



FAO Netherlands Partnership Programme

Phase II

First Evaluation

December 2005

Based on the inputs of:

G.E Abalu (Evaluation Team Leader - Policy)

G. Buys (Forestry)

S. Khot, Ms. (Agro-biodiversity)

R. Sauvinet-Bedouin, Ms. (Evaluation Management and Food Security)

List of acronyms

ADG	Assistant Director-General
AGL	Land and Water Development Division
APO	Associate Professional Officer (FAO)
BNFSSP	Bhutan National Food Security Strategy Paper
CAP/NAF	Consolidated Appeal Process/ Needs Analysis Framework
CARD	Council for Agriculture and Rural Development (Cambodia)
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CCD	Convention to Combat Desertification
CFS	Committee on World Food Security
COMIFAC	Conference of Central African Forestry Ministers
CTA	Chief Technical Adviser
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
EC	European Commission
ERS	Economic Recovery Strategy (Kenya)
ESA	Agricultural and Development Economics Division (FAO)
ESDG	Global Perspectives Studies Unit
FFS	Farmer Field School
FIVIMS	Food Insecurity and Vulnerability Information and Mapping System
FNPP	FAO-Netherlands Partnership Programme
GTZ	German Agency for Technical Cooperation
IDWG	Inter-Departmental Working Group (FAO)
INRA	Integrated Natural Resources Assessment
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
KARI	Kenya Agricultural Research Institute
LoA	Letter of Agreement
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MEPD	Ministry of Economic Planning and Development (Malawi)
NFNP	National Food and Nutrition Policy (Kenya)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NSDP	National Strategic Development Plan (Cambodia)
NSO	National Statistical Office (Malawi)
OCHA	Office of Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
PAIA	Priority Area for Interdisciplinary Action
PARPA	Mozambican PRSP
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
RAP	Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (FAO)
ROs/SROs	Regional and Subregional Offices (FAO)
SETSAN	Food and Nutrition Secretariat (Mozambique)
SNV	Netherlands-based International Development Organisation
SPFS	Special Programme for Food Security
SRA	Strategy for the Revitalisation of Agriculture (Kenya)
TCA	Policy Assistance Division (FAO)
TCAP	Field Programme Development Service
TCE	Emergency Operations and Rehabilitation Division (FAO)
TCP	Technical Cooperation Programme
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UTF	Unilateral Trust Fund
WEHAB	Water, Energy, Health, Agriculture and Biodiversity (UN)
WFP	World Food Programme
WFS	World Food Summit

Table of Contents

<i>List of acronyms</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Table of Contents</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Executive Summary</i>	<i>3</i>
1. Introduction	7
1.1. Background	7
1.2. Methodology	7
1.3. Structure of the Report	8
2. Brief Overview of the Programme	8
2.1. Country Programmes	8
2.2. Global Activities	9
3. Assessment of Individual Themes of the Programme	9
3.1. Food Security Theme	9
3.1.1. Programme Entity 1: Assessment of Food Security and Nutrition in Emergencies: Methodology for Improved Assessment and Response (PE1 Emergencies)	10
3.1.2. Programme Entity 2 Objective 1: Country Level Work to Support Poverty reduction Strategies Papers (PRSPs) and other policies, initiatives and Programmes Targeting Poverty and Food security	13
3.1.3. Programme Entity 2 - Objective 2: Food Systems Theme	20
3.2. Agro-biodiversity Theme	23
3.3. The Forests Theme	27
3.4. Global Activities Funded under the Unallocated Funds	29
3.4.4. The Global Integrated Pest Management Facility (Facility)	29
3.4.5. Working group meeting to review the format and indicators for reporting by governments on the progress on the WFS Plan of Action	31
4. Conclusions and Recommendations on Overall Programme Aspects	32
4.1. Programme Design	32
4.2. Programme Relevance	33
4.3. Programme Leadership and Management	35
4.4. Ways of Working	37
4.5. Effectiveness of Cooperation between FAO and the Netherlands	40
4.6. Overall Recommendations	41

Executive Summary

Background

1. The Policy Framework Paper (PFP) of the FAO-Netherlands Partnership Programme 2004-2007 (FNPP II) was signed in July 2004 for a 3.5 year period and became operational during the summer of 2004. The agreement is a follow-up to the first Partnership Programme though with a shift in emphasis away from a headquarter-based programme towards a country-oriented work, and consideration of outcomes. The three themes of the programme remain the same: food security, agro biodiversity and forestry with water being integrated within these three themes. The PFP provides a broad framework underpinned by principles and divided along the three main themes.
2. A first evaluation took place from October to December 2005 with the objectives to: (i) provide guidance to Programme Management on strategic and operational achievements and constraints; and (ii) provide accountability to the donor on the effectiveness of FAO's policy assistance to developing countries provided under the FNPP, and its working methods at country level. Taking into account that this evaluation took place at an early stage of the Programme life,, it focuses very much on issues of relevance.

Overview

3. The first period of the programme constituted a start-up period for the new phase of FNPP. In practice, the implementation of the FNPP started during the last few months of 2004 and activities at country level started during early 2005. Significant time was devoted to select countries in which the programme would be active. The need to achieve rapid impact at country level was an important factor driving the selection process. Over these first 18 months of implementation, FNPP has been active in 15 countries and one group of countries, the Conference of Central African Forestry Ministers (COMIFAC). It is only in Kenya that all three themes are active. Each theme has opted for a different strategy for the first year of implementation. The Forests theme initiated activities in a relatively large number of countries while the Agro-Biodiversity theme focuses on four countries. With regard to the latter, the innovative nature of the subject-matter and approach made it difficult to start implementation in many countries. The Food Security theme was very much geared to the imperatives of demonstrating results by the end of the first year. Water is so far implemented in Tanzania only as a follow-up to the FNPP I.

Assessment of Individual Themes

4. The three sub-themes of the Food Security theme have evolved differently during this first period. The development of a comprehensive needs assessment – response framework under Programme Entity 1 (Emergencies) is still work in progress. The normative work carried out under this theme is needed and relevant and should continue, though with greater collaboration with relevant divisions of FAO and in partnership with external agencies. There is also a need to develop a protocol which clarifies the role of FAO on needs assessment and analysis in emergencies and describes corporate institutional arrangements to operationalize this as well as guidelines for FAO staff to conduct needs assessment and analysis.
5. Good progress has been made under Programme Entity 2 Objective 1 (Policy Assistance). Bhutan and Mozambique were a good choice to demonstrate how relatively small amounts of funding can go a long way in influencing mainstream policy processes. A number of lessons can be drawn from the experience of this first period that can guide future policy assistance work. Because of the nature of the assistance provided as well as the intensive backstopping requirements, it is recommended that for new FNPP II countries, involvement of FAO Policy Assistance officers from Headquarters and decentralised offices be more systematically sought.
6. The Programme Entity 2 Objective 2 (Food Systems) is at a very early stage of implementation. It addresses fundamental issues relating to changes induced by globalization and urbanization on small farmers and rural communities. Recommendations are made to strengthen the country level research work as well as the overall management.

7. The issues faced under the Agro-biodiversity theme relate at this stage to the design and approach. The link between agro-biodiversity and other major goals of poverty alleviation and food security is not established in clear terms. A more convincing approach would be to design the agro-biodiversity theme as an integral part of food security/ poverty alleviation rather than as a separate issue. The two-pronged strategy to work at policy level, awareness-raising, and advocacy on one hand, while facilitating community practices of using and enhancing agro-biodiversity for sustainable development on the other is too ambitious. A step-by-step approach seems more appropriate for the concept of agro-biodiversity which is new and not always an area of immediate interest for governments. Some recommendations are made to address these issues. In addition, it is recommended that the Agro-biodiversity activities build more systematically on the strengths of Farmers' Field Schools and that the number of country level activities should be reduced to allow greater focus. With the given time and budget, focus should be placed on few activities where results can be obtained. It is also proposed that in a wider selection of the FNPP countries, cross-cutting agro-biodiversity issues should be identified and interventions should integrate agro-biodiversity with other themes, especially policy assistance.

8. The Forests Theme was deliberately implemented in a relative large number of countries to maximize the likelihood of finding countries with suitable entry points for its implementation and maximize the scope for learning from its application across a wide variety of circumstances. The formulation phase was short and consultative, involving a wide range of staff at Headquarters and in the Regional Offices. The FNPP Forests Task Force is an example of good coordination and balance of responsibilities between Headquarters and decentralised offices at Regional and country levels. In countries which the Evaluation Team visited, there is evidence that activities and outputs produced so far are likely to contribute to expected outcomes.

9. The main global activity reviewed by the Evaluation Team and funded with the Unallocated Funds is the global Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Facility. The Evaluation team concluded that the Global IPM Facility continues to play an important role in empowering farming communities to reduce pesticide use and improve their income and livelihoods. Besides backstopping field programmes, the Global IPM Facility plays an international lead role in: methodology development for participatory farmer-focussed learning; quality assurance and impact assessment of IPM field programmes; and policy reform emphasizing the importance of farmer adoption of IPM in programmes for trade development and food safety. The Evaluation Team recommends that FNPP support to the Facility be continued in the next two years of the Programme's life; and considering the funds position and time required for mobilizing support from other donors, consideration should be given to an increased allocation. The linkages within the FNPP between the IPM Facility and the agro-biodiversity theme should be strengthened by more systematically using the knowledge base of the Facility when relevant to build and implement country programmes.

Conclusions and Recommendations on Overall Programme Aspects

10. The Evaluation Team found that the overall Programme design rested on three main objectives and a set of principles that were to guide programme activities. It is in this broad framework that the three themes - food security, agro biodiversity and forestry - agreed upon by FAO and the donor, operate. While the document claims a programmatic approach "between the themes", specific objectives and outcomes are defined for each theme independently from the others. The Policy Framework Paper (PFP) does not present an explicit conceptual framework linking the three themes of the programme. The three Programme objectives address primarily *ways of working* of the Organization in its cooperation with the Netherlands and donors in general, in delivering services for the benefits of member countries at country level, in particular, and in providing policy assistance to developing countries.

11. The Programme relevance was examined in relation to the factors which influenced the selection of countries and the design of activities implemented under the Programme. All the three themes score well in terms of their relevance in the original design vis-à-vis the MDG 1 (eradicate extreme poverty and hunger) with which, in the stated principles underpinning the Programme, appears to be the overarching goal at country level. Furthermore, the Agro-biodiversity and Forests themes address the

MDG 7 (ensure environmental sustainability). The narrative for the agro-biodiversity theme also addresses more specifically other global commitments, including the Multilateral Environmental Agreements as well as the Plan of Action of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WEHAB). The assessment made by theme shows that all the activities have, to varying degrees, links with the Regular Programme of Work of the Organization and are embedded within FAO's priorities. In the countries visited, it was found that FNPP activities were befitting country needs. In all cases, activities responded to a request by and were agreed with the Governments.

12. The structure of leadership and management seems to be adequate. The group of coordinators functions well and reflects the team spirit necessary for the cohesion of the Programme. It is too early to assess whether one theme management structure is more efficient than another. The management structure for the Forests theme is likely to be more conducive to delegation (which is key for such a complex programme) and more inclusive both horizontally (other divisions) and vertically (decentralised offices). The Evaluation Team highlighted a number of issues which relate to: the need to increase the involvement of the Programme Coordinator to strengthen the FNPP II as a Programme; the need to enhance communication at all levels of the FNPP management and coordination and to promote greater participation of staff, in particular of the Regional and Sub-Regional offices.

13. The most innovative feature of the FNPP is the *flexibility* it provides to FAO. This is recognized by all staff as its most important and positive characteristic. Flexibility can be found in the funding, formulation and implementation of activities. The programme has much less "bureaucracy" than many other FAO extra-budgetary programmes. The yearly work plan does not specify detailed activities to be implemented under the programme, but only identifies the main outputs and outcomes the programme is expected to achieve.

