

Project Evaluation Series

**Cluster evaluation of
“Establishing a Hunger-free Initiative for
West Africa”
and
“Mainstreaming Nutrition in CAADP and
Agriculture Policies and Programmes in
Sub-Saharan Africa”**

**Project codes: GCP/RAF/476/GER
and GCP/RAF/477/GER**

Annex 7. Task and notes from working groups at Lomé workshop

Annex 7. Task and notes from working groups at Lomé workshop

TASK

Tool 1- Evaluation – After Action Reflection – Question Guide

How to do it:

1. On a wall, use one to three big pieces of paper, prepare the below table with the question set. If you use 3 pieces you can line them up on the wall to show the coherence.

Block	Question	Purpose
1	What was supposed to happen? What actually happened? Why were there differences?	These questions establish a common understanding of the work item under review. The facilitator should encourage and promote discussion around these questions. In particular, divergences from the plan should be explored.
2	What worked? What didn't? Why?	These questions generate reflection about the successes and failures during the course of the project, activity, event or task. The question 'Why?' generates understanding of the root causes of these successes and failures.
3	What would you do differently next time?	This question is intended to help identify specific actionable recommendations. The facilitator asks the team members for crisp and clear, achievable and future-oriented recommendations.

2. Split up in three groups, and work on one block per group. The group leader is proposing to reflect about each block.
3. "This framework allows us to start thinking about our project, our outcomes, and if and how we have achieved them. Let's have an honest and clear conversation about what worked, what didn't, and what we would do differently in a next project or continuation."

Exercise Arrangements:

- i. Each group spend 30 min on their "own" block.
- ii. Follow with a World Cafe – identify a secretary who stays behind with the paper of each group, and the rest of the group members rotate to contribute to the other blocks. Take 20-30 min for the rotations, 10 min each group.
- iii. Conclude in plenary on elements people feel strongest about, disagree with etc. for 10-20 min.

Considerations:

4. If you do not have enough participants to arrange adequate 3 groups, it can be done individually (each participant writes things on posits and sticks them on the wall paper).
5. The written “aspects” could be whatever: people, materials, resources, space and values, actions, etc. If values don’t arise within the dynamic, asking for them is a good option.
6. Please take note that each block has to be fulfilled. For the blocks that are sparsely filled, it is suggested to talking about it with the participants to find something to keep or something to obtain in order to balance positive/negative contributions.

NOTES

Topic 1: Capacity Building- Questions

1.1 What was supposed to happen?

- i. Support to countries with technical tools and procedures.
- ii. Experience and lessons sharing between countries.

1.2 What actually happened?

- i. Sharing of technical tools.
- ii. Technical support to direct processes of PRIA/PNIA.
- iii. Organizational support.
- iv. Support to the development of documents and methodology manuals/guides.

1.3 Why were there differences?

- i. Some countries did not get support at all.
- ii. Some countries are not supported until the end of the process of finalization of documents.

2.1 What worked?

- i. Improved understanding and consciousness on the notions and understanding of nutrition
- ii. Improved understanding of the importance of multi-sectoral interventions

2.2 What didn’t?

- i. Incomplete transfer of knowledge and capacities.
- ii. The approach did not allow for the creation of a national expert pool in Nutrition.

2.3 Why?

- i. Duration of the project was too short.
- ii. Available resources not sufficient.
- iii. Insufficient communication about the objectives of the project and with other initiatives and interventions.

3.1 What would you do different next time?

- i. Improve communication about the project, to improve stakeholder interaction on national and regional level.
- ii. Improve the overall approach – project design and implementation. Improve the implication and participation of national and regional stakeholders.
- iii. Improve scale and scope of the project according to budget and timeframe available, in terms of number of countries and number of technical topics.

Topic 1: Additional notes from discussion after presentation of this group:

- i. Development and promotion of Nut/Ag extension manual – lack of implication of actors on country level. MoA and MoH should be involved in the development of the materials and tools to improve uptake, application and use afterwards.
- ii. Needs more and clearer communication around the projects initiatives and linkages to country offices and ministries to ensure that it is all coherent and mainstreamed for better involvement and application.

Topic 2: Promotion of the Right to Food - Questions

1.1 What was supposed to happen?

- i. Capacity building to various organizations on national and regional level, and parliamentarians on the right to food.

1.2 What actually happened?

- i. Capacity building of organization and parliamentarians.
- ii. Awareness raising and promotion of the topic.
- iii. Training on the roles of various actors in the processes.
- iv. Training on technical aspects of the Right to Food.

1.3 Why were there differences?

- i. N/A – there was no differences.

2.1 What worked?

- i. Mobilizations of non-state actors and organizations.

2.2 What didn't?

- i. Insufficient support in the implementation of the identified actions by the various organizations.

2.3 Why?

- i. Insufficient resources for support.

3.1 What would you do different next time?

- i. Improve support of the various organization for the mobilization of capacities to created resources for the implementation of the various actions.
- ii. Consider and include the state actors and stakeholders, as this will influence the openness of state actors for receive advocacy and messages to create the political will.

Topic 2: Additional notes from discussion after presentation of this group:

- i. Countries have included the RTF into their constitution, results from the regional and national level assessments and discussions were shared with RPCA.
- ii. Need to reinforce existing national alliances and initiatives working already on this topic.
- iii. Ned to improve to overall understanding of RTF and its key elements of Human Rights, Dignity, etc. While it is aspirational to have it in the constitution, it is much larger and more implications to implement as a rights based approach.
- iv. Needs to bring in stronger the experience of the SUN and other platforms to reinforce comprehension and understanding.
- v. Support from Rome was provided, although there seemed to be a level of fatigue on continuous support throughout the project period. Unfortunately there were not enough resources to recruit a dedicated person as a core team member.
- vi. Collaborated well with Action Against Hunger on the organization of some workshops and the promotion of RTF. This could be developed further to tap into NGO capacities and local availability and presence on the ground.

