the policy making level and transformed into practical and concrete implementation due to the absence of relevant personalities (thus their commitment) in the workshops. Big teams could be important in terms of post-workshop inter-sectorial dialogue and consultation; however, the impact of the workshop cannot be measured only through the number of representatives; the follow-up phase after the workshop is the critical point.

During the workshop:

Through mixed-country and country group work, country team had to:

- Agree upon actionable recommendations for integrating nutrition into agriculture investment plans, following guiding principles, questions and tips provided during the workshop. The country participants were asked to identify and review key documents on nutrition problems and relevant policies, and synthesize this information into a Nutrition Country Paper (NCP), to be used during the workshop as a reference document for country group work²⁶. The process of preparing the NCPs was also an opportunity for participants to familiarise themselves with issues and strategies relevant to sectors they are not familiar with and to establish a common language.
- Prepare a Country Road Map including a work plan with broad categories of activities, timeline and indicators, to initiate implementation of the recommendations: participants received guidance and shared knowledge on integrating agriculture and nutrition and agreed on recommendations and sets of action for mainstreaming nutrition in their CAADP Process and Agriculture Investment Plans summarized in a Country Roadmap.
- In the workshop in Southern Africa (September 2013), in response to a criticism from previous workshops (that the presentations did not sufficiently draw upon experiences in the region), country teams were also invited to submit case studies to be presented during the workshop. This proved to be a strong motivating factor which fostered strong collaboration between participants before the event.

Main outputs of the workshop

The outcomes of the workshop include:

- Background briefs/Nutrition Country Papers summarizing information on the nutritional status of each country (drawing from/feeding the nutrition country papers being prepared by countries for the International Conference on Nutrition twenty one years later (ICN+21))
- Country Roadmaps based on a guidance check-list, defining how nutrition should be mainstreamed in agriculture investment plans (IP) and describing the actions to be taken to ensure recommendations are actually integrated in the plans and implemented.

These roadmaps include recommendations in terms of:

- Adding or amending nutrition-related goals and objectives, activities and indicators;
- Improving institutional arrangements and coordination mechanisms to facilitate the implementation of nutrition-related activities in collaboration with other sectors;

²⁶ These papers also serve as references and basis for the elaboration of Nutrition Country Papers for the upcoming International Conference on Nutrition 2 (ICN2) to be held in November 2014.

- Strengthening individual and institutional capacities to mainstream nutrition in agriculture; clarifying cost implications as well as funding requirements and opportunities.

The roadmaps also include actions to be taken to ensure that recommendations are adopted by national policy makers and translated into results.

It is important to mention that the template used for the outputs differed in the three workshops as a result of the lessons learnt throughout the process. The content of the information requested by each of the templates were however similar. With regard to the last workshop (Southern Africa in September 2013) only the draft version of the outputs is available; this obviously hampers the analysis.

All the input (presentations and official documents) and output materials used and prepared by the three workshops have been gathered in the website created by the project team (<http://www.fao.org/food/fns/homepage/en/>). Although some of the workshops' output have not yet been uploaded (i.e. the NCP and Action Plans from the Eastern and Central Africa and Southern Africa workshops), the website was conceived as a tool and a source of information and knowledge about the importance of mainstreaming nutrition in all sectors both within a country's national strategy or policy framework and at a lower level among the experts working in the field (i.e. lessons learned and good practices to share with stakeholders).

The project team has prepared three case studies (Ghana, Sierra Leone and Ethiopia) on the basis of countries' good achievements during the workshop as well as follow-up as presented below.

Ghana

Despite the large improvements driven by pro-poor agricultural growth in Ghana, the country still has a high prevalence of chronic and acute malnutrition, micronutrient deficiency and an emerging problem of double burden. The Action Plans developed during the workshop recommends to include a clear nutrition component in the METASIP (Medium-Term Agriculture Sector Investment Plan) and proposes a broad and very comprehensive range of activities, spanning from promotion of nutrient dense crops, improved post-harvest handling (including fortification), consumer education and nutrition curricula in universities, development of pilot value chains to increase smallholder's income opportunities, and collection of nutrition data from food consumption surveys. The commitment to gender mainstreaming is demonstrated by the designation of Women in Agricultural Development Directorate of the Ministry of Agriculture as the lead agency in the development of a multi-sectorial strategy involving both public and private entities. These recommendations have been integrated in the METASIP in 2013. A country level workshop has been planned for the end of 2013 with the aim of further increasing awareness of the agriculture and nutrition linkages, creating a consensus on priority actions, validate and disseminate findings emerging from a capacity assessment of nutrition capacity in the agricultural sector from 2012. Additional activities reported to FAO follow up survey include, among others, the design of a national food safety policy, the development of educational materials for schools and the organization of capacity development sessions for the Ministry of Agriculture personnel.

Sierra Leone

In Sierra Leone, the country has to overcome immense challenges to reduce the very high rates of poverty, food insecurity and malnutrition. Since the low productivity of subsistence agriculture is a leading cause of malnutrition, priority is given to the Smallholder Commercialisation Program (SCP), mainly focusing at increasing productivity and opportunities for poor farmers. The SCP (2010) has a food security/nutrition component, incorporating nutrition through three main elements: complementary and supplementary feeding for the targeted vulnerable groups; programs linking supply and demand of nutritious food (e.g. food-for-work and school feeding); and the creation of school gardens. The most remarkable recommendation for strengthening the SCP, emerging from the Action Plan, is the inclusion of nutrition indicators –comprehensively listed in the document – and the identification of priority products for creating “nutritious value chains”. An interview with a high level country representative reveals that nutrition indicators have been integrated in the revised version of the plan, and that implementation of some activities have already started: specifically the development of a food-based dietary guidelines; a nutrition education program; a program targeting mother-to-mother support groups; and the “Mainstreaming Nutrition and the Right to Food in the Smallholder Commercialization Program”. It appears that institutions are now committed to cooperate within the multi-sectorial platform established at the central level and efforts to improve coordination at the district level are on-going. Finally, an Information Hub has been created to facilitate the exchange of information related to food security and nutrition among the four Mano River Union States (Sierra Leone, Liberia, Cote d’Ivoire and Republic of Guinea).

Ethiopia

In Ethiopia, the nutrition situation in the country is alarming. While the current Agriculture Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF) does not include a nutrition component, the Action Plan, developed during the workshop, spells out very clear recommendations for revising the PIF, five strategic interventions and budget estimates for preparatory activities. Recommendations include: establishing a link between the CAADP focal point and the National Nutrition Technical Committee; including an explicit nutrition objective (to “enhance availability and consumption of diversified, nutritious and safe food at household level”), a situation analysis and indicators; identifying priority areas of implementation and groups (using a life cycle approach). Priority interventions are: increased production and promotion of diversified diets at household level; increased availability of bio-fortified seeds through support from agriculture research institutes for homestead and school gardens; capacity development activities within the Ministry of Agriculture; strengthening value chains and value addition; and promotion of labour saving technologies. After the workshop, a technical nutrition team has been established for drafting the national nutrition policy, which is a summary of nutrition interventions spanning many sectors, including agriculture. The committee in charge of the PIF revision decided that although the national nutritional strategy will not be ready before 2015, nutrition recommendation will be implemented through on-going programs. Priority areas, emerging from an interview with a high level country representative, are: advocacy for nutrition; nutrition education for extension workers and in farming training centres; and inclusion of focal persons in charge of nutrition at the central and district level. At this stage, development partners play a central role for financing interventions and coordinating stakeholders; however, the country is committed to improve sustainability throughout time.

Workshops follow-up

The workshop follow-up aims at ensuring that the NAFSIP is actually revised and validated according to the Roadmap agreed during the workshop and the nutrition component is budgeted. The responsibility for follow-up therefore lies with the country teams, but regional partners also pledged to increase their support to mainstreaming nutrition in agriculture. Technical partners coordinate themselves in order to leverage opportunities to support capacity development for the implementation of the roadmaps.

All teams planned to debrief about the workshop in the agriculture and nutrition coordination mechanisms upon their return. As for actually integrating recommendations in the NAFSIP, opportunities depend on the stage of the CAADP process countries are in, and, in the case where NAFSIP were already written, whether there are upcoming opportunities for revising these plans. A follow-up survey is conducted after each workshop, to interview CAADP focal points and participants to enquire about the uptake of recommendations in the process.

West Africa workshop evaluation report

A first survey was conducted in late 2012 with West African countries²⁷. The turnover in CAADP focal points between 2011 and 2012 and difficulties in contacting participants limited the response rate to 11 countries out of a total of 17.

The follow-up questionnaire, which was designed and submitted to all CAADP Focal Points, includes 8 questions aiming at evaluating the degree of implementation of the Action Plans:

- Actions described in the Action Plan for linking nutrition and agriculture implemented since the workshop
- Actors who implemented those actions (leader and partners)
- Actions planned to be implemented in the next 6 months
- Number of meetings organized on agriculture-nutrition linkages and participants to those meetings
- Main opportunities that support the implementation of these actions
- Main constraints that hinder the implementation of these actions
- Main solutions to overcome those constraints
- Need of technical assistance at country level and identification of stakeholder who could provide this technical assistance

The main findings of the survey were the following:

- The countries organised meetings on agriculture-nutrition linkages in their country through ad hoc meetings (Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, Mauritania, Senegal) or as part of existing coordination platforms (Benin, Guinea Bissau, Ghana, Togo);
- 8 countries were in the process of revising their National Agricultural Policy and included the results of the Action Plan integrating the nutrition dimension in the revision process (Benin, Burkina Faso, Guinea Conakry, Ghana, Mali, Mauritania, Senegal and Togo).

²⁷ CAADP Workshop Follow-up September – December 2012, Nanthilde Kamara, Dec 2012

- 2 countries had started implementing their actions, meeting all or almost all the objectives set at the workshop (Ghana and Burkina Faso).
- 2 countries have started to implement some actions with delay, due to a lack of funding, capacity and coordination mechanisms (Togo and Benin).
- 7 countries had not started any action specified in the Action Plan yet, mainly due to political, institutional or funding constraints.

However, the situation has evolved since end of 2012. According to the West Africa workshop follow-up report (December 2012) the interest in the recommendations has dwindled in some countries, while in others (e.g. Niger) the growing momentum on nutrition provides a new window of opportunity for promoting greater agriculture-nutrition linkages.

The surveys with participants in the East and Central Africa and Southern Africa workshops have not been conducted yet. However, the project team confirmed that regular dialogue with country level colleagues indicates that the workshops have stirred action on nutrition-related matters in the agriculture sector.