14. The staff involved in the FNPP and the Evaluation Team, both recognise that the programme has been conducive to more cross-divisional and cross-departmental *collaboration* which has helped in the adoption of more pluridisciplinary approaches. However, much progress remains to be made in particular with regard to collaboration with decentralised offices, the front liners for delivering FAO's assistance to member countries.

15. There is no thematic integration as per design of the Programme. Nevertheless, efforts have been made to foster greater integration in some countries, including country task forces set for Kenya, Mozambique and Lao PDR and/or joint formulation missions such as those carried out for Angola and Mozambique. However, in most countries where there is activity under more than one FNPP theme, integration is limited. This having been said, FNPP has adopted a mode of operation which seeks to provide some incentive to cross-thematic cooperation and ways have been defined with a view to promoting stronger cross-thematic linkages and cooperation at country level.

16. Linkages between the activities carried out under FNPP II and the normative work of the Organization could be strengthened. There is no built-in mechanism in the programme structure for identification of good practices and overall lesson learning, either for the overall Programme or individual themes. FNPP staff are aware of this and shortly before the Evaluation, a Lesson Learning Workshop was organised at Headquarters concentrating on management and implementation.

17. With regard to the first objective of the FNPP II, which is to increase the effectiveness of the cooperation between FAO and the Netherlands, it is believed that transaction costs have been reduced because of the approach adopted, as interaction between FAO (the FNPP programme) and the Dutch Government have been quite limited during the first period of operation of the programme. FAO's Management has greatly appreciated the opportunities given by the annual meeting and other encounters for intellectual exchange. However, there is scope for strengthening partnerships at country level.

18. The FNPP II concentrates primarily on improving ways of working of the Organization. It gives flexibility to FAO in various ways to deliver services to its member countries. However, the FNPP II cannot address by itself structural constraints inherent to the Organization. The latter relate essentially to administrative procedures, a still very much Headquarters-centred culture and resistance towards multi-disciplinarity and associated collaboration.

19. Finally, the Evaluation Team made a number of recommendations aimed at: (i) strengthening the Programme aspects of FNPP II; (ii) increasing coordination at Headquarters and decentralised offices; (iii) ensuring more systematic lesson learning and knowledge building, both for ways of working of the Organization (as per FNPP II objectives) and technical subject-matters where the FNPP II is innovative; and (iv) greater partnership between the Netherlands and FAO at country level.

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

20. The Policy Framework Paper (PFP) of the FAO-Netherlands Partnership Programme 2004-2007 (FNPP II) was signed in July 2004 for a 3.5 year period and became operational during the summer. The agreement is a follow-up to the first Partnership Programme though with a shift in emphasis away from headquarter technical work towards the achievement of outcomes and impacts at country level.

21. The main overall objectives of the FNPP are: (i) to increase the effectiveness of the cooperation between FAO and the Netherlands by a thematic and programmatic approach and closer cooperation with other donors regarding their extra-budgetary funding; (ii) to support reform within FAO by substance-driven innovations, including in FAO's working methods at country level; and (iii) to enhance FAO's effectiveness in providing policy assistance to developing countries.

22. The three themes of the programme remain the same: food security; agro biodiversity; and forestry with water integrated within these three themes. The Policy Framework Paper (PFP) provides a broad framework presently divided along the three main themes. Three-quarter of the budget is equally distributed between the three themes; the remaining 25 percent is unallocated.

23. The PFP also envisages in-depth assessments at the end of 2005 and 2007 on outcomes and progress towards achievements of objectives as established in the framework document.

24. This first evaluation¹ is expected to: (i) provide information to Programme Management on strategic and operational achievements and constraints; and (ii) provide accountability to the Donor on the effectiveness of FAO's policy assistance to developing countries provided under the FNPP, and its working methods at country level. Taking into account that this evaluation took place at an early stage of the Programme life, it focuses very much on issues of relevance. In countries and for some theme activities, outputs and possibly outcomes are analysed.

1.2. Methodology

25. A first evaluation took place in the period October - December 2005. The evaluation team was composed of a food security expert (Team Leader), a forestry specialist, an agro-biodiversity specialist and a food security/evaluation specialist. The team benefited from the inputs of the Programme Coordinator who participated in some of the country visits as a resource person. The evaluation was managed by the FAO Evaluation Service.

26. The evaluation is based on a review of documentation, interviews with those closely associated to the programme as well as country field visits. The evaluation team started with a briefing at headquarters followed by visits to four countries: Bhutan, Lao PDR, Kenya and Mozambique, and to the FAO Regional Office in Bangkok. These countries were selected taking into account the level of implementation of the FNPP II. The period covered by this report is July 2004-October 2005.

27. As the team did not include a water specialist and since the water theme is implemented in only one country not visited by the evaluation team, these aspects of the programme are not covered in depth except from a design point of view.

1.

¹ Terms of Reference in Annex 1

1.3. Structure of the Report

28. The body of the report is divided in three sections. Section 2 provides a brief overview of the programme, highlighting where the programme started activities at country and global levels. Section 3 provides an assessment of individual themes. The final section provides overall conclusions and recommendations.

2. Brief Overview of the Programme

29. The first months of FNPP II was a start-up period. Implementation started during the fall of 2004 and activities at country level started early 2005. This is reflected in the relatively low disbursement rate over that period. The ratio of expenses by end October (16 months into implementation) represented 57 percent of the first instalment (budgeted for the first 12 months)².

2.1. Country Programmes

30. Significant time was devoted to select countries in which the programme would be active. The need to achieve rapid impact at country level was an important factor driving the selection process. Country programmes were formulated and negotiated with member countries, and activities started progressively. At the same time, discussions with relevant FAO units were held to put together the work programme. By October 2004, a new FNPP coordinator was in place, selected among the senior staff members of the Policy Assistance Division. The process of preparation of a programme work plan for 2005 resulted in the submission of a document by end 2004, which was discussed during the annual FAO-Netherlands meeting in January 2005.

31. Over these first 18 months of implementation, FNPP began activities in 15 countries and one group of countries, the Conference of Central African Forestry Ministers (COMIFAC) which groups seven countries: Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, DR Congo, Gabon and Equatorial Guinea. Initially, it had been envisaged to be active also in Niger and Bolivia. Although not originally planned, activities were launched in Malawi, building on prior FAO work.

32. The table below shows where activities have been initiated or a work plan finalized. It is only in Kenya that the three themes are active. Each theme opted for a different strategy for the first year of implementation. The Forests theme initiated activities in a relatively large number of countries while the agro-biodiversity theme focuses on three countries. With regard to the latter, the innovative nature of the subject-matter and approach made it difficult to start implementation in too many countries. With regard to the food security theme (Policy Assistance), it was very much geared by the imperatives of demonstrating results by the end of the first year. Water is currently implemented only in Tanzania as a follow-up to FNPP I.

Table 1	Food Security	Forest	Agro-Biodiversity	Water
Africa:				
Angola				
Democratic Republic of Congo				
Kenya				

1.

² Data from TCAP: the expenses amounted to US\$ 3,501,290 as of 31 October. The first installment, covering the period July 2004-June 2005, amounted to US\$ 6,154,000. These figures differ from those presented in the Progress Report as the latter is based on commitments (actual and planned) until June 2006 and over the two installments.

Malawi				
Mali				
Mozambique				
Tanzania (Zanzibar)				
Uganda				
Zambia				
COMIFAC				
Asia:				
Bhutan				
Cambodia				
India				
Lao PDR				
Timor Leste				
Vietnam				
Latin America:				
Honduras				

2.2. Global Activities

33. In addition to country-level programmes, a number of activities took place at global level. These include:

- a) Food Security (FS) theme:
 - Assessment of Food Security and Nutrition in Emergencies: Methodology for Improved Assessment and Response. Most of the activities are to develop food security relevant responses to different types of crises based on a widely accepted comprehensive framework that analyses and addresses people's needs;
 - International conference on facilitating transformations in the food system which was held in FAO in Rome on 4-5 May 2005. The objective of the conference was to initiate and provide an analytical background to the activities of the food security theme related to the adjustment of smallholders in a globalized and urbanised food economy.
- b) The 25 percent unallocated funds:
 - The Global IPM Facility;
 - Working group meeting to review the format and indicators for reporting by governments on the progress on the WFS Plan of Action, following the agreement reached at the Thirtieth Session of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) in 2004.

3. Assessment of Individual Themes of the Programme

3.1. Food Security Theme

34. The Food Security theme is divided into three objectives (three sub-themes) under two programme entities:

- Programme Entity 1, Assessment of Food Security and Nutrition in Emergencies: Methodology for Improved Assessment and Response (PE1 Emergencies)
- Programme Entity 2 Objective 1 (PE2-O1 Policy Assistance): Country Level Work to Support Poverty reduction Strategies Papers (PRSPs) and other Policies, Initiatives and Programmes Targeting Poverty and Food Security
- Programme Entity 2 Objective 2 (PE2-O2 Food Systems): Food Systems Theme.

35. The two programme entities are conceived independently from each other. Both objectives (sub-themes) under PE2 relate to policies. However, the nature of the activities under each sub-theme is quite different. Under PE2-O1, most activities are geared at providing direct policy assistance at country level. PE2-O2 is conceived as a research programme based on country case studies and ultimately resulting in policy advice. For these reasons, the three sub-themes of the Food Security theme are assessed independently.

3.1.1. Programme Entity 1: Assessment of Food Security and Nutrition in Emergencies: Methodology for Improved Assessment and Response (PE1 Emergencies)

Design

36. As per the Policy Framework Paper (PFP), the objective of theme PE1 is to develop relevant food security responses to different types of crises based on a comprehensive framework that analyses and addresses people's needs. The planned outcomes include the development of analytical frameworks with associated tools to be used and agreed by selected partners; the application of the framework by selected partners and major agencies; and strengthened capacity by local governmental units to support the framework.

37. To a certain extent, the PFP makes assumptions on the role and place of FAO as far as food security analysis and needs assessment are concerned. It assumes that FAO has the leadership in food security analysis and assessment in emergency contexts, a leadership role which it may at present not necessarily take on fully. Also, it does not acknowledge the role of and analytical developments made so far by other organizations. Thus, the nature of the outcomes presented in the PFP constitute an ambitious expectation of what can be achieved under FNPP PE1.

38. Specified outcomes did not fully take into account a number of internal challenges FAO faces in analysis and assessment, e.g. the need to develop a shared vision of FAO's role and comparative advantage in emergency response; the importance of developing standardized frameworks for assessments and response protocols for the Organization itself; limited awareness by donors and members countries of FAO's technical capacity or field presence.

39. Furthermore, the outcomes do not fully capture how FAO should link its food security analysis and assessment activities with the relatively more advanced protocols of other international organizations and NGOs (e.g. WFP, UNICEF and Oxfam) and related processes, e.g. the processes outlined under the Inter-agency Standing Committee, in particular the Consolidated Appeals and Needs Analysis processes (CAP/NAF exercise), as well as various inter-agency initiatives for needs assessment in post-conflict settings (Post Conflict Needs Assessment (PCNAs), led by UNDP and the World Bank under the auspices of UNDG. The focus should be on ensuring that FAO's work complements rather than competes with related initiatives at the international level.

40. An inter-divisional meeting took place in September 2004 with a view to outlining the initial components of a roadmap for PE1. Following that meeting, a broad logframe was proposed, bringing some clarity on what the theme is aimed to do. The main planned activities for 2005 included: a literature review, stakeholder consultations with key donors and implementing partners, initial country reviews of needs assessment and crisis response processes, and the identification of key themes of an assessment and response framework.