Topic 3: Support to policy, strategy and program development

1.1 What was supposed to happen?

- i. Integrate nutrition and social [protection into policies, strategies and agriculture investment programmes.

1.2 What actually happened?

- i. Framework of Zero Hunger elaborated and validated.
- ii. Guidelines for the integration of nutrition-sensitive 15 countries have integrated nutrition and social protection into their national plans.
- iii. Integration of nutrition into ECOWAP, PRIASAN, PCDTASAN.
- iv. ECOWAS Nutrition Strategy.
- v. Conceptual framework and road maps for Zero Hunger have been developed and validated.
- vi. A Zero Hunger Index was developed.

1.3 Why were there differences?

- i. Application and familiarization still ongoing.

2.1 What worked?

- i. Institutional and political engagement on regional and national level.

2.2 What didn't?

- i. No Zero Hunger Goodwill Ambassador identified.
- ii. Lack of mobilization towards the ECOWAS contribution to the project.

2.3 Why?

- i. Weak advocacy on higher and political level.
- ii. Security crisis led to weak contributions from member states, post-election crisis, Ebola crisis, etc.

3.1 What would you do different next time?

- i. Ensure that financial means are available and contributed from regional institutions.
- ii. Regularly re-evaluate the commitments during the implementation to ensure momentum is not lost.

Topic 4: Multi-stakeholder coordination

1.1 What was supposed to happen?

- i. Ensure participation of national coordination agencies/initiative sand parliaments.
- ii. Strengthen multi-actor and multi-sector platforms.

- iii. Promote approach based on HD.

1.2 What actually happened?

- i. Re-activation of coordination mechanisms on national and regional levels.
- ii. Support to strengthening of multi-sector, multi-actor coordination through the SUN, REACH and ECOWAS Nutrition Forum.

1.3 Why were there differences?

- i. Coordination platforms are not yet institutionalized into government systems
- ii. The right to food is not yet properly disseminated and applied.

2.1 What worked?

- i. All ECOWAS countries adhere to SUN movement.
- ii. Existence of a coordination platform for the consultation of multi-sector stakeholders.

2.2 What didn't?

- i. Some national coordination mechanisms and alliances are not formalized.

2.3 Why?

- i. Problem of institutionalization and institutional responsibility for coordination.
- ii. insufficient resources for the functioning of coordination mechanisms.

3.1 What would you do different next time?

- i. Nutrition Champion on high level must be identified at the beginning of project
- ii. Higher level support on political level for nutrition discussions
- iii. Institutionalize coordination mechanisms and platforms
- iv. Improve mutual accountability and process linked to that.
- v. Must ensure most advocacy and messaging on political not only technical level.

Other Discussion topics:

Sustainability – how to ensure the efforts are continued?

- i. Must get topic (nutrition, RTF, etc) into the national budgets and state planning, but will need annual push to keep it there.

- ii. Support to Monitoring and Evaluation of the implementation to ensure actions continues, monitor the integrated activities in the national plans.
- iii. Strengthen the planning process on national and decentralized level.
- iv. Strengthen coordination efforts on regional and national level.
- v. Long term vision exists, but financing is complicated, for instance the RAAF funds exist for FSN actions, but are short term, true sustainability will need longer term funding commitment.
- vi. Many countries have other priorities and important topics to take care of – i.e. security, migration, refugees, climate change etc.
- vii. Priority must be given to the developed strategy on country level, for instance partner contribution implementation must align and coordinate with national level policy and strategies.
- viii. Needs continued capacity building for the creation of sustainability, but needs to look at different topics within capacity building, i.e. communication, management, technical nutrition and social protection, etc. the approach needs to include a variety of levels and profiles involved, not just one focal person on country level. All the cross cutting topics and contributing topics need to be fostered.
- ix. Support to the implementation on decentralized levels, with the reality of local communities for the implementation of the new policy or strategy.
- x. Stakeholder mapping for improve implementation through improved coordination efforts.
- xi. While awareness and interest have been created, now we must ensure the implementation of the policies.
- xii. There is a willingness to change approaches and adjust to what is really needed to bring about the expected change in the field for the local population.
 - Adjustment to approach needs support on various levels – technical and decision makers
 - The status quo of “we did it always this way” needs to overcome as they are not appropriate anymore. We moved ahead with the policy change now we need to follow with approaches, and we must promote the acceptance of the necessary change to happen! This includes different budget allocations and additional capacities to be created.

Knowledge and Information Management (KIM) System – what works?

- i. Creation and gathering of evidence for key messages, ie return for investment, approaches and experiences
- ii. Needs a system that is structured and animated, for all to find and seek information.
- iii. Needs to be incorporated into the national development plan to integrate into the “mother document”.

- iv. Push engagement and commitment for a percentage of budget allocation by all sectors to KIM to ensure resources are allocated from all sides.
- v. Needs to focus on benefit and independence of needing to attain the results for the country itself not others. This needs to be pushed to ensure KIM can be used effectively.
- vi. States need to “own” and partners need to along, ie school feeding Togo – MOA/WFP – ie its not a lack of food, but a lack of strategic processing to ensure food all year around. We must develop appropriate materials and knowledge to share and promote.