Annex 4 List of documents reviewed

1. Project documents, agreements and Consultant reports:
 - a. Project Document GCP/RAF/454/GER, 2010/2012
 - b. Inception Report, by C. Dufour and C. Deligia, FAO 2010
 - c. FAO Nutrition Programming for Africa Region Workshop Report, FAO 2012
 - d. Final Report, September – December 2012 by Nanthilde Kamara, RAF/AGN, 2012
 - e. Rapport de visite Burkina Faso by Nanthilde Kamara – 17 – 20 October 2012
 - f. Monthly Report – 1 by Nanthilde KAMARA, 18th of September- 17th of October 2012
 - g. Monthly Report – 2 by Nanthilde KAMARA, 18th of October- 17th of November 2012
 - h. Letter of Agreement between the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (“FAO”) under GCP/RAF/454/GER Supporting Food Security, Nutrition and Livelihoods in Sub-Saharan Africa and The New Partnership for Africa’s Development Planning and Coordinating Agency (NPCA) MidRand, South Africa For provision of “Advancing Food Security and Agricultural development in Sub-Saharan Africa with a specific focus on CAADP Pillar III Nutrition Capacity Building”, FAO – NEPAD 2012
 - i. Mainstreaming Nutrition in Agriculture, Key concepts and principles, Charlotte Dufour, FAO AGN, 2012
 - j. Communication to the Scientific and Technical Symposium, «From food security to food and nutrition security: what’s the difference? » International Conference on Food and Nutrition Security, (CISAN) in Niger by C. Dufour (FAO), J. Tefft (FAO), M. Sow, M. Ag Bendeche (FAO) et F. Ali, FAO 2011
 - k. Guiding Principles for Linking Agriculture and Nutrition: Synthesis from 10 development institutions, Anna Herforth, 2012
 - l. Key Recommendations for Improving Nutrition through Agriculture: Movement toward a global consensus, A. Herforth and C. Dufour, 2012
 - m. TCI Nutrition sensitization session, Evaluation results, FAO TCI, 2012
 - n. BTOR Report by Nanthilde Kamara 2012
 - o. BTORs by Charlotte Dufour 2010
 - p. BTORs by Charlotte Dufour 2011
 - q. BTORs by Charlotte Dufour 2012
 - r. BTORs by Charlotte Dufour 2013
 - s. BTOR by Chiara Deligia 2010
 - t. BTOR by Chiara Deligia 2012
 - u. BTORs by Chiara Deligia 2013

2. Projects six-month progress reports:

- a. July-December, 2010
- b. January-June, 2011
- c. July-December, 2011
- d. January-June, 2012
- e. July-December, 2012
- f. January-June, 2013

3. NEPAD documentation:

- a. New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme, African Union – NEPAD 2003
- b. Botswana Home Grown School Feeding Technical Development/Improvement Plan Meeting, Workshop report, NEPAD 2013
- c. Case Study of the National School Nutrition Programme in South Africa, Final Report, K. Rendall-Mkosi, F. Wenhold, N. Brenda Sibanda, University of Pretoria 2012
- d. Africa Day for Food and Nutrition Security, Commemoration and SUN Side Event Report, K. Moalosi (NPCA) and L. Lokosang (AUC – DREA) 2012
- e. Food Security Reference Table Malawi, Prepared by the Southern Africa Food and Nutrition Security Working Group, NEPAD 2012
- f. Food and Nutrition Security Working Group (FNSWG) Workshop report, NEPAD 2012
- g. NEPAD, COMESA, ECSA, EAC, MAFC, TFNC and PMO meeting Report, NEPAD 2012
- h. West Africa Regional CAADP Nutrition Programme Development Post – Workshop Visits Report by NEPAD 2012
- i. The Namibian School Feeding Programme: A Case Study, Republic of Namibia Ministry of Education 2012

4. CAADP and CAADP workshops:

- a. Nutrition Country Papers and Country Action Plans (for each country attending the workshops, 49 in total)
- b. Workshop Report, West Africa Regional CAADP Nutrition Programme Development Workshop, November 9-12, 2011, Dakar, Senegal
- c. FAO - Debriefing & lessons learned: West Africa CAADP Nutrition Program Development Workshop Dakar, 9-12 November 2011
- d. West Africa CAADP Workshop Follow-up Report, September – December 2012
- e. Participant Feedback and Evaluation Report, West Africa Regional CAADP Nutrition Programme Development Workshop November 9-12, 2011Dakar, Senegal, NEPAD 2012
- f. Developing capacities on agriculture-nutrition linkages in Sub-Saharan Africa The CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development Initiative, FAO – NEPAD 2013

- g. Building Capacity to Mainstream Nutrition in National Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plans in Africa CAADP Agriculture Nutrition Capacity Development Workshops, FAO – NEPAD 2013
 - h. Guidance for Country Level preparation, workshop enrolment and follow-up process, FAO – NEPAD 2013
 - i. East and Central Africa CAADP Nutrition Programme Development Workshop's Report, NEPAD 2013
 - j. Guidance for Country Participants, FAO – NEPAD 2013
 - k. Communiqué of the East and Central Africa, CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development Workshop, NEPAD 2013
 - l. CAADP Workshop evaluation sheet, NEPAD 2013
 - m. CAADP ECA Workshop follow-up, FAO ESN 2013
 - n. Southern Africa CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development Workshop's Report, NEPAD 2013
 - o. Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), Guidance Checklist for Mainstreaming Nutrition in Agriculture Investment Plan, NEPAD 2013
 - p. Capitalization of lessons learned from NEPAD CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development Process, questionnaire and interviews, FAO ESN 2013
 - q. Mainstreaming nutrition in agriculture investment plans in Sub-Saharan Africa: lessons learnt from the NEPAD CAADP Nutrition capacity Development Initiative, E. Uccello, FAO ESN, 2013
5. Corporate documents and documents from other divisions
- a. Evaluation of FAO's role and work in nutrition, Final Report, FAO OED 2011
 - b. Follow-up to the Evaluation of FAO's Role and Work in Nutrition, FAO Programme Committee 2013
 - c. Fao Policy on Gender Equality Attaining Food Security Goals in Agriculture and Rural Development, FAO 2013
 - d. Corporate Strategy on Capacity Development, FAO 2010
 - e. Mainstreaming Nutrition in CAADP and Agriculture Policies and Programme in Sub-Saharan Africa, Project Document, Draft, FAO NEPAD 2013
 - f. Strategy and Vision for FAO's work in Nutrition, FAO 2012
 - g. SO1 and the CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development Process, Mainstreaming nutrition into the CAADP framework and its processes, Draft, FAO 2013
 - h. Supporting the improvement of Household Food Security, Nutrition and Livelihoods in Afghanistan, Project Findings and recommendations GCP/AFG/039/GER, Terminal Report, 2008
 - i. Joint Evaluation Mission of German-funded FAO Projects Rural Development in Afghanistan Summary Report, FAO 2005
 - j. Project Visit Report Technical Cooperation Project German Bilateral Trust Funds "Supporting the Improvement of Household Food Security, Nutrition and Livelihoods in Afghanistan" GCP/AFG/039/GER, GTZ 2005

- k. Building capacity for better food security programming in emergency and rehabilitation contexts through better seed system assessment, better integration of nutrition and food security and improved accountability to affected populations, Project Document, FAO TCE 2013
 - l. Assisting the food and agriculture sector in addressing malnutrition, TCI, 2012
 - m. Food Security, Nutrition and Livelihoods: A people-centred approach to achieve the MDGs, TCI, 2012
 - n. ESN priorities for 2013 and considerations for the 2014-15 biennium Nutrition Security and Policy Group (ESNP), FAO 2013
 - o. Policy work and the Nutrition Division (ESN), FAO 2013
 - p. FAO Involvement in Nutrition at Country Level – Draft, ESN Division
 - q. Overview of Nutrition human resources in decentralised offices, ESN Division
 - r. Investment days Invest in sharing, Agenda 17-18 December 2012, FAO TCI
 - s. Capacity Development for Investment, TCI Update and Prospects, Investment Days 2010
 - t. CAADP Capacity Development Project for Investment and Policy, A. Lachapelle, FAO TCI 2013
 - u. REACH Facilitators Kit Nutrition Action Guides, REACH
 - v. REACH Annual Report 2012: Accelerating the Scale-Up of food and nutrition actions
6. Communication material:
- a. Brochures:
 - i. Assisting the food and agriculture sector in addressing malnutrition, FAO Role in Nutrition
 - ii. Food Security, Nutrition and Livelihoods: A people-centred Approach to achieve the MDGs
 - iii. Working as One – Nutrition, FAO, UN Standing Committee on Nutrition, REACH, MDG Fund, SUN
 - iv. Key recommendations for Improving Nutrition through Agriculture
 - v. Making Agriculture Work For Nutrition: Synthesis of guiding principles
 - vi. Scaling Up Nutrition: What's New in FAO?
 - vii. CAADP Agriculture Nutrition Capacity Development Initiative, 2011 – 2013, Objectives, Process and key outcomes, FAO – NEPAD
 - viii. Africa day For Food and Nutrition Security: Ensuring Access to Safe and Nutritious African Foods
 - ix. Information Brief: Gender, Nutrition and the Right to Food in Emergencies
 - x. Dandum School School Garden
 - xi. News from the field: Farming without land, Fishing without water

- xii. Success Stories: From nutrition-sensitive agriculture
- xiii. Introducing the project: Supporting Food Security, Nutrition and Livelihoods in sub-Saharan Africa
- xiv. Briefing Kit “Who does what” In the Nutrition Division?
- xv. BRIEF: FAO’s role in Nutrition. Seizing opportunities, Engaging with partners, Stepping up to the challenge, Linking producers and consumers
- xvi. Agriculture et Nutrition: Leçons du terrain et bonnes Pratiques
- xvii. Joint FAO/WHO Second International Conference on Nutrition (ICN2)
- b. Videos:
 - i. YouTube Playlist:
<http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL8A8F9F986F79F673>
 - ii. Agriculture and Nutrition (EN/FR/ES)
 - iii. Maximizing the Nutritional Benefits of Food Security interventions in West Africa (EN/FR)
 - iv. Nutrition impact of Food Security interventions in West Africa (EN/FR)
 - v. People, Trees and Forests
 - vi. Natural Resources
 - vii. Seminar on Nutrition and resilience -- building blocks for joint programming
- c. Posters and banners:
 - i. Making healthy diets accessible. Developing Capacities, Skills and Tools for Action, Advocating for Public Policies that favour healthy diets.
 - ii. Cities, Nutrition & Sustainable Diets
- d. Publications:
 - i. Agreeing on causes of malnutrition for joint action
 - ii. Synthesis of Guiding Principles on Agriculture Programming for Nutrition
- e. Website: <http://www.fao.org/food/fns/en/>

Annex 5 List of institutions and stakeholders met during the evaluation process

| FAO Internal Stakeholders | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| DEP. | NAME | POSITION |
| ESN | Ellen Muehlhoff | ESN Senior Nutrition Officer |
| | Brian Thompson | ESN Senior Nutrition Officer |
| | James Garrett | Consultant (Specialist in Nutrition) |
| | Florence Egale | ESN Interdisciplinary collaboration for nutrition |
| | Anna Herforth | Consultant (Specialist in Food-Agriculture-nutrition) |
| | Anna Lartey | ESN Director |
| TCI | Astrid Agostini | TCI Senior Adviser |
| | Benoist Veillerette | TCI Senior Economist |
| TCE | Angela Hinrichs | Liaison and Operations Officer |
| ESA | Luca Russo | ESA Programme Coordinator |
| | Johanna Jelensperger | ESA Programme Officer |
| ESA | Frank Mischler | ESA Programme Coordinator |
| FAO Country Offices | Benoit Cambier | FAO Tanzania - Associate Professional Officer |
| | Beatrice Okello | FAO Uganda - Programme Assistant |
| | Eleni Asmare | FAO Ethiopia |
| | Ibrahim AbdoulNasser | FAO Burkina Faso - Food Security Officer |
| | Solange Heise | FAO Niger - Food Security and Nutrition Officer |
| | Stacia Nordin | FAO Malawi - Nutrition Officer |
| | Florence Tonnoir | FAO Gabon - Food Security and Nutrition Officer |
| | AnneMarie NDaKouassiAbah | FAO Cote d'Ivoire – Expert from Ministry of Health (Nutritionist) |
| | Virginie OuedraogoOuaba | FAO Mauritania – National Consultant (Nutrition Focal Point) |
| FAO RAF | Mohamed Ag Bendeche | FAO RAF Senior Nutrition Officer |
| | Richemont Seki | Nutrition and Food Safety Consultant |
| | Komi Gbegblewoo | Field Programme Consultant |
| | Kwami Dzifanu Nyarko Badohu | Programme Officer (TCP), Budget Holder |
| | Sekou Hebié | Consultant, Project Analyst |

| | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| | Koffi Honouga | Programme Associate |
| | Arlette Amaizo | Technical Cooperation Programme Assistance |
| FAO SFW | Sophie Tadria | Food Security and Nutrition Officer, SFW and FAO Ghana |
| External stakeholders | | |
| ORG. | NAME | POSITION |
| REACH HQs | HollyDente SEDUTTO | Consultant, REACH Secretariat UN Inter-agency Initiative on Ending Child Hunger and Under nutrition |
| | Nancy WALTERS | REACH Global coordinator |
| NEPAD | Bibi Giyose | Food and Nutrition Security Advisor |
| | Kefilwe Roba Moalosi | Nutrition Programme and Research Officer Food and Nutrition Security Unit – PAPD |
| AFRICAN UNION | Laila Lokosang | CAADP Adviser, Food and Nutrition Security |
| REACH | Philip Mann | REACH Facilitators |
| | Tania Goossens | REACH Facilitators |
| DONOR (Germany) | Astrid Jakobs de Padua | Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Consumer Protection |
| Ministries | Victoria Tsepko | Women In Agriculture Directorate, Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Ghana) |
| | Josephine Quagraine | PPMD, Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Ghana) |