Implementation

<i>Table 2: Overview of Activities and Outputs</i>	
Key Activities	Outputs
Inception internal seminar	Draft work plan
Support to the CAP/NAF exercise through participation in a workshop on "Strengthening the Analysis of Needs" - February 2005	Back-to-office report
Internal Workshop on Food Security and Protection and Rehabilitation of Agriculture-based Livelihoods in Protracted Crisis – 21-22 June 2005	Workshop proceedings

Support to emergency coordinators for FAO's contribution to the UN Consolidated Appeal Process/National Assessment Framework (CAP/NAF) pilot countries July 2005	In 3 countries, food security assessments in the CAP/NAF
Leadership of the ODI/WFP Review of Emergency Needs Assessment Practices in Ethiopia	Analytical contribution to directions of PE1
Study on improving the link between food security assessment and response: towards a comprehensive framework	Draft working paper, Neil Marsland November 2005
Internal seminar	Draft work plan for 2006-2007

41. The activities undertaken so far focused on further defining the theme and assessing issues to be addressed in consultation with other FAO divisions through workshops, recruiting consultant(s), practical support to FAO's emergency coordinators in preparing their contribution to the CAP/NAF pilot countries and the development of a comprehensive assessment-response framework. In addition to travel, the main input from the FNPP has been the recruitment of a consultant for a total of 4.5 months in two periods. Another consultant has been hired jointly with the EC-funded programme since August for a period of 8 months.

42. The internal workshop in June gathered staff and consultant from the Food Security Service of the Agricultural and Development Economics Division (ESAF) working on the PE1 and emergency coordinators from different countries. The workshop resulted in three outputs: (i) a shared understanding of current needs assessment practices (including their strengths and weaknesses) and of the constraints for FAO to play its role; (ii) concrete suggestions for refining needs analysis and response capacity; and (iii) an agreement on the next steps to follow at country level. The workshop represented an important milestone for PE1 in enhancing partnerships and lessons learning within FAO between ESAF and emergency operations (TCE). It was also a useful step to determine how the programme can assist FAO's emergency coordinators in a practical way and can link field experience with the development of normative outputs. The experience gained through the support to emergency coordinators in strengthening their needs assessment capacity using the testing of the NAF and preparation of the CAP was expected to feed into the development of a comprehensive needs assessment-response framework. Finally, the workshop was also an opportunity to present the Food Security Phase Classification tool developed in the context of the Food Security Analysis Unit for Somalia³ and to examine potentially wider application. The PE1 Team plans to carry forward further piloting and testing of the tool in a number of countries in Africa.

43. The paper prepared by the FNPP consultant presents a good first attempt to develop a food security assessment - response framework, highlighting key aspects of the links between assessment and response. It proposed a tool to assess the extent to which certain critical benchmarks are being met, taking into account country contexts in relation to the assessment-response links and applies it to three countries building on the field experience with emergency coordinators in these countries. As acknowledged in the report itself, the report presented the "work in progress" and needed to be validated by further field-testing. Furthermore, and as per the terms of reference of the study, the report focuses very much on the assessment-response links but does not propose a framework for assessing and analysing needs per se.

44. The FNPP allowed FAO to respond to a request to provide technical leadership to an ODI/WFP review of emergency needs assessment practice in Ethiopia through the secondment of the FAO Chief Technical Adviser on the EC-funded project "Support to Food Security Analysis Unit (Somalia)" (see footnote5). Such an input was a positive step towards collaboration with external agencies (ODI and

1.

³ Project OSRO/SOM/003/EC: Support to Food Security Analysis Unit (Somalia)

WFP) working on common issues. Following the mission, a short paper was prepared addressing issues under PE1. In particular, the paper drew attention to the terminology used, the distinction between different types of emergency assessment and implications for the focus of PE1.

Relevance to and Links with Other FAO Regular and Extra-Budgetary Programme Work

45. There is no institutional “home” for needs assessment work within the Organization. Needs assessment for food security in emergencies is a broad domain of work with links to a number of programmes⁴ located in different divisions, particularly in ES Department but also involving emergency operations (TCE). PE1 is also very much relevant to the core themes of the Priority Area for Inter-disciplinary Action on Disaster Prevention, Mitigation, and Preparedness and Post-Emergency Relief and Rehabilitation (PAIA-REHAB).

46. There is a good rationale to place PE1 in the Agricultural and Development Economics Division (ESA). Food security in crisis and emergency situations is one of the four complementary themes of the division which impact on food security and food systems, thus the core theme of PE1 is relevant to the regular programme of the division. Furthermore, the focal point for the theme is also the Programme Coordinator for the EC-FAO Programme “Food Security Information for Action (GCP/INT/952/EC)” which has very similar objectives. There are possible complementarities with the EC programme, with the latter being very much country-based and the FNPP providing opportunities to develop normative contribution with broader validity. A consultant has been hired (with partial financial support from the FNPP) to assist the Chief Technical Adviser of GCP/INT/952/EC and provide technical support for both programmes at headquarters and at country level.

47. Overall, collaboration with TCE has been positive and fruitful in particular through the support to emergency coordinators in a number of countries following up the Nairobi workshop. Despite relevant activities in other divisions, substantive collaboration has been limited to their participation in the two internal planning meetings and comments on PE1 outputs. It partly reflects a structural problem within the Organization to carry out work in partnership which has not been programmed and budgeted in the programme of work. Secondly, there is still a lack of consensus conceptually and operationally within the Organization as to how the Organization should address food security needs assessment and response in emergencies. The PAIA-REHAB is one of the instruments aimed at coordinating work across divisions and departments and defining a corporate strategy in that domain. However, it is not clear that this facilitating platform has been used for enhancing collaboration with other divisions under PE1. Except for the two internal planning workshops, collaboration when it happened seems to have taken place mostly bilaterally. Finally, the lack of clear directions and work plan on PE1 noted above did not support horizontal collaboration.

Recommendations

48. The development of the food security emergency and disaster management framework, as well as that of the needs and analysis framework, is still work in progress. The June workshop and the more recent seminar highlighted the need for FAO to first achieve an internal consensus on the role it plays in needs assessment. It also recognized FAO’s weak capacity both at headquarters to react promptly when needed and at country level for emergency coordination units to conduct food security assessment and analysis. Therefore, the adoption and implementation by governments and international partners of a framework developed by FAO may be too ambitious an objective. These

1.

⁴ In particular those carried out under Programme 2.2.1A6 “Nutrition and Household Food Security in Emergencies” (ESN leadership), Programme 2.2.3P6 “Global Information and Early warning System on Food and Agriculture” (ESC leadership).

key findings and the remaining timeframe of the FNPP II constitute the basis for the following recommendations on priorities:

- **Continue the conceptual and analytical development for the needs assessments – response framework.** There is scope for close *internal* collaboration between the concerned technical and operational divisions, building on existing work and using expertise available in the Organization, and a mechanism needs to be established to formalise collaboration between the divisions already associated to the planning exercise. A small task force involving representatives (or focal points) of relevant divisions and with specific distribution of tasks and FNPP budget allocations could be set up. As identified during the last internal seminar, there is also scope for partnering with *external organizations* which are pursuing their own conceptual and analytical work (e.g. similar to the collaboration with ODI on the Ethiopia Review).
- **Develop an operational framework or a protocol which clarifies the role of FAO in needs assessment and analysis in emergencies and describes corporate institutional arrangements to operationalize needs assessment and analysis as well as serve as guidelines for FAO staff to conduct needs assessment and analysis in a given context.** Following the example of the Nairobi workshop, this will have to be developed in close consultation with technical and operational divisions, and with those at the forefront at country level, i.e. emergency coordinators and FAO representatives.
- **Pilot test of the operational framework (“Protocol”) in a number of crisis situations.**
- **Identify in-house training needs and build in-house capacity to apply the needs assessment-response framework.** It is likely that training will have to target first FAO staff working at country level.
- **A detailed work plan should be defined on the basis of the above priorities.**

3.1.2. Programme Entity 2 Objective 1: Country Level Work to Support Poverty reduction Strategies Papers (PRSPs) and other policies, initiatives and Programmes Targeting Poverty and Food security

49. The starting point for Programme Entity 2 Objective 1 (PE2-O1) of the Food Security theme is the recognition that development programmes, initiatives and funding frameworks at country level aiming at poverty reduction often lack a food security, hunger and/or agricultural focus. Food security objectives and the strategies to achieve them are missing in many PRSPs which, nevertheless, often constitute the major instrument for development policy and donor coordination. This was again re-confirmed by the results of a review carried out recently by the Policy Assistance Division (TCA) on how food security is addressed in these documents.

50. As stated in the Policy Framework Paper, PE2-O1 aims at influencing policies and relates to food security objectives, policies, programmes and monitoring mechanisms in PRSPs and other policy initiatives at country level. This objective reflects FAO’s main thrust of both its normative programme on poverty and hunger linkages as well as of its policy assistance work. In particular, this is one of the major research themes of the Agricultural and Development Economics Division (ESA) which is responsible for the management and implementation of PE2-O1. There are five coherent, although ambitious, expected outcomes which relate to integrating food security consideration into policy and programmes as well as capacity building of policy-makers and more generally of stakeholders involved in the preparation of the PRSPs and related policies and programmes. Rightly taking into account the necessary timeframe of policy processes, a reasonable target of results in three countries was set for the first year of implementation.

51. An additional outcome focuses more specifically on policy and implementation strategies of Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM). This is a follow-up to FNPP I and responds to the Donor’s expectation to have water as a cross-cutting theme under FNPP II.

Selection of Countries

52. A phased and inclusive approach was chosen for the selection of priority countries. It started with an open consultation with FAO Representatives as to their own views on opportunities for the programme to support national policy processes and potential interest and involvement of FAO's capacities at the country level. The second phase of the country selection consisted in setting up a task force at headquarters comprised of staff familiar to the countries concerned which eventually made final decision on country selection. To a certain extent, such an approach led to a quick selection process and "buy-in" from the FAO Representatives from the beginning. The main drawback of this process of self-selection is that countries that may be in need of support may not have been selected in priority just because of a lack of pro-activeness from the part of the FAO offices. In line with the FNPP's imperative to have tangible results, two groups of countries were selected: 'Tier 1' countries which presented an opportunity to start activities immediately and deliver results by the end of 2005, and 'Tier 2' countries, for which scrutiny would continue in 2005 and work plans would be developed in the course of the year.

Implementation

Summary of Activities and Outputs

53. Activities under PE2-O1 have been initiated in seven countries of which tangible results were expected in three (Kenya, Mozambique and Bhutan). As the summary table of activities and outputs shows, PE2-O1 has been progressing quite smoothly. In all these countries, the activities (or work plan) carried out aim at providing technical assistance to policy processes and, in some countries, for the preparation of specific PRS-related documents. Technical assistance has been provided in multiple ways: preparation of background and/or mapping documents on food security by national consultant(s) (Kenya, Malawi) day-to-day support (including inter-sectoral consultation) to the preparation of food security policy and/or PRSs-related documents through the appointment of an advisor working directly with the Government (Bhutan and Mozambique) and missions by technical officers from headquarters (mostly ESA). In some cases, (Kenya, Malawi and Mozambique), FNPP funded the visit of staff involved in the FNPP (including the visit of the FAO Representatives) to headquarters. These visits were instrumental in clarifying and agreeing the FNPP strategy for the country and to address implementation issues.

Management

54. In some countries, an FNPP coordinator has been recruited to assist the FAO Representative and ensure the day-to-day implementation of the programme (e.g. Kenya and Mozambique). In countries visited, it was recognized by all involved in the FNPP that the implementation of PE2-O1 (and the programme in general) requires significant administrative support as well as technical follow-up beyond the capacity of the FAO country office. The recruitment of coordinators in Kenya and Mozambique was a good step in reducing some of the burden.

