

**Management Response: Evaluation of OSRO/ZIM/903/SWE Project**

**Submitted to OED: 31 Jan 2011.**

Evaluation Recommendations	Management  Accepted, partially accepted or rejected and COMMENT on the Recommendation	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible Unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p><b>Recommendation 1:</b></p> <p>Continue to test, study and document different approaches used by different partners to enhance linkages with market and reduced dependency on external agencies for inputs (contract farming, vouchers, work-for-inputs, credit-in-kind, subsidized inputs, capacity building of farmers organizations, etc). The results should result in the development of consensus in good practice which can help to refine FAO's own strategy (PoA, output 2.6) and that of it's partners (GoE and NGOs).</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>GoE probably stands for GoZ</p> <p>These are the models FAO Zimbabwe wish to promote, with some limits and issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- some NGOs implement free inputs, other subsidized and FAO, even in its coordination role, has limited authority to reduce the part of free inputs</li> <li>- ERCU had subsidized schemes in 2010-11 programs but were told to implement through free inputs as "all inputs distributed by FAO need to be for free, financial contributions by farmers are not possible". HQ's clarification and guidance is required as FAO can't implement the opposite of what it promotes</li> </ul>	<p>Several programs are or have been implemented by FAO, e.g. contract farming, vouchers, credit-in-kind, subsidized inputs, capacity building of farmers organizations. However, the 2<sup>nd</sup> restriction/limit in 2<sup>nd</sup> column must be addressed urgently</p>	<p>ERCU, FAOR</p>	<p>Ongoing in 2010 and planning early 2011 for 2011-12</p>	

	FAO is in the process of designing a sector strategy with policy recommendations, with donors and GoZ, which will contribute to refine FAO's strategy				
<p><b>Recommendation 2:</b></p> <p>Increase collaboration with Agritex at district and provincial level, formalizing the linkages through MoUs and LoAs and expanding capacity development from individual training to more systematically include organizational and institutional levels to allow Agritex to be able to take over current extension services in the medium term. Work to institutionalize training i.e. TOT for supervisors of Agritex extensionists. Involve Agritex from the planning stage in the design of interventions.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>FAO has LoAs with GoZ, e.g. DVFS for livestock programs.</p> <p>Agritex is involved from planning stage.</p> <p>There are areas of close collaboration with GoZ, for institutional work, e.g. CA strategy, CA curricula</p> <p>Some pilot</p> <p>There are important restrictions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Complex and instable relations with GoZ, influenced by the political environment which shows risks of tensions in medium term</li> <li>- Donors need to agree on the level of collaboration with GoZ and very few accept their funds to be sub-contracted to GoZ, e.g. through an LoA</li> </ul>	<p>Initiate a pilot project in a province with an NGO-Agritex MoU for Agritex to be in charge of all extension work</p>	<p>ERCU, FAOR</p>	<p>Ongoing in 2010 and planning early 2011 for 2011-12</p>	

<p><b>Recommendation 3:</b></p> <p>Continue efforts to promote good farming practices, delinking CA from provision of inputs and expanding the current package of services (in line with FAOs PoA priorities) to include support for mechanized CA</p> <p>and where possible other expressed needs of communities related to sustainable land management such as: watershed management and irrigation/dams, tree planting, integration of livestock and crop (including vegetable) production, animal health, post harvest handling/storage, pest management, etc. An ecologically and economically friendly approach should be applied, limiting chemical fertilizers and pesticides to a minimum.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>This recommendation is wide and should be split in 2, one on CA and one with other aspects</p> <p>Yes, delinking CA from inputs needs to be extended, however:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Input availability remains a problem in parts of the country and affordability is a problem for the most vulnerable</li> <li>- Where NGOs implement their programs, farmer's expectations for free input provision are high</li> </ul> <p>On other expressed needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- include 'vegetables and micro-irrigation'</li> <li>- remove dams: we use and recommend them at appropriate levels. To recommend 'minimum' is risky. We promote herbicides under CA</li> <li>- chemicals and fertilizer</li> <li>- this may be too much and not all realistic over 1 year project (even if the Swedish project has been actually a 3 year process). This may dilute project focus and impact,</li> </ul>	<p>Extend and harmonize 'extension based' promotion of CA in 2011 onwards</p> <p>A lot of these needs are already under current FAO projects or pilots (integration of livestock and crop (including vegetable) production, animal health, post harvest handling/storage) and will be monitored, documented and developed / scaled up</p>	<p>ERCU, Regular Program</p>	<p>Ongoing in 2010 and planning early 2011 for 2011-12</p>	
---	---	---	------------------------------	--	--

	with little sustainability				
<p><b>Recommendation 4:</b></p> <p>Increased focus should be place on increasing area under cultivation and facilitating access to markets (e.g. for buying inputs and implements such as rippers) must continue to be a critical part of the approach.</p>	<p>Partially accepted</p> <p>Increasing area under cultivation has been promoted in Zimbabwe with the GoZ's national objective of planting 2 million ha of maize to achieve food security. This has been to a certain extend a wrong message therefore this recommendation includes risks.</p> <p>What FAO has been promoting is intensification in order to increase production in reduced areas. The national average in Zimbabwe's commnunal areas is 0,5-0,7 for maize, one the world's lowest averages.</p>	<p>Continuous support to provide extension to farmers on basic management for crops, livestock and gardens – building capacity in Agritex</p>	<p>ERCU, FAOR</p>	<p>Ongoing in 2010 and planning early 2011 for 2011-12</p>	

<p><b>Recommendation 5:</b></p> <p>FAO should proactively seek multi-year funding for agriculture related capacity building activities, advocating with donor partners for new funding modalities that better reflect the timing and duration required to deliver sustained developmental results.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>This is already being done by FAO; ERCU has secured several funding envelopes over 2 or 3 years, mainly from</p> <p>One limit is that there is still a majority of donors allocating relief funds for Zimbabwe, over 12 month duration projects</p> <p>One question on TCE handling longer term projects: is that welcome/OK by all FAO divisions in HQ?</p>	<p>Strategic planning and programming for food security / development budget lines available in 2011 from key donors (EU, 3 years, USAID, 5 years) in order to consolidate the coordination role of FAO and deliver programs within a medium long term vision, shared with GoZ and partners</p>	<p>ERCU, FAOR</p>	<p>Ongoing in 2010 and planning early 2011 for 2011-12</p>	
--	---	---	-------------------	--	--

<p><b>Recommendation 6:</b></p> <p>Partnerships with Agritex, NGOs and communities should be articulated with a longer term vision. Even when funding commitments are framed within short term LoA's, a common vision and strategy can be expressed through MoUs or through longer term sectoral strategic plans. FAO's role should more fully reflect its technical comparative advantage, bringing higher level technical assistance to its partners in addition to operational support</p>	<p>Partially accepted</p> <p>Ideally yes, but we are dealing with short term funding with no guarantee of any money and follow up beyond 12 months</p> <p>Limit: Not easy with political issues but we have engaged GoZ for drafting strategies for agric extension, for CA, for the overall sector. However, the agric policy drafted with FAO support and submitted to the Minister of agric has still not received his endorsement (mainly due to personal and political agenda</p> <p>Need for clarification: 'FAO's role should more fully reflect its technical comparative advantage': What should be done that is not already done ?</p>	<p>Strategies for agric extension, for CA, for the overall sector delivered by end of 2011</p>	<p>ERCU, FAOR</p>	<p>Ongoing in 2010 and planning early 2011 for 2011-12</p>	
---	--	--	-------------------	--	--