Annex 6 List of consultants contracted under the project

| INTERNATIONAL | | |
|----------------------|--|--|
| Names | Functions | Duration |
| Farah Ali | Food Security and Nutrition Consultant for West Africa (based in Dakar) | 4 months contract |
| Anna Herforth | Consultancy to review and develop technical guidelines on food-agriculture-nutrition linkages for Sub-Saharan Africa | 1 month contract |
| Johanna Jelensperger | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 months consultancy to support the preparation of the “West Africa Regional CADDP Nutrition Program Development workshop” (organised by NEPAD) and compilation of 17 nutrition country papers for West Africa • 2 months: Coordination and technical support to NEPAD/CAADP Nutrition Program Development workshops on mainstreaming nutrition in agriculture investment plan (Follow-up on West Africa workshop and support to the organization, of the workshops for East, Central, and Southern Africa) | 4 months |
| Ivan Grifi | Preparation of videos and design of communication products | 35 days |
| Holly Sedutto | Preparation of REACH Nutrition Action Guides on agriculture and livestock, and contribution to REACH facilitator’s manual and training (focus on agriculture and food security) | 2 months (part of cost-shared 7.5 months contract which includes other outputs related to inter-agency collaboration on nutrition) |
| Domitille Kaufmann | East and Central Africa CAADP Nutrition workshop country preparation: 1) assist countries participating in the CAADP Nutrition workshop in East and Central Africa to prepare for the workshop (collation of information, preparation of a country paper using ICN format, briefing of country teams.); 2) provide technical support to country teams during the workshop; 3) prepare the workshop report. | 40 days from December 2012 to March 2013 |
| Ana Perez | Consultative review of lessons learnt by FAO decentralised offices on FAO’s participation to the MDG-F UNJP on Children, Food Security and Nutrition: 1) interviews with FAO representations and UNJP stakeholders; 2) compilation of lessons learnt report – findings used to inform post-2015 consultation. | project paid 13 days contribution of a consultancy co-funded with French-funded project on inter-agency collaboration |
| NATIONAL | | |
| Names | Functions | Duration |
| Dassan | Support the integration of nutrition in PSTA3 and FAO’s contribution to REACH in Rwanda | 2 months |
| Arlette Amaizo | Administrative support to the project from RAF | 6 months |
| Mercy Butta | Support the organisation of the CAADP Nutrition workshop, based in Tanzania. | 3 months |

Annex 7 FAO Involvement in Nutrition at Country Level

| RAF Regional Office for Africa | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------------------|-------------|---------|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Country | REACH | Nutrition Cluster | UNJPs/MDG-F | AAHMSUN | | Name of support person for nutrition | Position | Contact details |
| Angola | | | MDG-F | | | Paolo Vicente | AFAOR (Programme): food security and nutrition | Paulo.Vicente@fao.org |
| Benin | | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| Burkina Faso | | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | Ancilla Ndahigeze | Consultant Gender, | Ancilla.Ndahigeze@fao.org |
| | | | | | | Francois Tiendrebeogo - TBC | HIV and Nutrition Nutrition Expert | Francois.Tiendrebeogo@fao.org |
| Burundi | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Cameroon | | ✓ | | ✓ | | Felicitas Atanga | Assistant Rep | Felicitas.Atanga@fao.org |
| Cape Verde | | | UNJP | | | Cristina Alderighi | JPP Prog. Officer | Cristina.Alderighi@fao.org |
| | | | | | | Ana Paula Spencer | Coordinator of UNJP on school nutrition | AnaPaula.Spencer@fao.org |
| Central African Republic | | ✓ | | ✓ | | Barthélemy Lamba | Programme support | Barthelemy.Lamba@fao.org |
| Chad | | ✓ | | ✓ | | Marianne Tinlot | APO – Food Security Analyst | Marianne.Tinlot@fao.org |
| Congo | | | | ✓ | | Etienne Ngounio | Assistant Rep | Etienne.NgounioGabia@fao.org |
| Congo (DRC) | | ✓ | | ✓ | | Tiphaine Bueke | Resp. gender, HIV, nutrition (emergency) | Tiphaine.Bueke@fao.org |
| Cote d'Ivoire | | | | ✓ | | Nda-Kouassi Abah, Anne-Marie | Expert Ministre de la Santé (Nutritionniste) | annemarie.ndakouassiabah@fao.org |
| Djibouti | | ✓ | | | | | | |
| Ethiopia | ✓ | ✓ | MDG-F | | ✓ | Eleni Asmare | Nutrition officer | Eleni.Asmare@fao.org |
| Gabon & Sub-regional office for Central | | | UNJP | ✓ | | Florence Tonnoir | APO Nutrition, Food Security, Livelihoods | Florence.Tonnoir@fao.org |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|-------|---|---|--|--|--|
| Africa | | | | | | | | |
| Gambia | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| Ghana | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | Sophie Tadia | APO Food Security, Nutrition and Food Safety | Sophie.Tadia@fao.org |
| Guinea | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | | |
| Guinea-Bissau | | | MDG-F | | | Rui Jorge Fonseca | | RuiJorgeAlvesda.Fonseca@fao.org |
| Ivory Coast | | ✓ | | | | | | |
| Kenya | | ✓ | | ⌘ | ✓ | Angela Murugi Kimani | Nutrition Officer from regional emergency office for East Africa | Angela.Kimani@fao.org |
| Lesotho | | | | | | Florence Conteh | JPO FS and Natural Resources Management | Florence.Conteh@fao.org |
| Liberia | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | | |
| Madagascar | | ✓ | | ⌘ | ✓ | Tiphaine Gire | Chargée d'appui au CAUR | Tiphaine.Gire@fao.org |
| | | | | | | Cecile Ramanitrera | Senior Agronomist | Cecile.Ramanitrera@fao.org |
| Malawi | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| Mali | ✓ | ✓ | MDG-F | ✓ | ✓ | Maguette Ndiaye + national nutrition officer | Emergency Coordinator TCE | Maguette.Ndiaye@fao.org |
| Mozambique | ✓ | ✓ | MDG-F | ⌘ | ✓ | Felicidade Panguene | HIV, gender and nutrition focal point | Felicidade.Panguene@fao.org |
| Namibia | | | | | ✓ | | Plans underway to send Florence Conteh on short mission as a start-up | |
| Niger | ✓ | | MDG-F | ✓ | ✓ | Solange Heise | Food Security and Nutrition Officer | Solange.Heise@fao.org |
| Nigeria | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| Rwanda | ✓ | | UNJP | | ✓ | | 454/GER supported a national nutrition consultant for a while but discontinued | |
| Senegal | | | MDG-F | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| Sierra Leone | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | Ruth Butao | Nutrition and Right to Food Officer to be recruited | |
| Somalia | | ✓ | | ⌘ | | Tom Oguta | Senior Nutrition Analyst | Tom.Oguta@fao.org |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|--|---|---|--------------------|--|--|
| South Africa | | | | ⌘ | | | | |
| South Sudan | | ✓ | | | | | | |
| Sudan | | | | | | | | |
| Togo | | | | ✓ | | | | |
| Uganda | ✓ | | | | ✓ | Beatrice Okello | Right to Food Officer | Beatrice.Okello@fao.org |
| Swaziland | | | | | | | | |
| Tanzania | ✓ | | | | ✓ | Mr. Benoit Cambier | Focal point for matters on Food and Nutrition Security – not nutritionist but playing key role | Benoit.Cambier@fao.org |
| Zambia | | | | ⌘ | ✓ | Bertha Mkandawire | Supported by the project to help with CAADP process | Bertha.MkandawireMunthali@fao.org |
| Zimbabwe | | ✓ | | | ✓ | Emily Mbanga | APO Nutrition | Emily.mbanga@fao.org |
| | | | | | | Delilah Takawira | Nutrition Officer | Delilah.Takawira@fao.org |

Information provided by Martina Park, Associate Professional Officer - FAO ESN, martina.park@fao.org

Annex 8 Sample of Country Information taken from the Nutrition Country Paper and Action Plan

| SENEGAL | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|--|------------------------------|
| NUTRITION COUNTRY PAPER | <p>Crisis regions with high acute malnutrition.</p> <p><u>Infant:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - acute and chronic malnutrition in rural areas; - iron deficiency and anaemia; - iodine deficiency. <p><u>Women:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - double burden and anaemia. <p><u>Determinants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - food insecurity (15% households); - poor sanitation; - dietary transition. | Strengthening the system of food crisis prevention/management to increase actors' capacities to anticipate food and nutritional insecurity. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nutrition education; - Bio fortification; - Diversification; - Promotion of food composition tables. | | | Business meeting (June 2010) |
| RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACTION PLAN | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - dietary diversity score; - rate of coverage of food needs; - % of income spent on | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Halve hunger and underweight in infant below 5 years. - Increase dietary diversification and the availability and consumption | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advocacy to improve nutrition and food security through agriculture; - Periodical meetings of various partners (government, NGOs, UN agencies, Senegalese committee for food fortification) to ensure better inter-sectorial communication and coordination | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthening human resources; - Increase financing; - Improve methodologies of data | |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>food;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - % of consumption of improved production | <p>of safe and nutrition dense food.</p> <p><u>Targets:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - rural and poor populations; - infant below 5 years and school age children; - women of reproductive age and pregnant. | <p>in information sharing and joint implementation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - institution of a joint work group within the ministry of agriculture; - use of CAADP Compact as a reference document for all actors, capitalizing lessons from joint program on infant nutrition and food security. - Increase participation of agro-industry for value chain development - create an enabling the environment for private investments and for PPP to tackle maternal and child iron deficiency, acute malnutrition in rural areas and women obesity <p><u>Targets:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - high level policy makers, private sector - civil society, - local collectivises, - various ministries and technical and financial partners. | <p>collection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analysis to improve M&E | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|