55. There is one ESA technical officer⁵ responsible for each country with a coordinator for PE2-O1 located in ESA and assisting the Food Security Programme Manager (budget holder). In the case of Tanzania, there is also a responsible officer from the Land and Water Development Division. Intensive backstopping has been carried out during this first year and is not expected to slow down in the near future. On the contrary, the country visits, as well as the work plan for other countries, highlight the need for significant increase in technical backstopping. As recognized by those involved, it stretches the capacity of the division (the mandate of which is primarily normative) to its limit. In addition,

1.

⁵ The FIVIMS Coordinator (ESDG), formerly in ESA, maintained his responsibility as manager of the Kenya Food Security theme.

considering the nature of PE2-O1 (policy support), it is questionable why the Policy Assistance Division (TCA) officers in the Regional and Sub regional Offices and at headquarters are not involved more significantly. This is an issue that will also be addressed in the section below on the programme aspects.

Expected Outcomes and Impacts

56. In two out of three countries visited where PE2-O1 is implemented, there are concrete outcomes resulting from support provided under PE2-O1.

57. In Bhutan, the PE2-O1 provided a crucial support, and enabled the government to develop an analytical process that addresses the different dimensions of food security. It started a process of change in the vision of food security from a typical cereal-based self-sufficiency perspective to a more complex vision of self-reliance with importance given to access. The timeliness of FNPP and its positioning within the Policy and Planning Department (PPD) of the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) means that food security will be mainstreamed into the Five-Year plan of the MoA. By highlighting the multi-sectoral nature of food security, it is expected that food security will be mainstreamed in the Five-Year Plans of other ministries.

58. Without FNPP support, the MoA would not have been able to provide the resources and food security technical expertise to follow such an analytical and multi-sectoral approach. In addition, the documents produced so far and discussions at the core group workshop have contributed to sensitising key MoA staff on the multi-sectoral nature of food security. The forthcoming national workshop and press release in the national newspaper is expected to make a similar contribution among other ministries and raise public awareness.

59. In Mozambique, considerable progress has been made in integrating food security in the poverty reduction strategy document (PARPA), which now reflects food security as a cross-cutting theme. This is an achievement in itself considering that the previous document (PARPA I) did not address food security issues. Equally important as this final output is the process through which it was achieved. Indeed, a better understanding of the food security concept and greater awareness on food security issues among Government staff were permitted by the placement of a full-time adviser within the Ministry of Development and Planning.

60. In Kenya, An important value addition of PE2-O1 activities is that it is establishing a viable linkage with the country's poverty reduction strategy process. Its involvement in the preparation of the National Food and Nutrition Policy (NFNP) offers an opportunity for FNPP to support and provide guidance in the revision of the Economic Recovery Strategy (the overarching national strategy). However, because of the delay encountered in the finalization of background documents, the NFNP process may not benefit to the extent expected from the analytical inputs.

Linkages with Normative Work

61. As indicated above, the management of PE2-O1 was placed in a division with a primarily normative mandate with a view to ensuring/strengthening mutual benefits between the normative work carried out by the division on food security-poverty links and the policy assistance provided at country level. While country level work benefited from solid technical support from the division, there is no mechanism in place so far to share and learn from the country experiences and ultimately to draw lessons and best practices feeding into normative work. The first year was rightly dedicated to getting the programme into place at country level. Considering progress made in implementation and achievements made in one year, there is already great potential for learning.

Water

62. Activities related to Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) have been undertaken in only one country (Tanzania) in follow-up to previous work. This is reported as covering:

- Formation of water users' associations and their federation into a catchment organization for IWRM, in Mbeya region (follow-up to FNPP I) in line with the Agriculture Sector Development Strategy. WWF – Tanzania is the main counterpart in delivering pilot support, through a letter of agreement;
- Technical and financial support to the formulation of a National Irrigation Policy and Strategy for mainland Tanzania. A work plan has been agreed with the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security to conduct a comprehensive situational analysis of the irrigated sector and develop a new irrigation policy in line with the national water policy;
- In Zanzibar water policy is also intended to be integrated into the Zanzibar Poverty Reduction Plan (ZPRP) where the FNPP is supporting the UNDAF input in the ZNRP process.

63. It is the intention that water policy be integrated into the themes of policy for food security, biodiversity and forestry and a paper on this is being drafted. To date, however, work has been very limited and in so far as could be ascertained by the evaluation team, it has been directed towards water/irrigation policy as distinct from the place of water in wider policies and PRS. This slow start-up was reported to be due to the demands on the Water Resources Development and Management Service (AGLW) for support to the FAO/Government of the Netherlands International Conference on Water for Food and Eco-systems (31 January-5 February 2005) and its immediate follow-up. On the other hand, the FNPP provides a framework for FAO follow-up on the main themes of this conference and there now needs to be a rapid acceleration.

Conclusions

64. Bhutan and Mozambique were a good choice to demonstrate how relatively small amounts of funding can go a long way in influencing mainstream policy processes. From these two country experiences, a number of positive factors can be highlighted:

- Good longstanding good relationship and significant cooperation programme with the government. Mozambique is one of FAO's largest field programmes with several projects with policy-level dimensions. In Bhutan, external cooperation in general is limited and FAO has been a significant player for a long time.
- Active and supportive FAO Representatives: In the three countries where PE2-01 has started significant activities, FAO Representatives have been/are well engaged in the policy dialogues at all levels, thus setting an appropriate environment for PE2-01 support.
- Provision of long-term technical assistance positioned within the government structure responsible for coordinating the policy/strategy formulation process. Policy support requires regular day-to-day support, including taking opportunities when they occur to provide technical support and advocacy.
- Backstopping capacity: In Bhutan, the technical backstopping has been ensured by a Food Systems Analyst of ESA (a Bhutanese national with a deep knowledge of the country) who is well known and highly respected by the government. In Mozambique, in addition to backstopping from headquarters, the national consultant/policy adviser benefited from the pool of FAO expertise available from projects at country level.
- Appropriate timing: in Bhutan and Mozambique, the flexibility of the FNPP allowed support at a crucial time in policy processes being initiated. By contrast, in Kenya, the lack of timeliness in providing inputs is likely to affect outcomes.
- Process has been inclusive and consultative. In particular in Bhutan, attention has been paid at various stages to the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders including government departments, donors, and UN agencies, elected representatives as well as farmers and representatives of the private sector. In Mozambique, the PRS preparation process was also consultative, although to a lesser extent, through inter-sectoral working groups on cross-cutting issues.

- **Government in the driving seat:** In Bhutan, FAO had already experienced openness of government and clarity and commitment to national programmes. Well-coordinated ministries, effective and committed bureaucracy, and well-defined instruments of planning and decentralized budgeting have all facilitated the potential to translate FNPP contribution into mainstream programme policy. The same holds for Mozambique where the PARPA is very much owned by the Government.

Recommendations

65. *Implementation strategy:* Lessons should be drawn from the successful examples, in particular Bhutan, to develop approaches in “Tier 2” countries and to continue further support in “Tier 1” countries.
66. For new countries (Tier 2), *involvement of policy assistance officers* (TCA and decentralized offices) should be systematically sought. This will require involving policy officers at an early stage of formulation. In order to ensure commitment, a system of “buying services” for technical backstopping within FAO internal market could be established whereby services provided by policy officers are paid by the FNPP (PE2-01). In turn, programme managers together with the FAO Representatives will select policy officers based on their commitment and knowledge of the country.
67. *Linking normative with country-level work:* An internal workshop during year 2 of implementation should be organized, including the participation of technical staff involved in the implementation of PE2-01, as well as staff from ESA and TCA. The objective of such a workshop(s) would be primarily technical, to take stock of country level experiences so far, to draw lessons on the various themes addressed and the issues faced in providing policy support.
68. *With regard to water,* it is suggested that a specific water theme (entity) should now be identified within each of the FNPP themes and that resources from the unallocated funds should be designated for this.

Table 3	Country	Key Activities	Main Outputs
<i>Countries where tangible results were expected for 2005</i>			
Bhutan (visited)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outline for the preparation of BNFSSP agreed. Partnership with SNV established. TCA and ESA backstopping missions National and regional workshops Preparation of Drafts of BNFSSP and discussed at regional and national workshops. Planning started for Phase II for mainstreaming the analytical underpinnings and recommendations of the BNFSSP into ongoing decentralize Dzongkhag and Geog planning processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft BNFSSP completed. Functional linkages with the FYP process established. Regional food security profiles completed. Production of food security maps for the different Geogs completed. Drafts of Phase II of the theme under preparation 	
Kenya (visited)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-sectoral Task Force to prepare and National Food and Nutrition Policy (NFNP) established Concept Note for the preparation of the NFNP agreed. ESA/ESDG Backstopping missions Travel of FAOR and project staff to HQ's Recruitment of a National Project Coordinator Food Security Policy Review and Food Security Assessment studies contracted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantive comments from FNPP on the NFNP Participation in review meetings and workshops Draft Food Security Policy Review and Food Security Assessment studies 	
Mozambique (visited)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systematic evaluation of food security themes and objectives in the current poverty reduction strategy paper ("PARPA 2001-2005") Contribution to publication on progress made on MGS. Technical Support to the preparation of the PARPA II (local consultant/ Policy Adviser in the MPD) and working groups through a full-time consultant placed in the MDP; Recruitment of National Coordinator ESA Backstopping mission Travel of FAOR and project staff to headquarters. Food Security and Nutrition (FSN) Working Group established for drafting the related sections of PARPA Natural Resources Working Group established to provide inputs into the finalization of the Rural Development Strategy. Preparation of case studies. Workshop on integration of fisheries sector into PARPA II . Minor financial support to 3 provincial SETSAN 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inputs into PARPA Thematic groups papers Inputs into PARPA drafts 3 draft case studies 	

<i>Other countries where work planned</i>		
Angola	Contribution to activities carried out under the Forests Theme Recruitment of a national consultant to conduct field surveys on economic and social aspects of Forests and the contribution of Forests to food security ESA backstopping mission	
Cambodia	TCA and ESA formulation missions One month international consultant; technical assistance to the National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP) formulation process. Partnership established with GTZ and CARD	Work plan developed and agreed with government Inputs into the FSN-TWG submission to the NSDP Secretariat
Malawi	Preparation of a paper "Food and Nutrition Security in Malawi" as a background document to the Malawi Poverty and Vulnerability Assessment and as input to the PRS process; Visit to FAO headquarters by MEPD staff member to work on the draft paper (training on the job);	Draft Paper Presentation
Tanzania	1. Formulation of the PRSP-II for Zanzibar 2. Work plan agreed with UNDP and the Government of Zanzibar to conduct a situational and causal analysis of food security and integrate food security objectives in the PRS work on water (see above).	

3.1.3. Programme Entity 2 - Objective 2: Food Systems Theme

Design

69. The objective of PE2-02 as stipulated in the Policy Framework Paper is to have “policies adopted at national and sub-national levels that facilitate the adjustment of small farmers and rural communities to a more globalized and urbanised food economy”. PE2-02 is part of an overall programme of the Agricultural and Development Economics Division (one of the four Regular Programme themes) where it is located: “Making markets work for the poor” supported by both the Regular Budget and Norway, in addition to the FNPP. The overall orientation of the ESA work on this topic is one of research and the strategy has been to integrate FNPP into this from a research cum action perspective.

70. The Policy Framework Paper states two major planned outcomes which relate to: (i) capacity building of policy makers; and (ii) policy changes. These outcomes were expected to be realized by the end of 2005 in three countries. However, the objective and outcome statements did not take into account the timeframe needed for generating results of research, mapping and building knowledge on issues relating to small farmers, access to markets and appropriate policy measures addressing these issues. They also underestimated the complexity of policy processes, including the need to identify the country specific issues, the main actors in the policy processes, and to build awareness and sensitize these actors on issues to be addressed.

71. The approach for implementing PE2-02 was presented in a document “FNPP sub-theme proposal: Facilitating the adjustment of small farms into the food economy”. A conceptual framework and the research approach are further refined in a concept note prepared in October 2005. The stated immediate objectives give a better indication how these outcomes are expected to be achieved. It is a research proposal aiming at a better understanding of issues relating to changes in food systems, focusing on the following questions: To what extent are food systems changing and how? What are the drivers of change? and how are changes manifested (organization and institutions)? It is envisaged that this review exercise will enable country case research activities to add value to currently available information sources and to cater to policy demands, including direct use in policy debates at country level. The approach at country level comprises three building blocks, which are (a) building of country specific knowledge regarding the context within which small farms operate and an examination of changes in food systems; (b) an understanding of the country specific policy processes; and (c) building of networks to ensure that the findings of the analytical work will be fed into the policy-formulation process. The proposal and the concept note acknowledge that issues need to be properly analysed through case studies and that the results of the research should feed into policy processes at country level. However, achieving expected outcomes remains challenging within the FNPP timeframe.

72. The selected countries are all countries where the PE2 Objective 1 of the food security theme had started activities, so as to maximize synergy and to increase cross-fertilization and to open up multiple avenues for influencing the policy process. However, for all four countries (except India) where activities have been planned, there is no clear indication as to how linkages between activities of PE2-02 and PE2-01 are envisaged and within which broader policy framework the research takes place. In Mozambique, three steps were planned, including (i) a mapping exercise of all policies, programmes and projects relating to small farms and market linkages; (ii) a case study on small farms at provincial level; and (iii) a strategy to implement the major policy recommendations. Some possible avenues at national level were identified (including the Agriculture Marketing Strategy 2005 -2009 being now finalized) but again no detailed concrete approach has been laid down yet. The research proposals for Bhutan and India are still in a draft form.

Implementation

Overview of Activities and Outputs

73. Overall, the implementation of PE2-02 has been slow. The above table summarizes the status of implementation. During the first quarter of 2005, activities concentrated on the organization of a

symposium on agricultural commercialization and the small farmer which took place in May 2005 and the production of conceptual and analytical papers for this. Country papers were presented on the country-specific contexts within which small farms operate and historical trends regarding the small farm sector. For each country where PE2-O2 was planned to be implemented, consultants were contracted. The symposium was conceived as a starting point in the research for identifying common issues and helping to develop the analytical framework within which country-level work would fit but to some extent diverted resources and time from country-level work. The paper, presented in a subsequent conference⁶ on “Commercializing Small Farms: Reducing Transaction Costs” was prepared following the symposium. It provides an analysis of the relationship between transaction costs of small farmers and their potential to trade in domestic and international markets. It concludes on the broad questions that the research should address.

74. The finalization of proceedings of the symposium which still remains to be completed should help to refine the overall vision.

75. Considerable time was also spent on organizing the symposium and starting activities in one country (Kenya) where smooth implementation was also hampered by administrative difficulties in processing the contract (LoA) with a local research institute.

Table 4	Key Activities	Outputs
Global level	“Agricultural Commercialization and the Small Farmer”, 4-5 May 2005	Proceedings (not finalized yet)
	- Preparation of the research analytical framework	ESA Working Paper on “Commercializing Small Farms: Reducing Transaction Costs”, October 2005
	- Study (by a consultant) on "The impact of supermarket development on the rural economy"	Draft Paper - July 2005
Kenya	- ½ day workshop - LoA with KIPPRA to carry out field surveys	Guidelines for conducting Rapid Rural Assessment of Small Farmers and Commercialization (Kenya), November 2005
Mozambique	- Mapping exercise of policies/programmes/projects on small farmers and markets in 3 provinces by 3 national consultants	One draft available
Bhutan	- National consultant contracted to write a research proposal	A draft research proposal for Bhutan
India	- National consultant contracted to write a research proposal	A draft research proposal for India

76. A further case study is being carried out in China with Norwegian funding.

77. PE2-O2 is under the direct management of the Director, ESA. While it gives a high profile to the programme, it is unlikely that management can always provide the regular technical support and guidance needed by the junior staff involved (an APO and a junior consultant (recently hired) are responsible for implementing the programme and both expressed the need for more regular guidance and technical support). It is also possible that the rate of implementation could be speeded up if a senior officer were able to devote more time.

78. The programme is at a very early stage of implementation. The observations made below are thus based mostly on the case of Kenya where the field work will start soon and activities are most advanced and to a limited extent on Mozambique.

1.

⁶ IFPRI and Imperial College, University of London.

79. *Need to build on existing country knowledge:* The approach developed for Mozambique starting with the mapping of existing programmes and policies that address issues of small farmers and commercialization is valid. It is not clear to what extent the research approach developed in Kenya is informed by a similar literature review and mapping of existing knowledge in the country.
80. *Scale of the research at national level:* The limited scale of the research may reduce the relevance at national level of the research vis-à-vis the issues it aims to address. There is a risk that the results may be valid only for the area where field work will be carried out and for the specific commodity chain it focuses on, rather than having overall national application.
81. *Range of stakeholders involved:* The identification of “stakeholders” and entry points in policy processes still needs to be done. In Kenya, the workshop that took place in November was a first effort in this regard but it gathered mostly staff from the government ministries. Considering the issues addressed in the research, it needs to establish a broad platform and network, including representatives not only from the government but also representatives of the farmers, and other parts of the food supply chain: traders and processors, as well as those involved in distribution.
82. *Clarity on entry points in policy processes:* This aspect of PE2-O2 deserves greater attention as it is one aspect where the value-added of FNPP carrying out such research lies. In Kenya, the half-day workshop appears to have been a one-time event. Insufficient attention has been given to defining a strategy to influence policy, the most appropriate entry point(s) and what is achievable given the timeframe of the FNPP and the scale of the research work.
83. *Potential normative contribution:* The symposium was a first step in sharing knowledge. Mechanisms should be built into the project for this and to draw lessons from case studies and other activities. Given the limited extent of the FAO research, this can most meaningfully be achieved by collaboration with other partners (see below) and placing case studies in the context of comprehensive literature review.
84. *External partnerships:* Efforts have been made to enhance partnerships, primarily through exchange of data, with the DFID-funded Re-governing Markets Project⁷ with which PE2-O2 bears strong similarities in terms of objectives and approach. Re-governing markets is a global and ambitious project with significant resources and application in a large sample of countries. As such, it constitutes potentially an ideal partner for identifying gaps on the issues, building knowledge, and providing a global avenue for the results of the research carried out under PE2-O2. Complementarities and what FAO can bring through PE2-O2 would need to be clearly defined.
85. *Collaboration within FAO:* Up to now, there has been limited collaboration with other FAO Divisions (except *ad hoc* collaboration with the Policy Assistance Division - TCA). Considering the theme and its relevance to other regular programmes of the Organization, there is scope for greater collaboration, in particular with units working on marketing issues (e.g. AGSF⁸). Other units can contribute in consolidating the overall vision and analytical framework underpinning PE2-O2 and mapping existing knowledge.
86. *Expected outcomes:* It is too early to assess what outcomes can be expected and it is unlikely that the outcomes stated in the Policy Framework Paper were realistic or will be realised within the timeframe of the FNPP, given the research approach adopted under this theme.

1.

⁷ A consortium of North- and South-based institutions led by the International Institute for Environment and Development to analyze growing concentration in the processing and retail sectors of national and regional agri-food systems and its impacts and implications for rural livelihoods and communities. Funding for Phase 1 of the project is provided by DFID with some seed money from Swiss Development Cooperation.

⁸ Agricultural Management, Marketing and Finance Service

Recommendations

87. Expected outcomes should be refined taking into account achievements so far and the remaining timeframe. PE2-O2 should be seen as a first phase of a longer-term programme with the following outcomes at the end of the first phase:

- Better understanding by policy decision-makers and stakeholders in general of changes in food systems and of factors of change affecting small farmers in specific food supply chains;
- Policy measures and possible programmes to address the issue of inclusion of small farmers in dynamic markets identified by policy-makers and stakeholders in general; and
- Policy makers are sensitized and policy avenues identified.

88. A detailed work plan for the overall theme over the next two years needs to be elaborated. Among other things, the work plan would clarify how country case studies and other activities at global level will contribute to normative outputs.

89. At country level:

- Coverage of systems and areas by field work should be greater so as to have a higher degree of representativity and ensure greater relevance both at country and global levels. This can be done through larger sampling and coverage of a wider diversity of rural economies.
- Field research should be associated to other activities that would involve a broad range of key stakeholders and, at various stages (milestones) of the research, bring issues to a higher level in the policy making chain: national, provincial workshops for understanding concerns of the various groups of actors along the food supply chains, promoting fora for discussing issues, sensitization, and awareness building around the specific issues addressed in the research.
- Both recommendations above will involve re-adjustment of funding from the FNPP. Additional resources may be allocated or the number of country case studies reduced in order to increase scope and depth of the analysis. It is suggested that priority be given to Kenya and Mozambique as implementation is more advanced than in Bhutan and India.

90. *Management:*

- Ensuring strengthened methodology for the field work, building networks at country level and identifying opportunities for linking with policies require very regular visits of the responsible staff or more presence in country. There is a case for the consultant working on country case studies to be closer to implementation. Posted in Kenya, she could also facilitate backstopping the Mozambique project, the sharing of experiences and consistencies of approach between the two countries.
- A senior technical staff/consultant should assist the Divisional Director in carrying out the normative aspects of PE2-O2 and providing regular technical backstopping when necessary to the staff in charge of the country case studies. This could be an officer from another division, thus ensuring horizontal collaboration with other relevant programmes of FAO. In Mozambique, more delegation for designing and implementing the research should be given to the Chief Technical Adviser of project UTF/MOZ/077/MOZ “Marketing Management Assistance for Food Security” which has obvious links with the overall research theme. The project offers direct links with policy-makers and entry points in the ongoing policy processes.
- Partnerships with the Regoverning Markets Project should be further explored. Respective complementarities should be clarified and concrete joint initiatives developed. Because of its scope, the Regoverning Markets Project offers an avenue for normative outputs of PE2-O2.

3.2. Agro-biodiversity Theme

91. The agro-biodiversity theme is planned in only 10 out of the 17 countries covered by the FNPP II: in four countries as the focal theme and in the other six as complementary to the food security and/or

Forests theme. This theme is present in two of the four countries visited by the evaluation team. Implementation is at the initial stages in Lao PDR, where it is the focal theme, and in Kenya, where it is implemented along with the other two themes. Planning for the agro-biodiversity theme is still underway in Mali, and implementation has yet to begin. Therefore, the evaluation could not assess implementation or results, and focused on adequacy and relevance of design, on the one hand, and implementation plan and management structure on the other.

Selection of Countries and Design

92. An agro-biodiversity theme was included in the FNPP in view of its direct relationship to the wellbeing of the poor as recognized in various international conventions. The countries selected for the programme are signatories to treaties such as the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) and other Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEA), and were participants in the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in 2002. However, inclusion of agro-biodiversity considerations in national programmes and policies concerning agriculture, animal husbandry, fishery and forestry, is lacking, and commitments remain unfulfilled.

93. Countries that have prepared comprehensive National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plans and adopted them for mainstream development planning were short-listed for inclusion under the agro-biodiversity theme in recognition of the importance attributed to these issues at national level. Other selection criteria included the relevance and wide applicability of agro-biodiversity issues, past experience in working with their governments, and the capacity of the FAO country office.