| SIERRA LEONE | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATI ON & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| NUTRITION COUNTRY PAPER | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stunting, - MND, - Underweight, - Acute malnutrition, - NCDs. <p><u>Determinants food insecurity:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - poor yields - unstable supplies - recurrent shock - limited access to nutritious food - lack of dietary diversification - rural poverty, - unemployment - landlessness <p><u>Determinants health and care:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - poor infant feeding practices - deterioration of health/ water / sanitation infrastructures - Civil war until 2002 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce rural poverty and increase households food security (+ 25%) sustainably through agricultural growth. - Reduce vulnerability and increase food security and nutrition of vulnerable households through social protection and asset creation. <p>Targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Infant; - school children; - PLW | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - % of children under 2 stunted - % of children under 5 wasted - % children under 2 and women of reproductive age with anaemia - children consuming iron rich food - consumption of vitamin A rich fruit and vegetables - population living under poverty line - household expenditure on food - household food insecurity - food consumption score - household consumption of 4 food groups - post-harvest loss - VA products in the markets - N° of girls in school feeding programs - increase in vegetable production and perishable food in the market - % of smallholder with access to finance - % of vulnerable households with access to safety nets <p>(not clear: indicators already there or just planned? included in the NSADP but not in NCP?)</p> | <p>Six Components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Smallholder Commercialisation (intensification, crops and food diversification, value addition - including fortification - , reduction of post-harvest losses, marketing) 2. Small scale irrigation development; 3. Smallholders market access; 4. Smallholder access to finance; 5. Support food insecure populations (including: national school feeding program also with fortified food, school gardens and teacher training, complementary feeding for children and PLW); 6. Planning, coordination and monitoring. | Inter-ministerial cooperation (Ministry of labour and social security, Health, MES, MAFFS, NGOs) | | Business meeting (June 2010) |

| SIERRA LEONE | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|---|---|--|----------------------------|----------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACTION PLAN | | Also: - women headed households - youth - disabled - NCD affected. | Include reduction of NCDs. | | Support contract farming and PPPs especially for: - promoting nutritious value chains (fortified oil, flour and benmix, fruit juice, milk, fisheries); - food safety; - fortification; - production; - supplementary feeding - cash/food for work. Use a multi-sectorial approach in programs and advocate for higher level coordination (e.g. REACH) | - Improve capacity gaps (human, technical, financial) ; - Training (project managers, agricultural focal points at district level, esp. women, agricultural officers, extension workers, farmer field schools and nutritionists, mother support groups). - Mobilise public, private sector, academia (e.g. SLARI) civil society and NGOs, PPPs, development partners, development banks, NGOs, innovative financing and media advocacy. | |

| BURKINA FASO | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| NUTRITION COUNTRY PAPER | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Children stunting, underweight and wasting - women double burden, - very high anaemia in children and women. <p><u>Determinants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - inadequate breastfeeding practices, - limited access to diversified diets, - poor water, sanitation and health | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Halve hunger - Contribute to strengthen food and nutrition security of vulnerable populations. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Under 5 underweight, - prevalence of energy deficiency, - food need coverage | | | | Business meeting (march 2012) |
| RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACTION PLAN | | <p>- “sustainable contribution to food and nutrition security, to strong economic growth and poverty reduction”</p> <p>Target: Women and regions with bad health and nutrition situation (with clear indication of targeted populations).</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dietary diversity score - Prevalence of stunting, wasting and calorie deficiency in women of reproductive age. | <p>Integrate nutrition in these sub-programs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sustainable development of agricultural production (promote self-consumption alongside with sell, value chains for nutrition dense food, agricultural research); 2. Animal production (promote milk consumption, especially for infants); 3. Irrigation (promote L-saving technologies) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PPPs between Government & agricultural organisation (nutrient dense production and promotion) and firms (complementary and fortified food). - Coordination between Ministry of Agriculture & M. of Health (IEC education for agricultural workers), Education (school gardens), Social Action (advocacy), Women Promotion (advocacy). - Ensure coordination in M&E of food and nutrition | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Basic training on nutrition for institutions in charge of implementation of the investment plan - Training on agriculture-nutrition linkages, - Building competence skills on gender mainstreaming and empowerment, - Include nutrition | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | Include a food diversity objective. | | <p>and small irrigation to increase productivity of small fisheries run by women);</p> <p>4. Prevention and management of food and nutrition crisis (re-define objectives, split crisis management and food and nutrition security, define vulnerable population, integrate education to infant feeding practices);</p> <p>5. Rural economy promotion (empower women, promote fortified wheat, locally produced nutrient dense food, nutrition education);</p> <p>6. Sustainable water management and soil consolidation (promote women access to land and women crops);</p> <p>7. Forestry, fisheries and fauna development (biodiversity for nutrition security);</p> <p>8. Water and sanitation (link with nutrition and health).</p> | <p>security and coordination on the indicators.</p> <p>- Involve and develop partners (technical and financial support) as such producers organisation (advocacy and mobilisation for food and production diversification) consumers organisation (food quality control), NGOs (production of complementary food, advocacy and nutrition education, create and disseminate evidence of impact).</p> | <p>education in extension agents training,</p> <p>- Train responsible for M&E on nutritional impact of programs.</p> | |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|

| GHANA | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|--------------------------------|---|--|------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| NUTRITION COUNTRY PAPER | <p>Despite large improvements in nutrition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - high prevalence of MND in women and children (iron, iodine, vitamin A, zinc) - anaemia, - stunting in children - severe acute malnutrition, - NCDs (double burden). <p><u>Determinants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - rural poverty (esp. women, main food producers; limited access to nutritious food, worsening as a result of higher prices), - dietary transition, - poor infant feeding practices, - diseases. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce stunting and underweight in children, vitamin A deficiency, iron and iodine deficiency in children and women of reproductive age by 50%; - Food security and emergency preparedness, - Increased income growth, - Competitiveness and market integration, - Sustainable resource management, - Science and technology applied to agriculture, - Institutional coordination. <p>Priority areas: those with highest incidence of various MNDs (explicit in the plan).</p> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nutrient dense food promotion (OFSP, High quality maize, leafy vegetables) - High quality staples through breeding and fortification, - Consumer education, - Advocacy for consumption on micronutrient rich food. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lead agency is: M. Agriculture (Women in Agricultural Development Directorate + Directorate of Extension Services). - Inter-ministerial cooperation between M. of Health, M. Education and the Food Research Institute. - Inter-sectorial cooperation in M&E coordinated by the MOFA. - Include representatives of farmer based organisation, associations of private sector enterprises, civil society (Food Security and Advocacy Networks and Ghana Agricultural Workers Union) traditional ruler (national and regional House of Chiefs) <p>Proposed Organs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steering committee/country team (key ministries, private sector, workers representatives, development partners); - Policy Dialogue platform/forum; - National SAKSS (strategic analysis and Knowledge Support System); - Secretariat. | <p>Improve technical (including internet connectivity and computer endowment) human and financial capacity of M&E.</p> | <p>Business meeting (June 2010)</p> |

| GHANA | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACTION PLAN | | Additional target populations nationwide: - HIV/NCD/TB - affected people - elder. | Proportion of population below MDER, food diversification index, total protein share in DES + include indicators to capture contribution of nutrition education, school feeding, and various nutrition sensitive agricultural activities. | - Mainstream nutrition in all activities and projects; - Intensify nutrition education programs. | - Include private sector, CSOs, NGOs, agri- processors, media, academia, research and statistical institutes; - Link up with Nutrition department of Ghana Health Services and Universities for harmonised programs. W - WIAD's stronger role in the coordination of nutrition partners; - Establish a forum which can feed into bigger bodies such as CAADP Steering Committee. PPPs for tackling MNDs (e.g. bio fortification, improved/ planting materials/animal breeds). | - Run food consumption survey and other statistics to include baseline data for M&E (led by Ghana statistical office). - Strengthen WIAD as focal point for nutrition in MOFA. - Nutrition training in the agricultural sector at all level and recruit nutritionists. - Nutrition curricula in universities and colleges. - Finance running costs and new investments through government budget and the support of donors and sponsorships (private). | |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| CHAD | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|-------------------------|--|---|------------|---|---|------------------------|---|
| NUTRITION COUNTRY PAPER | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very high stunting, wasting, underweight, female under nutrition - MNDs - iodine, vitamin A, iron (anaemia). <p><u>Determinants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - almost non-existent exclusive breastfeeding, - low and unstable availability, - vulnerability to recurrent climatic shock, - highly fragmented markets, - extreme poverty, - extremely low access to improved water and health services, - monotonous diets. | <p>Vulnerable populations are: PLW, infants, small producers and landless labourers, youth and unemployed, handicapped, elderly and sick people.</p> <p>Vulnerable area: Sahelian belt and Sudanese area.</p> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nutrition education - School gardens | <p>Stakeholders in charge of Nutrition Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministry of Health (Nutrition Services), - Nutritional centres, - Local authorities, - Traditional chiefs, - Village associations, - Women associations, - NGO, - Technical and financial partners: <p>Stakeholders in charge of School gardens:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - school directions, - local authorities, - local technical services for nutrition, agriculture and husbandry, - traditional chiefs, parents/ village / - women associations, - NGOs, - technical and financial partners. | | Focal point appointed in 2009 but compact not signed yet. |

| CHAD | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACTION PLAN | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Halve hunger and reduce child underweight (target 21%). - Ensure water and food in appropriate quantity and quality are available to all households; - Ensure access to food; - Appropriate food utilisation through balanced diets; - Improved water, food safety and nutrition education. <p><u>Targets:</u> women, children, schools in sahelian belt.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proportion of population below MDER, - Food diversification index, - Nutritional indicator (e.g. underweight) | <p>Detailed roadmap for establishing school gardens:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - informative workshops, - women groups creation, - targeting schools, - increase nutrition dense food production and physical and economic access to them, - improve water sources, - production diversification (including animal source food), nutrition education). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Institutional cooperation among ministries (e.g. of Health, Agriculture, Water, Education, Social Action...etc.) - and with civil society (producers and consumers association, women associations). - Create a coordinating mechanism and channels for permanent communication among ministries. - PPPs for malnutrition prevention and treatment, BCC, hygiene, VC development, income generating activities etc...with the participation of the Ministries of Agriculture and Health. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve knowledge on nutrition / BCC / school gardens / food composition. - Improve data collection and analysis. - Capacity development at different levels, from the Ministerial Level to school teachers and community groups. - Advocacy to technical and financial partners for financing purposes. | |

| CAMEROON | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|--------------------------------|--|---|-------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| NUTRITION COUNTRY PAPER | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rising child chronic malnutrition and stunting; - Stable underweight and wasting; - MNDs and anaemia; - Adult obesity. <u>Determinants:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - bad health status and lack of health services; - lack of hygiene, improved water and sanitation; - food insecurity (esp. in the North; - landlocked area with lowest food availability and access to social services); - inadequate breastfeeding, early weaning; - poverty, economic crisis which reduce purchasing power; - climatic areas; - low food storage and processing capacity | | | | | | toward signing compact |

| CAMEROON | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACTION PLAN | | <p>General Objective: Contribute to reduce chronic malnutrition from 33% to 25%.</p> <p>Specific Objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase households nutrition related knowledge and practices; 2. Increase vulnerable populations access to food and improved water; 3. Promote access to adequate food. <p>Vulnerable people: women and children</p> | <p>Indicators for each objective:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. % of children who have at least one meal per day; 2. % infant with normal growth; 3. % population with access to MDER. | <p>Activities for each objective:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nutrition education and BCC (incl. in primary school), hygiene and sanitation activities at community level; 2. Promotion of homestead/ peri-urban/school gardens, production diversification and bio-fortification, food safety control, improve access to potable water; 3. Growth monitoring for pre-school children, promote adapted technology and farmer field schools, post-harvest handling, improve food commercialisation | <p>Objective 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote an effective institutional and operational structure for: joint/ coordinated planning / implementation/ M&E/ financing). - Increase decentralisation and coordination. <p>For each objective/activity institutional arrangements should be done between designated ministries (Agriculture, Primary education, Health, Women promotion and Family, Fisheries; Finance, Economy and Planning: SME and Social economy ...) NGOs, farmers organisations.</p> | <p>Assistance of partners for capacity development</p> | <p>Compact signed (July 2013)</p> |