94. Some issues affecting agro-biodiversity and therefore livelihoods were already identified by the Global IPM Facility through its community level work with Farmer Field Schools (FFS) and research. They were highlighted during the first phase of the programme, and country-level actions were expected to be initiated during the second phase. These involved the improvement of practices to enhance agro-biodiversity at community level, and policy assistance to support and safeguard those actions at the national level. Should this approach be adopted on a large scale, it is expected to make a contribution in the long term to the achievement of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by reducing the vulnerability of the poor, improving management and utilization of agro-biodiversity for sustainable livelihoods.

95. The design of programmes in all the countries is intended to be two-pronged: firstly, showcasing examples of good community practices so that they are adopted widely; and, secondly, influencing government policies and programmes that are supportive of local communities. It is envisaged for actions and policies to build on the community processes and local knowledge systems of women and men farmers, fisherfolk, pastoralists and Forest dwellers especially in IPM, soil biodiversity and/or soil health, pollinator conservation and management, plant, crop and/or forest genetic resources management, and aquatic resource management. Issues such as HIV/AIDs mitigation, alien species management, domestic animal management, and/or management of protected areas should be taken into account in designing specific activities.

96. By the end of FNPP II, community-level agro-biodiversity management practices are expected to have improved in three to six countries and local institutions to operate in pilot sites as examples of how to improve their resources, household, and/or enterprise decisions, reduce poverty, enhance food security and sustain local agro-biodiversity.

97. The design also foresaw that existing Farmer Field Schools would serve as platforms for agro-biodiversity related activities. It acknowledged that the formation of any group takes time and human resources, and thus rightly builds upon existing community groups, including community-level organizations such as Junior Farmer and Life Schools and self-help groups. These are perceived as efficient mechanisms for community-level planning and promotion of practices for better use, maintenance and/or improvement of biodiversity.

98. Though all 17 countries covered by the programme have specific agro-biodiversity issues and are signatories of the CBD, the agro-biodiversity theme is concentrated in four countries: India, Kenya, Lao PDR and Mali. The selection seems to have been based on consensus among the agro-biodiversity team regarding the issues that need to be addressed and perception of country readiness to address

them. The evaluation found that this rationale was unclear to others within the FAO country offices, FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP) and government counterparts.

99. Some of these countries do not see agro-biodiversity as a priority area. In fact, in countries visited, strategic and planning documents including agriculture sector plans and budgets do not indicate any explicit focus on agro-biodiversity. When asked to list key priorities of the country, as an open-ended question, those interviewed never mentioned enhancing or conserving agro-biodiversity.

Implementation of the theme

Country	Planned activities
Lao PDR	National level : (1) Application of the new approach for monitoring the implementation of the Global Plan of Action (GPA) on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (PGRFA) in the Lao PDR and preparation of the Country Report on the State of the World's PGRFA in Lao PDR; (2) Awareness-raising among policy-makers regarding the value of the conservation and utilization of agricultural biodiversity for food security, nutrition and sustainable livelihoods; (3) Awareness-raising among concerned governmental officers regarding the full implications of the International Treaty on PGRFA; (4) Integration of agricultural biodiversity considerations into environmental impact assessment (EIA) procedures; (5) Support to the development of marketing systems for Non-Wood Forest Products (planned for 2006-07). (1) Community-based Pest Management through combining the use of beneficial organisms (predators, parasitoids, beneficial fungi) in vegetables and fruit trees' production systems, including Integrated Crop Management (ICM); (2) Conservation and Management of Pollinators for sustainable agriculture through an ecosystem approach; (3) Plant genetic resource access and utilization: understanding and contributing to sustainable livelihoods in Lao PDR; (4) Promote in situ conservation of crop wild relatives and wild plants, including crop-associated biodiversity for food production at the village level; (5) Improvement of the productivity of indigenous goats; (6) The role of aquatic biodiversity from rice-based ecosystems in improved nutrition and livelihoods.
Kenya	(1) Promoting farmer innovation and indigenous knowledge; (2) Creating a data base for improving access to information and knowledge; (3) Integrating agro-biodiversity in training institutions and extension programmes; (4) Developing agro-biodiversity curricula for FFS based on the issues identified by the farmer community.
Mali	(1) Study and sharing of findings for awareness generation regarding (a) traditional knowledge and skills of Sahelian farmers in using Plant Genetic Resources and local Seed Systems, (b) Role of Local Markets in the Promotion and Sustainable Use of Plant Genetic Resources for Agriculture, (c) Status of Conservation of genetic diversity of plants, (d) conservation and management of pollinators and pollination, (e) assessment of aquatic biodiversity resources in agricultural systems; (2) developing a multi-media Strategy for Communication on Agro-biodiversity

100. Contrary to the approach developed in the design of the agro-biodiversity theme, in practice the theme does not necessarily build on the FFSs. In Kenya, for example, a participatory rural appraisal (PRA), aimed at covering river ecosystems, is being conducted in a region where there is no FFS. Yet, farmers' innovation work has begun thanks to the screening carried out by IPM-FFSs. As a result, establishing a rapport takes more time and farmers' previous experience of validating their opinions by trials has not been used.

101. In the two cases above, adoption and application of practices for enhancing agro-biodiversity would probably be better ensured if coming from FFS, but the FNPP has not benefited from the situation. FFSs' processes and operations are already well-inserted in their socio-cultural settings, and the schools are widely recognized as institutional centres of genuine innovation. An existing network of trainers/farmer facilitators could be a valuable resource for accelerating implementation. They could also be useful for the food security and Forests themes. This idea is already under discussion in Mali, though not included in the work plan yet.

102. Allowing existing FFSs or farmer facilitators to select the issues to be addressed would have been more practical, if the goal were to improve local management of agro-biodiversity. The water harvesting FFS in Kenya, for example, could have been called in to identify the issues. In addition, perhaps choosing a specific cropping system, or a particular animal breed and its productivity, would have been better than approaching broad themes such as "pollinators". There are positive examples in Vietnam and Lao PDR, where IPM in selected vegetables has been tackled.

103. Integration with other themes is typically limited to joint planning workshops, keeping each other informed about activities, or seeking common ground for joint activities only once each theme team has formulated them. There is an example of designing an integrated intervention in Mali, where an attempt is under way to integrate agro-biodiversity in the Forests theme. Plans are to send a consultant to document the oral histories of forest dwellers (local communities/tribal) in order to grasp traditional tribal knowledge and practices in the use of forest species and attempt to align oral histories with sustainability themes.

Conclusions

104. The link between agro-biodiversity and other major goals (poverty alleviation, food security, AIDS prevention, linking small farmers to global markets, etc.) is not established in clear terms. In fact, the concept of agro-biodiversity is not translated clearly into operational terms. "Biodiversity" is associated with environmental conservation objectives rather than presented as a mechanism for enhancing livelihoods, wellbeing, sustainable poverty reduction, etc.. A more convincing approach could perhaps have been to address agro-biodiversity as an integral part of food security/poverty alleviation rather than as a separate issue.

105. Due to the broad range of sectors it covers (micro-organisms, pollinators, pests, tree and animal species, etc.), identifying a champion for agro-biodiversity in government structure at country-level appears to be a challenge. The multiple themes included at country level (see Table 1), ranging from crop diversity to pollinators, etc., fall under the responsibility of different sectors/departments of government. In this context, it would be desirable to identify an institutional home to steer policy-making and facilitate the process. Nonetheless, benefits of agro-biodiversity can be understood only if viewed in an interdisciplinary perspective (e.g. food diversity having links with nutrition, indigenous practices, food taboos, etc.).

106. The two-pronged strategy to work at policy level, awareness-raising, and advocacy on the one hand, while facilitating community practices of using and enhancing agro-biodiversity for sustainable development on the other, was overly ambitious for the resources available. A step-by-step approach seems more appropriate for concepts such as agro-biodiversity which is new and not always an area of immediate interest to governments.

107. The scale of operations for the community-level practices is insufficient, especially for deriving lessons for national policy-making and mainstreaming in government programmes

Recommendations

108. *Raise awareness on agro-biodiversity.* The brochure "Agriculture for Biodiversity and Biodiversity for Agriculture" needs to be adapted to each FNPP country, both translating it into the local language and including examples relevant to the local context. It should also be more explicit as to how agro-biodiversity will contribute to the achievement of the MDGs, linking agro-biodiversity with broad goals of poverty reduction and food security.

109. *Build on FFS strength.* As per design, the agro-biodiversity theme should be implemented through the well-functioning FFS. In addition, the identification of the key issues to be addressed and the design of interventions at country level should be carried out in close consultation with FFS.

110. *Downsize.* In each country, the number of activities should be reduced. With the given time and budget, focus should be placed on few activities where results can be obtained (e.g. farmers innovation in Kenya).

111. *Integrate agro-biodiversity with other themes.* In a wider selection of the FNPP countries, cross-cutting agro-biodiversity issues should be identified. Interventions aiming at integrating agro-biodiversity with other themes, in particular policy assistance, should be sought.

3.3. The Forests Theme

112. FNPP Forests theme activities are currently active in 11 countries. It was deliberately implemented in a relative large number of countries to maximize the likelihood of finding countries with suitable entry points for its implementation and to maximize the scope for learning from its application across a wide variety of circumstances. In all countries, activities are either directly or indirectly linked to the provision of policy assistance and, in over half of the countries, Forests theme activities are to varying degrees also linked to activities related to FNPP's Food Security and Agro-biodiversity themes.

Selection of countries and design of interventions

113. In addition to the country selection criteria common to all themes of the FNPP, countries were selected for the Forests theme according to the opportunity they presented for capitalizing on the programme's flexibility to respond to policy processes as they arise in a timely and focused manner. Indeed, as forest policy processes tend to be executed in a sporadic or patchy manner rather than following a continuous sequence of actions, this flexibility was considered to constitute a key element of the value-added that FAO can bring to policy formulation.

114. The formulation phase was relatively short. Formats for work plans for Forests theme projects had been discussed and distributed by August 2004. Individual responsibilities for four 1st tier countries where early results could be achieved, were also assigned at that time. Work plans for Timor-Leste and Vietnam were clear, and proposed in-country activities and performance indicators. This was also the case for the policy theme of the Kenya programme. Work plans for the "integrated resource assessment" of the Kenya programme were not as readily available, though there was access to terms of reference (TORs) for some of the activities they were to support. In-country requests for work plans or consultant terms of reference for Mozambique programme activities, on the contrary, were not readily available at the time of the evaluation, noting that the Forests theme is not a separate activity in Mozambique but is part of the larger Food Security theme.

115. In Kenya, Timor-Leste and Vietnam, a TCP proposal already existed for at least one of the activity areas addressed, but in each case the FNPP was identified as a more appropriate instrument to support the relevant activities. The subsequent work plan and TORs developed for these activities benefited from the fact that TCP proposals were very comprehensive documents and provided considerable detail.