| CONGO DRC | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACTION PLAN | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Global Acute Malnutrition, - wasting, - stunting (moderate and severe), - underweight, - malnutrition in women of reproductive age, - MND (vitamin A - low level of retinol serum in children), - anaemia, - iodine deficiency (although goitre prevalence plunged talks to salt iodisation), - food borne diseases (konzo, irreversible spastic paralysis). <p><u>Determinants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Food insecurity (structural, due to lack of basic socio-economic infrastructure, low land fertility, demographic pressure on lands, lack of education, low budget to agriculture, lack of | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase farmers and other actors' revenues through sustainable promotion of agricultural and food chains and agribusiness; - Improve food and nutrition security and strategic stock creation; - Research and dissemination; - Improve agricultural governance, - Be gender sensitive and reinforce capacity; - Reduce vulnerability to climate change, rehabilitation, implementing agricultural code. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - N. bio fortified seeds, - N. transformed products, - N. sessions of nutrition education, - % of population consuming bio-fortified products | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agriculture VC and agribusiness promotion; - Management of FS, nutrition and strategic reserves; - Agricultural research, dissemination and training; - Agricultural governance; - Gender and human/institutional capacity development; - Climate Change adaptation; - More M&E. - Advocacy for malnutrition reduction including a nutrition component (towards: farmers' organisation, development supporting structures, education institutions including those for rural agents). - Support the creation of a women/confessional org. network for nutrition education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Multiple stakeholders involved in the early warning system: M. agriculture and rural development, health, education, UN agencies in charge of nutrition. (I)NGOs. - Add a National FS Council to the already existing FS Cluster: it should be an inter sectorial technical structure directed by the prime Minister and gathering, among others, the M. of agriculture and Rural development, M. Health, M. Social affairs, M. environment, M. Economy and Commerce, M. Trade and Infrastructures, M. Finance, M. Education + technical and financial partners, farmers' organisations, private sector and CSOs. - Activities should be coordinated through Public Health structures - and under his leadership - : national and provincial steering committees, and administrative councils of the Health Zones. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Set up an early warning system with 2 components: market information system and FS early warning system. - Technical and financial support (budget estimation provided) and support or M&E can come from partners but also: government, AU, COMESA, NEPAD, FARA, IFPRI, ReSAKSS, private sector, CSOs and farmers organisations. - PLANNED CAPACITY DEV ACTIVITIES: advocacy for the aforementioned activities. | Business meeting (may 2013) |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>access to credit, insufficient R&D;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conjuncture displacement of people due to conflicts and natural disasters). - Inadequate breastfeeding, - Poor diets (nutritious food are sold), - Livelihood insanity, - lack of food reserves, - Poverty, - Poor health (diarrhoea, cholera epidemics), - Unhealthy environments (zoonotic pathogens, plant diseases). <p>Vulnerable people: Infant below 5, PLW, rural and urban poor. Vulnerable areas: East and West Kasai, Equateur Bandundu, bas-Congo - localised determinants are also identified.</p> | | | <p>with local products;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PPPs in food fortification; promote income generating activities; - BCC; - Rural infrastructure rehabilitation. <p>INTERVENTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - bio fortification, - fortification, - promotion of forestry products, - improve agricultural trade between different agro ecological zones, - use local products for food aid | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|

| GABON | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|----------------------------|
| NUTRITION COUNTRY PAPER | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stunting, - acute chronic malnutrition, - anaemia, - iodine deficiency, - double burden. <p>Determinants: low availability (also due to infrastructural underdevelopment), household food insecurity, poor health, water and sanitation, inadequate breastfeeding, low consumption of nutrient dense food compared to imported processed food</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nutrition and universal access to nutrition education; - Mitigate HIV/AIDS impact on food security (most notably: optimal nutrition for 50% of PLWHIV); - Promote nutrition education and school gardens; - Promote food and water hygiene and safety | | | <p>Nutrition Committee within the National CAADP Commission (multi-sectorial: Ministries of health, agriculture, education, finance, research, internal affairs, family; civil society, private sector, OP, NGOs; religious associations)</p> | | Compact signed (may 2013) |
| RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACTION PLAN | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase access to diversified and nutrition dense food, - Promote nutrition education, - Put in place an M&E mechanism, - Strengthen information and data system, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Food composition table, - number of producers having adopted nutrition dense food and diversified production, - number of advocacy campaign, - number of community networks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - evaluate nutrient value of local food, - promote nutrition dense production, - diversification, - aquaculture and fisheries, - school gardens, - integrate nutrition education in formal education curricula, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Put in place an inter-sectorial coordination mechanism, - Implement SUN, - Support from FAO, UNICEF, NEPAD and other partners. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Collect data on national nutritional situation and consumption; - Strengthen capacities of agronomist and professionals, NGOs. | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote budgeting and planning of interventions, - Promote institutional cooperation | trained in nutrition, - number of schools with garden, - food consumption score, - dietary diversity score, - number of meals per day, - FAO indicators on access and food expenditure as a % of income | - training of teachers, of communities, | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|

| ETHIOPIA | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|-------------------------|---|---|------------|---------|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| NUTRITION COUNTRY PAPER | Alarming nutrition situation (57% child deaths): - stunting, - wasting, - underweight, - MNDs, - women low BMI - anaemia. <u>Determinants:</u> irregular rainfalls, low technology use, limited cultivable land size, lack of food availability/ access/ utilisation / diversification, poverty, poor feeding practices for children and adults | Lack of explicit nutrition objective: - Agricultural productivity and production; - Commercialisation and agro-industrial development; - Reduce degradation and improve productivity of natural resources; - Universal food security and protect vulnerable household). | | | | | Business meeting (Dec. 2010) |

| ETHIOPIA | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|------------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------|
| RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACTION PLAN | | <p>Include nutrition objectives. Use life cycle approach to define targets. Disadvantaged household in food insecure, pastoralist and food secure areas or high potential areas</p> | <p>Include nutrition indicators</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote nutrition sensitive agriculture (livestock, fisheries, poultry, fruit and vegetables) - Increase production and promotion of diversified diets, - Value addition, - Post-harvest handling and value chains, - Promote labour saving technologies | <p>Sponsor will be development partners</p> | <p>- Capacity development of Ministry of agriculture to implement nutrition sensitive agriculture. Budgeted CD activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - prepare nutrition project proposal for funding, - recruitment of technical support, - promotion of nutrition through media, - preparation of materials for school, - training of agricultural expert | |

| TANZANIA | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|-------------------------|--|--|------------|---|---|---|----------------------------------|
| NUTRITION COUNTRY PAPER | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Child stunting, underweight and wasting, - iron and vitamin A deficiency, - anaemia among children and women of reproductive age, - women overweight. <p><u>Determinants:</u> inadequate intakes, monotonous diets based on staple, diseases, income poverty, chronic food deficits in some regions, food price volatility, inadequate breastfeeding in some areas (e.g. Zanzibar)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Food and nutrition security components in early warning systems for food security; - mainstreaming nutrition in policies, plans, strategies and programmes; - social protection; - use of indigenous nutritious food; - school feeding; - food blending and fortification, - capacity building | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase food availability; - inclusion of dietary diversification and nutrition BCC into all agro-sectors programs; - food safety and (bio)fortification | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inter-ministerial partnership in agriculture (e.g. 12 ministries, among which Food Security and Cooperatives; Education, Health; Community development, gender and children; Finance etc.) - Several Government agencies involved in nutrition (e.g. Tanzanian Food and Nutrition Centre); - ad hoc structures (e.g. high level steering committee for nutrition; national and district multi-sectorial committees) | <p>Address capacity gaps at the following levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National (lack of awareness on nutrition and of multi-sectorial strategy) - Regional/district (inadequate awareness, planning and budgeting for nutrition) - Community (inadequate awareness, sociocultural behaviours) - Research (lack of evidence-based integrated nutrition programs, low priority to nutrition and insufficient utilisation of funds) | Business meeting (November 2011) |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| <p>RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACTION PLAN</p> | | <p>need to articulate a clear nutrition objective is recognised but not further specified</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HFS access score, - HH dietary diversity score, - food consumption frequency, - crop diversity, - N. institution and students in nutrition; - increase in Knowledge, Attitude and Practice (KAP), - frequency of exclusive breastfeeding, - frequency of complementary feeding | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - crop diversification and organic farming, - post-harvest handling (aflotoxine, hygiene, pesticide use), - BCC - nutrition education for extension workers/ - nutritious curricula, - Labour-saving technology for women empowerment, - advocacy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Align key nutrition messages within the agricultural system; - share complementary information between sectors; - political will for multi-sectorial nutrition structures strengthening and accountability; <p>Partner to fill capacity gaps: UN/bi-multilateral agencies, local partners; make Big Results Now drafting team aware of recommendation and of the need to integrate nutrition</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include info on protein, fruit and vegetables in national SF data; - Improve data accuracy. - Increase budget to nutrition (potential funding include SUN/REACH, bilateral and multilateral organisation, development partners, private sector, donors, government, (I)NGOs) | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|

| MADAGASCAR | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|---|---|---|------------|---|--|--|--------------------------|
| RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACTION PLAN | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chronic and acute malnutrition (stunting, wasting and underweight) alarmingly high and rising in the last years. - Energy malnutrition and MNDs. <p><u>Determinants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inadequate breastfeeding and care, - Inadequate feeding habits (lack of dietary diversification). - Bad health status of mothers and children (lack of access to healthcare during pregnancy; inadequate coverage of vaccinations); - Inadequate knowledge of infant optimal feeding practices; - Poverty and food insecurity, lack of access to potable water. | <p>Global:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contribute to reduction of malnutrition through agriculture, breeding and fisheries sector. <p>Specific:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contribute to reduce food insecurity from 65% to 43% by 2025; - Improve diets of vulnerable households; - Contribute to mitigate the impact of natural disasters. <p><u>Target:</u></p> <p>Infant below 5 and PLW. Target areas are spelt out. Rural and peri-urban vulnerable households</p> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote aquaculture and nutrient dense productions; - Promote small animal breeding; - Increase year round access to food for vulnerable households (address seasonality through community level stocks, improved infrastructure etc...); - Bio fortification; - Nutrition education and “enabling interventions” - Include vulnerable people in planning and implementation; - Improve poor and vulnerable people access to education; - Strengthen capacities and facilitate local projects; - Strengthen small producers; - Have a gender sensitive approach. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decentralisation and improve coordination between local, regional, national level. (Coordination part is not very clear) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve and scale up early warning systems and data, - Strengthen individual and institutional capacities | Compact signed June 2013 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extreme vulnerability to natural disasters, worsened by damages of human activities; - Structural determinants, linked to bad political and economic governance, which lead to worsening economic performance and widespread poverty. - Severely hit by price spikes in last food crisis. | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| SEYCHELLES | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|----------------------------|
| NUTRITION COUNTRY PAPER + ACTION PLAN | <p>Overweight and obesity at 60% including in children.</p> <p><u>Determinants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - trade liberalisation induced dietary changes toward sugary, fat and salty food - 80% food is imported, which also creates concerns for lack of control on food safety) - Sedentary lifestyles, perceptions that "fast-food lifestyle" is attractive. <p>Lack of data on MNDs and undernourishment</p> | <p>General: Improve nutritional status of population decreasing overweight and obesity.</p> <p>Specific:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote consumption of diversified, locally grown food; - Make fresh and healthy food accessible, available and affordable, - Change consumer behaviour by making healthy food more attractive and increasing awareness of healthy diets. <p>No targeted population due to lack of data.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - decrease in trends of prevalence of overweight and obesity, - increase in dietary diversity score; - decrease in proportion of imported food | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cooperatives; - Home gardening | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create an inter-ministerial working committee, - Employ a nutritionist in the M. of agriculture, - Involve M. of Health, M. education, M. natural resources, health NGOs, private sector, implementing agencies, farmers organisations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create a data base for food and nutrition beyond those already existing (clinical database in Health and production database in M. agriculture). - Improve capacity through IFAD and ADB program and resources and national budget | Compact signed (Sept 2011) |