Implementation

116. The management structure of the Forests theme includes a fairly large number of divisions and regional offices.

Table 6: Country	Activity	Status
Kenya		
	Subsidiary legislation to support implementation of the new Forest Policy and Forest Bill 2005; Guidelines Forest management information system Integrated Natural Resource Management Assessment (INRA) to be conducted	Local and international consultants identified and being recruited Local Integrated Assessment Consultant recruited & involved in Zambia INRA training / study tour
Mozambique		
	Case studies on the significance of charcoal production on poverty, and on the wildlife – farmer conflict	1st draft of wildlife study prepared
Timor-Leste		
	Drafting of National Forest Policy statement	Policy statement drafted & accepted by client; follow-up support to draft legislation to commence once Policy formally
Viet Nam		

	Contributions to National Forest Strategy development Drafting of regulations pursuant to Law on Forest Protection Study on community access & management of forests Capacity strengthening for policy analysis & implementation	12 provincial consultative workshops completed; 4 regional workshops on-going Pre-implementation Pre-implementation Forest ownership study completed
--	---	---

117. In line with the policy emphasis of the programme, the Forest Policy and Institutions Service (FONP) was given leadership to review all work plans and advise lead officers on policy aspects of the work. In addition, responsibilities for conceptual guidance and for monitoring of outcomes were assigned to different managers in the department⁹. Lead officers were appointed and made responsible for planning and supervising in-country programme implementation and for coordinating with the other FNPP themes. The overall theme coordinator role for the FNPP Forests theme was assigned to the Chief, FONL. He chairs an FNPP Forests Task Force consisting of responsible officers for each country programme with alternates drawn from headquarters and Regional Offices. Concept papers were solicited and in-country project formulation missions were undertaken by lead officers from headquarters and/or the region. Monthly reports to the ADG were prescribed and reasonably frequent formal and informal collaboration between forestry staff has become routine. Some of the outputs from this were posted on the Forestry Department's website, an exercise which should be further pursued.

118. Each country is supported by a focal team consisting of one lead officer in Headquarters and one in a decentralized office. Country work plans, analyses, reports, etc. are vetted by each of these individuals, providing two avenues for recourse when headquarters, regional or in-country staff required specific country information, backstopping, etc. The principle of "double teaming" country responsibility with two officers is a valid one, and has the potential for delivering greater benefits if fully implemented, with both officers equally current on all issues.

119. Between February 2004 and September 2005, an FNPP National Programme Coordinator (NPC) was recruited in most countries. NPCs are an important juncture between in-country participants and headquarters staff, and the timing of their recruitment influenced the level and efficiency of communications between them. They are also in a position to act as a bridge between the various in-country stakeholders, including FAO staff, local counterparts, potential future donors or ministerial actors not currently active in the programme. The evaluation team found that this position could be enhanced and strengthened to fulfil much needed coordination and monitoring roles within the programme.

Collaboration and linkages with other Programmes

120. Lead officers are responsible for promoting partnership opportunities and there are significant linkages with other FAO programmes. FNPP activities and FAO Regular Programme activities are being implemented by the same individuals and teams. The benefits of partnering are widely understood and efforts to initiate collaboration are taking place at country level. In Vietnam, FNPP and National Forestry Programme Facility (NFPF) were jointly launched and supported; and in Lao PDR, a TCP is supporting forest-related project implemented as an FNPP agro-biodiversity activity¹⁰. The NFPF strategy and legislation development activities in Vietnam and the case studies in Mozambique also complement other FAO activities. Links to activities undertaken by donors are rare,

1.

⁹ Chief FONP – Outcomes 1 and 2; Chief, FORM – Outcome 3; Chief, FOPE – Outcome 4

¹⁰ TCP/LAO/3002(A) Support to the Development of Market Systems for Non-Wood Forest Products

but present in the charcoal study in Mozambique which paralleled a GTZ activity on the same issue. While such efforts should be commended, careful consideration should be given to benefits of partnering on the one hand, and transaction costs of doing so on the other.

Potential outcomes and impact

121. The four expected outcomes of the Forests theme clearly relate to the overall objective of *strengthening national policy framework and institutional arrangements necessary to achieve the sustainable management and conservation of forests*. Case studies and workshops are geared to improve decision-makers' understanding of the issues they face and building capacity to adequately address them.

122. In Vietnam, 12 consultative workshops are building capacity at central, provincial and local levels for implementing the Law on Forest Protection and Development. In Kenya, the outputs of the Integrated Natural Resources Assessment (INRA) should contribute to better informed decisions on sustainable development issues. Mozambique's case studies will influence the design of land management approaches and the development of instruments to increase resource security for rural communities and households. Indeed, they will be used in national and decentralized provincial planning processes to shape the country's land tenure rights for specific community and rural household land claims as well as informing the elaboration of a national zoning strategy for land use planning, registration, and other purposes. These decisions, in turn, will impact directly on cross-cutting FNPP themes: sharing of revenue between national and provincial levels, household livelihoods and food security.

Recommendations

123. Work plans, activity schedules and project milestones should be sufficiently detailed to allow for greater coordination of programme events and activities. In particular, proposals for FNPP funding should be as comprehensive as those for TCPs, in order to facilitate their translation into detailed work plans.

124. The concept of "double-teaming" country responsibility should be further pursued, so as to fully yield the benefits it is capable of delivering. For example, each member of the two-member lead official team should be equally conversant with the respective country's programme and activity status. To this end, all information should be fed to the lead officers, incorporated into progress reports and made readily accessible to all relevant participants and stakeholders, regardless of its source. This includes promptly capturing all activities and outputs within the monitoring efforts, and reflecting the latest status and progress of all activities.

3.4. Global Activities Funded under the Unallocated Funds

125. A particularly innovative characteristic of FNPP is that 25 percent of the funds are unallocated. These resources can be used during the year for activities that satisfy a set of criteria that can be summed up as follows: deepen or expand activities already undertaken by FNPP at country level, or fund new activities in countries in which FNPP is already active; help consolidate lessons learned; and further the knowledge on particular topics and allow FAO, through the FNPP, to explore related areas of work. These funds are also used to finance programme management activities.

126. In 2005, the use of these unallocated resources has been rather slow to take off: they mostly funded the IPM facility, a working group meeting to review the format and indicators for reporting on the progress of the WFS Plan of Action, and the support provided to the Farmers' Commission in India. Several other proposals are in the pipeline that will be implemented in 2006.

3.4.4. The Global Integrated Pest Management Facility (Facility)

127. The evaluation team reviewed the progress made by the Facility in 2005, based on interviews at both headquarters and country level, interaction with the FNPP coordinator, reports and documents produced under the FNPP. At the outset, it must be mentioned that it is difficult to separate FNPP

funding from other funding of the Facility. However, in 2005, FNPP was the major contributor of external funding and therefore it is not unreasonable to attribute the outputs largely to the FNPP.

IPM activities under FNPP and status of implementation:

128. All the activities of the Facility contribute to achieving FNPP objectives and principles; moreover, the strategy (and approach) adopted present a model for policy formulation focus of FNPP, by working at various levels simultaneously.

129. FNPP support to the Facility is not limited to a few specific activities but is more a flexible budget facility for innovative or catalytic activities that enhance ongoing programmes or leverage new funding. As such, the Facility needs to be flexible to respond to opportunities as they arise. It therefore does not have a detailed work plan in which activities are planned a year in advance. However, the Facility does work within a framework of objectives and principles.

130. A broad range of activities have been carried out and outputs produced during 2005 (details in Annex 2) which all fit to the framework.

Assessment of design and approach

131. Though the stated objectives indicate that the Facility “promotes Integrated Pest Management (IPM) through awareness-raising and support to development of field programmes and policy”, in practice it engages in a range of pro-farmer community level actions as well as policy reforms at both national and global levels. Primarily, it promotes an approach to empowering farming communities to make informed decisions and uses the outcomes of these decisions to formulate supportive policies for the wellbeing of humans and ecosystems.

132. A feature of the Facility is its philosophical and pedagogical underpinning, keeping communities first, respecting their rights, wisdom, choices, and playing a supportive role to enhance their practices, by creating a learning environment in Farmers’ Field Schools (FFS). The success of this approach has had across nations in transforming unviable and unscientific practices into people friendly, healthy, economic and “just” practices, has led to “evolving” this approach (FFS) as a core competency of the Facility.

Assessment of relevance to FAO and country/global priorities

133. Other programmes, like the FNPP agro-biodiversity theme, the Special Programme for Food Security (SPFS), pesticide management, etc., are directly benefiting from field data, experience and innovations being generated by IPM field programmes with assistance from the Global IPM Facility.

134. The expertise and success of field implementation and development has created a network of IPM FFS practitioners in over 50 countries, among the largest community bases of any FAO programme. These local networks are taking leadership positions in IPM FFS programmes in several regions. Though relatively ‘young’, these programmes have been innovative in developing a variety of self-sustaining processes. The Facility is benefiting from mutual exchanges among these networks and in turn, it is in a position to facilitate this exchange, encouraging growth.

135. Furthermore, at national policy level, the Global IPM Facility assists IPM field programmes to respond to current issues in trade and food safety that are related to pesticides. The Facility plays an important role in the further development of the normative framework for pest and pesticide management and is pioneering innovative approaches to effectively connecting IPM field programme implementation with policy development. The Facility has nurtured alliances and partnerships with a broad range of institutions, UN agencies, NGOs and FAO Departments, which indicates the seriousness with which the Facility is opting to identify cross-cutting issues and exemplifies how working together is more efficient and effective, thus fulfilling another mandate of the FNPP.

Conclusion

136. The Global IPM Facility continues to play an important role in empowering farming communities to reduce pesticide use and improve their income and livelihoods. Besides backstopping field

programmes, the Global IPM Facility plays an international lead role in: methodology development for participatory farmer-focussed learning; quality assurance and impact assessment of IPM field programmes; policy reform by emphasizing the importance of farmer adoption of IPM in current priority programmes related to trade and food safety that are responding to pesticide residue concerns.

137. As mentioned earlier other programmes are benefiting directly from field data, experience and innovations being generated by IPM field programmes with assistance from the Global IPM Facility.

138. Continuation of this work is dependent on external funding as the present allocation under the Regular Programme does not allow for the current inter-sector and inter-agency work that carries IPM beyond technical pest management and connects it to broader agendas on trade, food safety and environmental health. Nor does it allow for important normative work on methodology development and impact assessment that strengthens the quality and impact of ongoing field programmes.

139. For 2006-2007, the FNPP is the only confirmed source of external funding for the Global IPM Facility, with an annual amount of US\$ 400,000. This is less than a third of the average external funding during the period 1997-2004, which stood at about US\$ 1.4 million¹¹.

Recommendations

140. It is recommended that FNPP support to the Facility be continued in the remaining years of the current FNPP; and considering the funding position and time required for mobilizing support from other donors, consideration should be given to an increased allocation.

141. The linkages within the FNPP between the IPM Facility and the agro-biodiversity theme should be strengthened by using more systematically the knowledge base of the Facility to build and implement country programmes.

3.4.5. Working group meeting to review the format and indicators for reporting by governments on the progress on the WFS Plan of Action¹²

142. Following the agreement reached at the Thirtieth Session of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) in 2004, the CFS Secretariat convened a regionally balanced working group of experts to review the reporting format used by countries for follow-up to the World Food Summit (WFS) Plan of Action. The FAO Statistics Division, in collaboration with the CFS Secretariat, organized a two-day Expert Working Group meeting at FAO headquarters in February 2005 which was attended by national experts from 11 countries distributed across Africa, Asia, Latin America, North America and Europe. In addition, two members of the Food Insecurity and Vulnerability Information and Mapping System (FIVIMS) Inter-Agency Working Group also participated. FNPP funded travel and stay in Rome for experts from developing countries, as agreed with the Netherlands Representative to FAO.

143. The outputs of the meeting were a Revised Reporting Format, a set of guidelines to be provided to countries and a list of key indicators for monitoring implementation of the Plan of Action and the progress made in reaching the WFS target. Subsequent to the recommendations made by the Expert Working Group and endorsed by the CFS in May 2005, an evaluation exercise was designed by the

1.

¹¹ The previous average external funding of US\$ 1.4 million per annum also included funding from Switzerland (last contribution in 2005, depleted in November 2005) and the World Bank (last contribution in 2001, depleted in 2004). Efforts are ongoing to raise new co-funding, but this will only be small amounts, if successful. The Facility's technical backstopping services are now in principle being charged against the projects/programmes that are receiving this service. FNPP funds partially serve as a buffer-revolving fund to ensure continuity for these backstopping services.