| SOUTH AFRICA | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|------------------------------------|--|---|------------|---|---|--|--------------------------------|
| RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACTION PLAN | <p>Double burden for both adult and children: especially stunting, overweight and obesity, MNDs.</p> <p><u>Determinants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poverty, - Inequality, - Alarming high prevalence of HIV/AIDS and TB, - Low exclusive breastfeeding. - Unhealthy diets (energy dense) and lifestyles (physical inactivity, abuse of alcohol and tobacco and other risk factors), - Lack of health and nutrition knowledge and awareness. - NDCs in pregnancy and neonatal malnutrition creates predisposition for obesity and NCDs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure availability, accessibility, affordability and consumption of safe and nutritious food at national and household level, to reduce stunting and MND in children under 5. - Integrate indigenous food in the dietary basket, creating linkages with community based activities. <p>Targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - vulnerable groups, - people allergic with no knowledge of alternatives (VS hidden hunger) - homeless, - asylum seeker, - children under 5, - households depending on social grant (chronic hunger); - casual labourer and job seekers, seasonal workers, - families that have lost the breadwinner, - people affected by disasters, - temporary ill, orphan children and dependent | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design comprehensive intervention plans involving all stakeholders; - Link local producers school feeding and expand coverage (for at least 20% of school food needs); - Expand nutrition education including district level (nutrition services + agriculture and extension program) for better food management, safety and meal planning; - Diversify and increase production of nutrition dense food particularly in rural areas. - Home and community gardens, assistance programs for the poor; - Support urban and peri-urban agriculture; - Input subsidies and supporting services for nutrient dense food production; - Post-harvest handling | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthen cooperation forums; - Revise structure ensuring that they support nutrition (= make identify nutrition champions in each key department). - Involve: DAFF, DSD, DOH, DBE, DRDLR, Treasury, DWA, Food banks, bi and multilateral agencies, NGOs, traditional leaders, private sector, financial institutions, media, DTI, commodity groups, COGTA. - Integrate FS and nutrition in War on Poverty initiative. <p>Improve coordination through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regular FS cluster meeting; - revive Integrated FS and Nutrition task Team an Food Security Forums | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve capacities in terms of: funding, coordination, FS and nutrition skills (+ recruit nutritionists) - Incentives for staff retention. - Ensure uniform and regular measurement of malnutrition indicators, - Develop a food security index through households surveys, - Improve administrative data systems in poor states, - Fund regular surveys and invest in mobile tech to improve data systems, - Use funds more effectively | CAADP launched in October 2011 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - on remittances, - child headed households, - victims of crime (acute hunger), - people without social networks, entitlements and outside safety nets, - people not concerned with what they eat (!!!) - severely politically unstable areas, - people with retarded mental capacity (starvation) | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (storage, processing.); - Improve market participation with PPPs, government purchasing programs promote healthy food choices through distribution networks (e.g. food banks) , subsidies and marketing: - Early warning system on nutrition security; - Research in bio fortification against MNDs | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| ZAMBIA | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|-------------------------|--|--|------------|---|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| NUTRITION COUNTRY PAPER | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stunting - mild and severe - underweight; - iron-deficiency and anaemia, - women overweight and obesity. <p><u>Determinants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - poor health (high rates of infectious diseases - TB, malaria, HIV/AIDS) - high level of poverty; - low production and productivity in agriculture due to lack of public and private investment; - widespread food, - insufficient and monotonous diets, - insecurity suboptimal breastfeeding - complementary feeding (NCP) | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agricultural diversification, - livestock and fisheries, - BCC, - energy saving technologies, - bio fortification of selected crops, - improved farming systems (e.g. conservation agriculture), - complementary feeding through local nutritious food, - national food processing and nutrition centres, - post-harvest techniques, - Farmer Input Support Programme. | | | |

| ZAMBIA | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|------------------------------------|--|---|------------|---|--|--|-----------------|
| RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACTION PLAN | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contribute to decrease stunting for children under 5 from 45% to 30% by 2018; - Promote sustainable production, processing, access and consumption for diverse diets especially the most vulnerable by 2018; - Contribute to reduce Vitamin A, iodine, iron and zinc deficiency through improved diversified diets. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase N. of extension workers, - Improve coordination. - Training extension workers and farmers households for promoting food diversification is a priority intervention | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better coordinate stakeholders through a National Food and Nutrition Commission (being in M. Health limits its power to function) - Improve coordination in policy, strategies, planning, actions, implementation, monitoring, information sharing. - Incorporate Nutrition Subcommittees at district, provincial and community level; - Strengthen nutrition within agriculture technical committees; - Broaden arrangements for NAFSIP review. - Include national institutions (M. Health, Agriculture + others) development partners, CSO (including CSO committee in SUN), SUN, farmers association, private sector and their associations, University of Zambia. | <p>Improve information system (lack of consumption indicator which interphases agriculture and nutrition + no common M&E framework for agriculture and nutrition, linking them together and identifying the hosting institution). Capacity development on: food standards to improve compliance, national agenda on food and nutrition research, financing (for: R&D, M&E, building capacities at individual and institutional level, for reviewing legislation of food standards and safety).</p> | |

| ZIMBABWE | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|--------------------------------|--|---|-------------------|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| NUTRITION COUNTRY PAPER | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stunting, MND iron, vitamin A, underweight, seasonal wasting; - Emerging overweight and obesity. <u>Determinants:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Food insecurity, - poor complementary feeding practices (in quantity and quality) - monotonous diets, - repeated droughts, - socio-economic environment, - poor access to health services, - water and sanitation. - Diseases (e.g. HIV). <p>Vulnerable children below 5 years old, women of reproductive age, elderly, OVC, people with chronic NCDs and CDs.</p> | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - livestock drought mitigation; - agriculture input support schemes; - crop and livestock breeding - maize & beans; - small livestock; - promotion of small grains, including cassava; - nutrition gardens; - apiculture; - conservation agriculture; - aquaculture; - market gardening; - nutritious indigenous food to increase biodiversity in diets; - social cash transfers; - food for assets | | | |

| ZIMBABWE | MAIN NUTRITIONAL PROBLEMS AND DETERMINANTS | NUTRITION OBJECTIVE, COMPONENT AND TARGETED POPULATION | INDICATORS | ACTIONS | COORDINATION & PARTNERING | CAPACITY AND RESOURCES | CAADP MILESTONE |
|------------------------------------|--|---|------------|---|---------------------------|---|--------------------|
| RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACTION PLAN | | <p>Overall: “Facilitate sustainable increase in nutrition sensitive production, productivity and competitiveness of Zimbabwean agriculture through building capacity of farmers and institutions, improving quantity and quality of public, private and development partners’ investment and policy alignment”.</p> <p>Specific:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve nutrient quality through staple fortification, increase bio fortification by 5%, - Improve household dietary diversity through increased production of diversified crops and indigenous food, - Improve safety and quality through | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include nutrition education, link livestock auctions with nutritional food fair, promote animal by-products, subsidize small livestock; - include fortified crops, strengthen extension support, increase crops/seeds diversity, bio fortification, breeding and improve varieties; - investments for breeding and bio fortification; - scale up to national level, sensitize farmers, marketing schemes; - post-harvest equipment at community level and support SMEs in producing it, nutrition education, BCC (through food composition tables); - increase crop diversity, integrate small livestock, scale up coverage, strengthen extensions, invest in post-harvest handling; - review legislations, invest in value addition; - Intercropping with nutritious food, extend mechanisation with gender lens; - Promote aquaculture, sessions on fish cooking; - Post-harvest technology, market linkages, diversification; 120 integrate cash transfers with agriculture support input | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consolidate database and tackle fragmentation in information system strengthening integrated FNS information management unit. - Develop capacity on nutrition for: extensions workers (include in curricula) - FNS committees at all level (+ provide them with ICTs) | Compact not signed |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>good agricultural practices, design and implementation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nutrition education and Communication Strategy for agriculture, - Strengthen linkages with other ministries for improved coordination on nutrition | | <p>schemes and health and education access safety schemes.</p> <p>PRIORITY ACTIONS: revive CSC as a PPP; bio fortification: legislation and standards, make it mandatory for selected crops, promote through media and extension agents; SPS measures; gene bank for bio fortified crops, promote commodity exchange to facilitate agro-food marketing; nutrition sensitive contract farming framework</p> | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Annex 9 CAADP Workshops Country Teams' members

| COUNTRY | MINISTRY OF HEALTH | MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE | MINISTRY OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | OTHER NATIONAL/ REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS | COOPERATION AGENCY | ONGs/CSOs | PRIVATE SECTOR | TOTAL TEAM |
|----------------------|---|---|--|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------|
| West Africa | | | | | | | | |
| BENIN | Focal point for nutrition WAHO-Benin (also Rep. Nutrition Service for the Ministry) | CILSS' and CountryStat's Head | Department for Sectorial Policies' Head | Researcher of CPSA (Coordination des Politiques Sectorielles Agricoles) | | | | 8 |
| | | CAADP Focal Point | Head of Department for studies and programmes of Governance and economic sectors | Researcher of CNSA (Conseil National de Sécurité Alimentaire) | | | | |
| | | | | Coordinator and Expert for FSN Policy and Strategy of Benin Nutrition's Core Group | | | | |
| BURKINA FASO | | | | Director for Nutrition and healthy diets promotion (Nutritionist) | FAO Representative's Assistant | | | 2 |
| CAPE VERDE | Nutrition Programme | Technician | | | | BORNEfonden | | 2 |
| CHAD | Responsible for the Nutrition Centre | Ministry inspector (also CAADP Focal Point) | Director for Planning and Research (also deputy CAADP Focal Point) | | | | | 3 |
| IVORY COAST | Director of the National Coordination of Nutrition | | | | | Chairman of ANARIZ-CI | | 2 |
| GUINEA BISSAU | CAADP Focal Point | Food Security Focal Point | | | | | | 2 |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| COUNTRY | MINISTRY OF HEALTH | MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE | MINISTRY OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | OTHER NATIONAL/ REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS | COOPERATION AGENCY | ONGs/CSOs | PRIVATE SECTOR | TOTAL TEAM |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|--------------------|--|--|------------|
| GUINEA CONAKRY | Head of Department | Director of the Strategy and Development Office | | Director of the Child's Health and Nutrition Institute (INSEE) | | | | 5 |
| | Nutritionist | Food Security Officer | | | | | | |
| GAMBIA | | General Director | | Principal Agriculture Officer | | | | 3 |
| | | | | Executive Director of the National Nutrition Agency | | | | |
| GHANA | Deputy Director | 1 Staff | Director | SUN Focal Point of the National Development Planning Commission | | | | 7 |
| | | Senior Agricultural Economist | | Deputy Director of the Nutrition Division of Ghana Health Services | | | | |
| | | Deputy Director | | | | | | |
| LIBERIA | Nutrition Director | Senior Economist | Economic Development Specialist | | | ACF Nutrition Programme Manager | Klicks Corporation's Managing Director | 10 |
| | WAHO Focal Point | Ass. Minister & CAADP Focal Point | PRS Pillar 2 Assistant | | | National Facilitator of the Coalition of CSOs | | |
| MALI | Chief of the Nutrition Department | 1 Staff | | Executive Director of the African Agribusiness Supplier Development Program (AASDP) | | Advisor on rural economy for Canada/Mali Cooperation | | 6 |
| | Adviser to the Minister and Nutritional | | | | | | | |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| | Focal Point CPS Nutritionist | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|---|---|--|---|-----------------------------|------------|
| COUNTRY | MINISTRY OF HEALTH | MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE | MINISTRY OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | OTHER NATIONAL/ REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS | COOPERATION AGENCY | ONGs/CSOs | PRIVATE SECTOR | TOTAL TEAM |
| MAURITANIA | Head of Nutrition | | Advisor to the Minister | Deputy Director of Programs of the Food Security Commission/CSA | WFP - Country Nutrition Officer REACH - Country Coordinator | | | 5 |
| NIGER | Head of the monitoring division | Nutrition Division Head of the Planning Division | Responsible for Rural Development Sector within the Direction for Financial Reforms Programme and plan direction | Member of the Executive Secretariat Head of the Nutrition Unit of the Food Crisis Cell | | | | 7 |
| NIGERIA | Head of Nutrition Division & Country Nutrition Focal Point | CAADP Focal Point | Ag. Nutrition Desk Officer | Nutrition Society of Nigeria's President | USAID Nigeria Senior Ag. Economist USAID Programme manager for Maternal and Child Health UNICEF Nutrition Specialist | Chairman of the National Fortification Alliance | Agriculture Donor Community | 9 |
| SIERRA LEONE | National Food & Nutrition Programme Manager | National Programme Coordinator Smallholder Commercialisation Programme | Senior Assistant Secretary | Agricultural research Institute Project & Development Management Officer | UNICEF Nutrition Manager | | | 9 |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| | Nutritionist | Assistant Director - Agricultural Statistics & Programming | | Women in Agriculture and Nutrition Head of Unit | Mainstreaming the Right to Food FAO National Coordinator | | | |
|---------|---------------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|---|------------|
| COUNTRY | MINISTRY OF HEALTH | MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE | MINISTRY OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | OTHER NATIONAL/ REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS | COOPERATION AGENCY | ONGs/CSOs | PRIVATE SECTOR | TOTAL TEAM |
| SENEGAL | Head of the Nutrition Division | Head of the Direction of Analysis of the Forecast and Statistics (DAPS) | Programme Officer | Adviser for Foreign Affairs at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs | FAO Country Gender Specialist | Hellen Kellen International Country Director | 1 Staff of Caisse Nationale de Crédit Agricole du Sénégal | 16 |
| | | Technical Advisor | | | FAO Representative Assistant | | | |
| | | | Division of Agricultural Statistics | USAID Senior Agriculture Advisor | | | | |
| | | | | Advisor Planning Directorate National Planning | USAID Deputy Director Health Office | | | |
| | | | | | 1 staff of the Executive Secretariat of the National Council on Food Security | | | |
| | | FAO Project Coordinator | | | | | | |
| TOGO | Medical assistant for nutrition | General Secretary | 1 Staff | 1 staff from ECOWASS Commission | | | | 7 |
| | | | Focal Point for Agriculture | 1 Staff of the Directorate of agricultural statistics of information and documentation | | | | |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| | | | | 1 Staff of the Department of Planning and agricultural cooperation | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|------------|
| COUNTRY | MINISTRY OF HEALTH | MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE | MINISTRY OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | OTHER NATIONAL/ REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS | COOPERATION AGENCY | ONGs/CSOs | PRIVATE SECTOR | TOTAL TEAM |
| East and Central Africa | | | | | | | | |
| BURUNDI | 1 Staff | Permanent Secretary | 1 Staff | Senior of University of Burundi's Faculty of Agronomy | FAO Nutrition, HIV/AIDS and Gender FP | 1 Staff of CARE International | | 9 |
| | | Advisor | | | | Confederation of associations of agricultural producers for development | | |
| | | Director of the Statistics Department | | | | | | |
| CAMEROON | Deputy Director for food and Nutrition | Director of Agriculture Development | 1 Rep. for Ministry of Economy and Territory Planning (MINEPAT) | 1 Staff of Ministry of Basic Education (MINEDUB) | | Group of NGOs for Food Security and Rural Development (COSADER) | Inter-Management Group (GICAM) | 10 |
| | | Coordinator of the National Plan for Food Security | 1 Staff for Finance (MINFI) | Head of the division of studies, the planning, cooperation and strategies (Ministry of Livestock, Fisheries and Animal Industries) | | | | |
| | | Assistant Director for fertilizers and soil | | | | | | |
| CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC | Focal Point for CIN+21 | Director for Planning | 1 Staff | National Federation of Central African Republic farmers | FAO Nutrition Focal Point | APAICA's President (ONG) | 1 Rep. | 8 |
| | | | | 1 Staff of Ministry of Education | | | | |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| COUNTRY | MINISTRY OF HEALTH | MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE | MINISTRY OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | OTHER NATIONAL/ REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS | COOPERATION AGENCY | ONGs/CSOs | PRIVATE SECTOR | TOTAL TEAM |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|------------|
| CONGO DRC | 1 Rep. of Programme National de Nutrition | 1 Staff of the National Agricultural Statistics Service | 1 Staff for Budget | 1 Rep. of Ministry of Primary, Secondary and vocational education | FAO rep. for Food Security Cluster | | | 9 |
| | | Director for Planning | 1 Staff for Finance | | FAO Nutrition Focal Point (NPP OSRO Project) | | | |
| | | CAADP Focal Point | | | | | | |
| CONGO BRAZAVILLE | 1 nutritionist | Project Coordinator PNSA | | | | 1 nutritionist specialised in agribusiness | | 4 |
| | | 1 Inspector | | | | | | |
| DJIBOUTI | 1 Rep. | 2 Rep. 1 Adviser for the Minister | 1 Rep. | 1 Rep. Ministry of Education | | 1 Rep. CSO | | 9 |
| | Coordinator of the National Programme for Nutrition | 1 Rep. Dept. for Fisheries, Livestock and Veterinary services | | | | | | |
| EQUATORIAL GUINEA | Nutrition Coordinator | 1 Veterinary | | | | 1 Agronomy Engineer | 1 Rep. for the chamber of agriculture | 4 |
| ERITREA | Head of the National Nutrition Programme | Director General, Planning and Statistics | | Ministry of Education - Director General, Planning department | | Eritrean women Agri-business Association | Secretary General of the Eritrea, National | 7 |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| | | Home economist, Agricultural Extension Dept. | | Ministry of National Development -Director General, Planning Department | | | Chamber of Commerce | |
| COUNTRY | MINISTRY OF HEALTH | MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE | MINISTRY OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | OTHER NATIONAL/ REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS | COOPERATION AGENCY | ONGs/CSOs | PRIVATE SECTOR | TOTAL TEAM |
| ETHIOPIA | Nutrition Advisor & research facilitator | Head of Plan and Programme Directorate, CAADP Focal Point | 1 Rep. | Ethiopian Health and nutrition Institute - Director of the Food science & Nutrition Directorate | 1 Rep. FAO | 1 Rep. VSF | Education Training & research Service PLC - Director | 12 |
| | Nutrition Focal Person for Agrarian Health Promotion and Prevention Directorate | 1 Rep. of the Disaster risk management Directorate | | Ministry of Education - Assistant to the Minister | UNICEF Nutritionist | 1 Rep. Save the Children | | |
| GABON | Director of the National Centre for Nutrition | Agricultural Research Director, Chairman of the Codex Committee | Responsible for studies at the Directorate General for Budget | Director of the Laboratory of Biotechnology (Ministry of Research) | FAO Nutrition Focal Point | National consultation of farmers' organizations | Chamber of Commerce | 9 |
| | Head of the National Centre for Nutrition Service | Agri-technical Engineer in the Directorate General for Agriculture, Nutrition Focal Point | | | | | | |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| COUNTRY | MINISTRY OF HEALTH | MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE | MINISTRY OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | OTHER NATIONAL/ REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS | COOPERATION AGENCY | ONGs/CSOs | PRIVATE SECTOR | TOTAL TEAM |
|-------------|---|---|---|---|---------------------------|--|--|------------|
| KENYA | Coordinator | Assistant Director of Agriculture, Head of Home Economics | | Programme officer of the Agricultural Sector Coordination Unit | 1 Rep. FAO | 1 Rep. of Tegemeo Institute of Agricultural Policy and Development | Chief Executive of the Kenya Fish Processors and Exporters Association | 9 |
| | | | | Programme Coordinator of the Njaa marufuku Kenya project (collab. Of Ministry of Agri., Ministry of Edu. and Ministry of Public Health) | | World vision Programme Officer | | |
| | | | | Ministry of Basic Education, Head of School, Health and Nutrition | | | | |
| RWANDA | 1 Rep. | 1 Rep. | | | 1 Rep. WFP | | Director of Rwanda Farmers Chamber | 9 |
| | | Technical Advisor on Food Security and Nutrition | | | FAO Nutrition Focal Point | | | |
| | SUN Focal Point | Food Security and Nutrition Officer, ICN+21 Focal | | | 1 Rep. WHO | | | |
| SOUTH SUDAN | Nutrition Unit Rep., ICN+21 Focal Point | Director General for Research | Director of Aid Coordination | Ministry of Education - School Feeding Programme | | 1 Rep. | 1 Rep. | 8 |
| | | Director Post-harvest Department | | National Bureau of Statistics | | | | |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| COUNTRY | MINISTRY OF HEALTH | MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE | MINISTRY OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | OTHER NATIONAL/ REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS | COOPERATION AGENCY | ONGs/CSOs | PRIVATE SECTOR | TOTAL TEAM |
|---------|--------------------|---|---|--|---|-------------------------|---|------------|
| SOMALIA | 1 Rep. | | | 2 Rep. Ministry of Natural Resources | 1 Rep. FAO | | | 8 |
| | | | | | Senior Nutrition Analyst of Food Security and Nutrition Analysis Unit | | | |
| | | | | 1 Rep. Ministry of Education | 1 Rep. WFP 1 Rep. UNICEF | | | |
| SUDAN | 1 Rep. | Alternate CAADP Focal Point | | Director General of the International Cooperation and Investment | | Sudanese Farmers' Union | 1 Rep. of the Union of Chamber of Agriculture and Animal Production | 8 |
| | | 1 Rep. Agriculture Planning | | | | | | |
| | | 1 Rep. Food Security Department | | | | | | |
| | | Director General, Planning and Agricultural Economics | | | | | | |

| COUNTRY | MINISTRY OF HEALTH | MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE | MINISTRY OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | OTHER NATIONAL/ REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS | COOPERATION AGENCY | ONGs/CSOs | PRIVATE SECTOR | TOTAL TEAM |
|----------|--|---|---|---|--------------------|--|----------------|------------|
| TANZANIA | Nutrition Focal Person | 3 Rep. | 1 Rep. | 1 Rep. Ministry of Education and Vocational Training | 1 Rep. Fao | 1 Rep. AfriCare | | 31 |
| | CEO Tanzania Food and Nutrition Centre | Director of the National Food Security Division | | 2 Rep. Office of the Prime Minister | | Tanzania Association of Horticultural crops (TAHA) | | |
| | 1 Rep. of Zanzibar | 1 Rep. of Zanzibar | | 1 Rep. President's Office, Planning Commission | 1 intern FAO | 2 Rep. Centre for Counselling, Nutrition and Health Care | | |
| | 2 Rep. Tanzania Food and Nutrition Centre | | | 1 Rep. Ministry of Community Development, Gender and Children | 1 Rep. REACH | Director AfriCare | | |
| | Director | | | 1 Rep. Ministry of Livestock Development and Fisheries | | | | |
| | Director of the Department of Nutrition Education and Training of Tanzania Food and Nutrition Centre | Communication Officer | | | 1 Rep. WFP | 1 Rep. Helen Killer International | | |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| COUNTRY | MINISTRY OF HEALTH | MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE | MINISTRY OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | OTHER NATIONAL/ REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS | COOPERATION AGENCY | ONGs/CSOs | PRIVATE SECTOR | TOTAL TEAM |
|-----------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|--------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|------------|
| UGANDA | Head of Nutrition Unit | Programme Officer, Food and Nutrition Focal Point | Nutrition Officer Agric. | Nutrition Desk Officer of the Ministry of Education and Sports | 1 Rep. FAO | Coordinator of Food Rights Alliance | | 9 |
| | | Senior Agricultural Officer, Food and Nutrition | | Nutrition Desk Officer of the National Planning Authority | | | | |
| | | | | Coordinator Nutrition Action Plan at the Office of the Prime Minister | | | | |
| SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE | | 1 Rep. | | | | | | 1 |
| Southern Africa | | | | | | | | |
| ANGOLA | 1 Rep. | 1 Rep. of the Office of Food Security | | 1 Rep. Ministry of Education | | 1 Rep. CSO | | 7 |
| | | | | 1 Rep. of the National Institute to Fight Against HIV/AIDS | | | | |
| | | | | 1 Rep. of the Ministry of Assistance and Social Reintegration | | | | |
| | | | | 1 Rep. Ministry of Family and Women's Promotion | | | | |

| COUNTRY | MINISTRY OF HEALTH | MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE | MINISTRY OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | OTHER NATIONAL/ REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS | COOPERATION AGENCY | ONGs/CSOs | PRIVATE SECTOR | TOTAL TEAM |
|-----------------|---|--|---|---|--------------------|---|--|------------|
| BOTSWANA | Ag. Head of the Nutrition & Food Control Division | 8 Rep. Principal Scientific Officer of the Dept. of Crop Production | | 1 Rep. of the Dept. Finance & Procurement of the Ministry of Local Government & Rural Development | 1 Rep. FAO | Nutritionist from University of Botswana | 1 Rep. of the Nutrition & Dietetics Unit of the National Food Technology Research Centre | 25 |
| | Principal health Officer of the Nutrition & Food Control Division | Chief of the Dept. of Agric Business Promotion | | 1 Rep. of the Botswana Meat Commission | | 1 Rep. of Botswana Institute of Development and Policy Analysis | Board Member of Food Control Unit of BOCCIM | |
| | | Director of the Poverty Eradication Unit | | 1 District Commissioner (Kanye) | | | | |
| | Food Safety Officer | Agric Information / Communications | | 1 Deputy District Commission (Lobatse) | | 1 Rep. of Botswana Millers Association | | |
| COMOROS | Nutrition Focal Point, Responsible for Nutrition Programme | | | | | President of the Federation of Consumers Union Consumers | | 2 |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| COUNTRY | MINISTRY OF HEALTH | MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE | MINISTRY OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | OTHER NATIONAL/ REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS | COOPERATION AGENCY | ONGs/CSOs | PRIVATE SECTOR | TOTAL TEAM |
|------------|---------------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|------------|
| LESOTHO | 1 Rep. | 2 Rep. | | 1 Rep. of the Technical Vocational Department of the Ministry of Education | FAO Nutrition Focal Point (Food Security and Natural Resources) | 1 Rep. University of Lesotho | | 13 |
| | | | | 1 Rep. of the Ministry of Planning | | 1 Rep. of the National Farmers Union | | |
| | | | | 1 Rep. Ministry of Trade and Industry, Cooperatives and Marketing | | | | |
| | | | | 1 Nutritionist from the Food and Nutrition Coordinating Office (Prime Minister's office) | Health and Nutrition Specialist from UNICEF | Lesotho Council of NGOs (Rural Self Help Development Association) | | |
| | | | | 1 Rep. of the Prime Minister's Office | | | | |
| MADAGASCAR | 1 Rep. of the Nutrition Service | Director of the Support to the organization of chains | | Director of Studies and promoting partnership from the Ministry of Livestock | | | Senior of the Chamber of Agriculture | 9 |
| | | | | Assistant DG of Ministry of Fisheries | | | | |
| | | | | 1 Rep. for Nutrition and Education of the National Board of Nutrition | | | | |
| | | Technical Assistant | | 1 Rep. for Planning of the Vice Primature, Economy and Industry | | | | |
| | | | | National Board of Nutrition Coordinator | | | | |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| COUNTRY | MINISTRY OF HEALTH | MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE | MINISTRY OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | OTHER NATIONAL/ REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS | COOPERATION AGENCY | ONGs/CSOs | PRIVATE SECTOR | TOTAL TEAM |
|-----------|--------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----------------|------------|
| MALAWI | Nutritionist | Chief Economist | | Principal Community Development Officer of the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Welfare | | Executive Director of Civil Society Agriculture Network (CIVANET) | | 11 |
| | | Director of Planning | | Nutritionist of the Department of Nutrition of the Office of the President and Cabinet | | | | |
| | | | | Economist of the Department of Nutrition of the Office of the President and Cabinet | | | | |
| | | Deputy Director of the Department of Agriculture - Extension Services | | Deputy Director of the Dept. of school Health, Nutrition, HIV & AIDS Prevention Programme. | | Nutrition Officer | | |
| | | | | Permanent Secretary, Dept. Of Nutrition, HIV and AIDS under the President Office, SUN Focal Point | | | | |
| MAURITIUS | Chief Nutritionist | Senior Technical Officer | | Responsible for Primary School Programme | Chairperson of Small Farmers Welfare Fund | Senior Lecturer | | 9 |
| | | Agricultural Planning Officer | | | | | | |
| | | Assistant Director of the Agricultural Research Extension Unit | | Head of Home Economics Unit of Ministry of Gender Equality, Child Development and Family Welfare | | | | |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| | | Principal Research Scientist of the Agricultural Research Extension Unit | | | | | | |
|------------|--------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------|--|----------------|------------|
| COUNTRY | MINISTRY OF HEALTH | MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE | MINISTRY OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | OTHER NATIONAL/ REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS | COOPERATION AGENCY | ONGs/CSOs | PRIVATE SECTOR | TOTAL TEAM |
| MOZAMBIQUE | | Deputy Director of Agricultural Extension (DNEA) | 1 Rep. | 1 Rep. of the Nutrition Department, Planning | National REACH Facilitator | Deputy Director of Plan | | 11 |
| | | | | Advisor and Focal Point for National committee for Food Fortification | | Coordinator of Mulher, Género e Desenvolvimento | | |
| | | | | National Coordinator of Technical Secretariat of Food security and Nutrition, SUN Focal Point | FAO Nutrition Focal Point | 1 consultant in food security and nutrition issues | | |
| | | | | 1 Rep. Ministry of Education | | | | |
| NAMIBIA | | 3 Rep. | | 1 Rep. of Namibian Agronomic Board | | | | 7 |
| | | | | 1 Rep. Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources | | | | |
| | | | | 1 Rep. of the Science and Technology Commission | | | | |
| | | | | 1 Rep. of Ministry of Gender and Family Welfare | | | | |

Evaluation of the Project GCP/RAF/454/GE, final evaluation report

| COUNTRY | MINISTRY OF HEALTH | MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE | MINISTRY OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | OTHER NATIONAL/ REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS | COOPERATION AGENCY | ONGs/CSOs | PRIVATE SECTOR | TOTAL TEAM |
|--------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|---|--|------------|
| SEYCHELLES | 1 Nutritionist | CAADP Focal Point | Finance Officer | Coordinator for Educational Development (Farmer's training centre), Ministry of Education | | Chairperson of the Farmers' Association | Member of the Council of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Board Member of the Agricultural Agency | 9 |
| | | Public Relations Officer | | Sr. Research Officer from Ministry of Social Affairs | | | | |
| SOUTH AFRICA | | 2 Senior Food Security Officers | | Executive Manager for Social Statistics | FAO CAADP Focal Point | | | 4 |
| SWAZILAND | | 2 Rep. | 1 Rep. Ministry of Finance | 1 Rep. of the National Nutrition Council | 1 Rep. FAO | | 1 Rep. of National Marketing Board | 8 |
| | | 1 Nutritionist | 1 Rep. Ministry of Economic Planning and Development | | | | | |
| ZAMBIA | 1 Rep. | 1 Rep. | | 1 Rep. Ministry of Community Development, Mather/Child Health | 1 Rep. WFP | 1 Rep. of the Grain Traders Association | | 13 |
| | | 1 Nutritionist | | 2 Rep. National Food and Nutrition Commission | | | | |
| | | 1 Rep. Dept. of Livestock Development | | 1 Rep. Dept. of Fisheries 1 Rep. of the Programme Against Malnutrition, Food and Nutrition Security | FAO Nutrition Focal Point | 1 Rep. of the National Farmers Union | | |
| ZIMBABWE | Nutrition Deputy Director | 1 Rep. | | | FAO Nutrition Officer | 1 Principal Economist | | 7 |
| | | Chief Economist for Policy, Planning | | | | Chairperson Agric Economics of | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|--|--|
| | | and Project Management | | | | the University of Zimbabwe | | |
| | | Chief Agronomist Agritex | | | | | | |

Annex 10 Profile of team members

Dr. **Pernille Nagel Sørensen** (team leader), a national of Denmark, is a senior consultant with more than 20 years of specialization in food/ nutrition security and livelihoods systems (agricultural and pastoralist areas) in Africa and Asia. Since 2006, she has worked as an independent consultant primarily with evaluation and monitoring. e.g. contribution and impact evaluation and Results-Oriented- Monitoring (ROM) for clients such as the EC, ECHO, FAO, WFP, NORAD, Danida and NGOs.

Dr. Sørensen headed evaluations of two FAO programmes: “EC/FAO Programme on Linking Information and Decision Making to Improve Food Security” and the “EC/FAO Programme on Information Systems to Improve Food Security Decision-making in the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) East Area (2011-2012). For other clients, she e.g. led the global evaluation of Norwegian bilateral agricultural support to food security 2005-2011, including 25 projects/programmes (2012).

Prior to her job as consultant, Dr. Sørensen served as food security advisor for a Danish NGO, DanChurchAid (2004-2006). During the period 1997-2004, she was employed at Centre for Development Research/Danish Institute for International Studies coordinating a longitudinal study in Ethiopia, focusing on the impact of a large Danida-funded NGO programme on food security at household level. In addition to numerous reports and articles, the study was later published as a book in Ethiopia: “Nice Children don’t eat a lot of Food – Strained Livelihoods and the Role of Aid in North Wollo, Ethiopia” (With Selome Bekele), Forum for Social Studies (FSS), Addis Ababa. 2009.

Dr. Sørensen holds a PhD in Anthropology from University of Copenhagen; based on the PhD dissertation, the book “Money is the true Friend”. Economic Practice, Morality and Trust among the Iganga Maize Traders in Uganda” (APAD/LIT), 1997.