¹² The evaluation team did not have the opportunity to conduct a proper assessment of this activity. This section is an extract of the Progress Report July 2004 – December 2005.

Statistics Division to test the new reporting format before its full implementation in September 2005. A group of 12 countries was chosen to perform the test and evaluation of the new reporting format, which took place over July and August 2005. An analysis of the results showed that as a whole, respondents were satisfied with the reporting format and supporting documentation. Some modifications were introduced to the report following comments and suggestions made.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations on Overall Programme Aspects

144. **This section has much in common with the Progress Report. The evaluation team had the benefit of the draft of the Progress Report. The programme team was also provided drafts of this section of the evaluation report. As a result, findings and recommendations are largely shared.** The section to provide an assessment of the programme as a whole, across thematic themes, across individual country programmes vis-à-vis the objectives of and principles underpinning the programme. It looks at the programme design, its relevance, the management of the programme, the ways of working within the programme at various levels of the Organization and at the effectiveness of the cooperation between FAO and the Netherlands.

4.1. Programme Design

145. The evaluation of the programme design focuses on the extent to which the *Policy Framework Paper for 2004-2007 (PFP)*, which constitutes the FNPP programme document, is conducive to the adoption of a “real” programme approach. The latter can be defined at various levels by: (a) common and coordinated objectives; (b) common outcomes and impacts; and (c) joint activities for common outputs.

146. The evaluation team found that the overall programme design rested on three main objectives and a set of principles that were to guide programme activities. It is in this broad framework that the three themes – food security, agro biodiversity and forestry - commonly agreed upon by FAO and the donor, operate. While the document claims a programmatic approach between the themes, specific objectives and outcomes are defined for each theme independently from the others. The PFP thus does not present an explicit conceptual framework linking the three themes of the programme. The three programme objectives address primarily *ways of working* of the Organization in its cooperation with the Netherlands and donors in general, in delivering services for the benefit of member countries, in particular at national level, and in providing policy assistance.

147. The nine principles stated in the PFP contributed to an overarching goal (poverty alleviation) and three principles were found to particularly promote the adoption of a programme approach.

148. The focus on *poverty alleviation* found in the two first principles provides a common goal for the three FNPP themes and FNPP activities, particularly at the country level. Similarly the stated goal of improvement of the food security situation is common to two of the three themes as can be seen in the PFP. However, poverty alleviation and food security are wide goals and the way in which activities of the themes will be combined to achieve them is not specified in the document neither conceptually nor operationally. Their combination at country level so as to constitute a programme addressing poverty alleviation and food security improvement will depend on specific country conditions. The review of the countries visited by the evaluation team gives some indication as to whether this integration has taken place. It appears that in Mozambique the country activities are at their most integrated. Indeed, the Forests theme (though of limited scope) is part of the activities carried out under the food security theme. However, except in the cases of Mozambique and possibly to some extent in Kenya where joint formulation missions took place, planning was done separately and this generally appears to be the case for implementation.

149. The principle of *integrating FNPP activities within the FAO country programme, programmes undertaken by other cooperating partners, and national frameworks such as PRSPs, CCAs and UNDAFs* also are conducive to a more programmatic approach. The principle of *interdisciplinarity* on which FNPP rests should also be conducive to better integration of activities in a programme. The

extent to which partnerships at country level and greater inter-disciplinarity actually happened are analysed later on in this section along with other aspects of the programme organization, management and ways of working.

150. In addition, the approach adopted in allocating budget to the three themes was found conducive to a programme approach and provides incentives to adopting a more integrated programme approach. Out of the total budget, only 75 percent was found to have been allocated in equal shares to the three themes (a measure which would tend to encourage compartmentalisation). The criteria chosen by the group of coordinators, however, largely encourage cross-theme complementarity and cooperation, thus fostering the programme approach.

151. It may also be noted that integration in a programme approach may not only be within the FNPP itself. This was amply demonstrated in the forest, food systems and IPM work, where there was integration into FAO's overall country programme.

152. Finally, there are limitations to a programme approach in the design of the themes themselves. All three themes ultimately aim at influencing policies or policy frameworks through policy-level interventions. The approach developed under the agro-biodiversity theme is bottom-up, from piloting through Farmers Field Schools to influencing national policies on a theme which is new for most countries. The agro-biodiversity theme thus starts its interventions at village level. The food security (country level theme) and Forests themes are more "traditional" in their approach in the sense that they are conceived so as to support existing policy processes whether at national or sub-national levels. Levels of interventions (village based as opposed to sub-national/national levels) and timeframe of interventions differ significantly and make a programme approach difficult to translate at country level.

4.2. Programme Relevance

153. The programme involves a relatively large number of FAO staff, comprises a large number of themes and activities and operates in more than 15 countries located in three different regions. The challenge is to ensure that programme activities are relevant to the programme objectives. At this stage of early implementation, relevance and questions above can be examined through the factors which prevailed in the selection of countries and the design of activities to be implemented under the programme.

Selection of countries

154. The discussions of the evaluation team with the FNPP coordinators suggest that the selection of countries in which the programme is being implemented was made considering the following factors:

- FNPP had already had activities in the country during Phase I;
- FAO country office was responsive to consultations by FNPP coordinators;
- Requests for FAO assistance had been made and FNPP seemed to be the most rapid way to respond to this demand;
- The stage reached by the policy process was favourable for an intervention to achieve impact;
- Emphasis was given to Africa and Asia where needs for assistance are greatest;
- Countries were part of eco-geographical clusters (Mali/Niger; Kenya/Tanzania/Uganda; Cambodia/Lao PDR/Vietnam; COMIFAC).

155. Many of the factors listed were a consequence of the need for the programme to show results as early as the end of 2005. This encouraged the FNPP team to select in a somewhat opportunistic way countries where conditions were there to get rapid results, rather than countries where the needs were greatest.

Selection of Activities

156. The table below provides a brief assessment by the Evaluation Team of the relevance of activities so far formulated or undertaken by the programme.

157. The designs of all three themes score well in terms of their relevance to the MDG 1 (eradicate extreme poverty and hunger) which is stated in the principles underpinning the programme, and provides its overarching goal at country level. Furthermore, the agro-biodiversity and Forests themes address Goal 7 (ensure environmental sustainability). In addition, the agro-biodiversity theme objectives also address more specifically other global commitments, including the Multilateral Environmental Agreements and the Plan of Action of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD/WEHAB).

158. The assessment made in the previous section by theme shows that all the activities have, to some degrees, links with the Regular Programme of Work of the Organization and therefore, are embedded within FAO's priorities. It is more difficult to assess relevance vis-à-vis FAO's priorities at country level as these are only now being articulated. Nevertheless, in some of the countries visited, the activities of the FNPP clearly show links with FAO's other activities in the country and build on past cooperation, making FNPP activities part of an implicit priority framework. This was the case for Kenya and Mozambique, in particular with the food security theme.

159. The extent to which activities will contribute in filling gaps in knowledge is examined through the innovative content of the theme and the approach adopted. It was felt that, by the nature of the theme and the approach adopted, the food security policy assistance and the Forests theme (policy assistance, legislation) were the least innovative. The food security sub-themes for emergencies and food systems are research-oriented, thus aiming at increasing knowledge on their respective themes. Finally, agro-biodiversity is a relatively new theme attempting to apply an approach well tested in other contexts.

160. The food security (policy assistance), the forestry and the agro-biodiversity themes have potential for replication to the extent that they are implemented in countries which are representative of a group of countries from the viewpoint of the issue addressed and that they have mechanism in place to learn from country experience. Results of work with a high normative content, food security, emergencies and food system themes, will become available globally and thus have a high potential for replication. Whether this happens will depend on the results themselves. The criteria of selecting groups of countries with common eco-geographical features is a step towards introducing elements in the programme for replication. In this respect, except India which has very specific features (by its size and activities carried out under the FNPP), activities at country level all have some degrees of replication, most likely in countries with similar features. Some global activities, including those relating to the working group meeting on indicators on the progress on the WFS Plan of Action, IPM facility, address issues of a wide range of countries.

161. In the countries visited, it was found that FNPP activities were befitting country needs. In all cases, activities responded to a request by and were agreed with the governments. In Mozambique and in Bhutan as described in the earlier section, factors of achievements have been among other things the timing and integration into ongoing policy processes. It is less clear for some themes (food security – food system and agro-biodiversity) how they are planned to feed into policy processes in some of the countries visited (Kenya, Lao PDR and Mozambique).

FNPP Activity xxx=high x=low	MDG1	MDG7 WSSD	Meets country needs	National policy frameworks and processes	FAO priorities	Fill gap in knowledge	Opportunity for replication
Food Security							
PE1 (emergencies)	XXX				XXX	XXX	XXX
PE2 objective 1 (policy assistance)	XXX				XXX	X	XX
PE2 Objective 2 (Food Systems)	XXX				XX	XXX	XX
Forests Theme	XX	XXX			XXX	X	XX
Agro-	XX	XXX			XXX	XX	XX

FNPP Activity xxx=high x=low	MDG1	MDG7 WSSD	Meets country needs	National policy frameworks and processes	FAO priorities	Fill gap in knowledge	Opportunity for replication
biodiversity							
Working group meeting - indicators on the progress on the WFS Plan of Action	XXX				XXX	XXX	XXX
Global IPM Facility		XXX			XXX	XX	XXX
Kenya			XXX	XX			
Mali							
Mozambique			XXX	XXX			
Tanzania	XX		XXX	XX			XX
COMIFAC countries		XX	XXX				XXX
Bhutan	XXX		XXX	XXX			XX
Lao PDR	XX	XXX		XX			X
India	XX		XXX	XX			X
Timor Leste	XXX	XXX	XXX	XX			X
Vietnam	XX	XX	XX	XX			XX

4.3. Programme Leadership and Management

162. A large and complex programme like FNPP needs an effective leadership and management to ensure that all activities are designed and implemented according to plans and in an efficient manner.

Management Structures and Functions

163. The **FNPP coordinators group** comprises the programme coordinator and the three theme coordinators, although some attend with other supporting staff. Its function is to maintain general oversight of the programme. The group has been meeting regularly since October 2004 (about once every six weeks) with participation of all members (in the rare case of absence, coordinators depute another staff member). Main topics discussed include: relations with the donor; preparation of progress reports and work plan; agreement on criteria to allocate the 25 percent of the budget that are not allocated automatically to the three themes; agreement of activities that should be funded from the 25 percent unallocated; programme progress monitoring mechanisms; lesson learning mechanisms; preparation of yearly meeting with donor; programme evaluation; programme website; cross theme issues in countries where the three themes are represented (Kenya) and discussion and agreement on overall programme matters. The coordinators are satisfied with this mechanism¹³. The frequency of meeting and the focus of the work of this group seem adequate. Meetings have been called at short notice in case of emergency, and there are no complaints that the group delays programme activities. Decision making is based on consensus (specific rules have been agreed for the special case of use of the 25 percent allocated budget resources).

164. The *programme coordinator* is a senior officer from the Policy Assistance Division (TCA) whose main functions, according to his terms of reference, are to: draw the attention of theme coordinators to possible inconsistencies of programme design and implementation with FNPP principles; identify and promote synergies between normative and operational (country and regional level) activities; design and implement measures to provide incentives to the programme themes to collaborate and seek synergies; facilitate the coordinators group meetings; liaise with the donor and maintain an overall

1.

¹³ FNPP – Lesson Learning Workshop (11/10/05): Summary of Main Points

view of the programme's financial situation. The nomination of a senior staff from TCA was also done with a view to ensuring closer links between policy focused activities of the programme and the division primarily responsible for policy assistance in the Organization.

165. The evaluation team observed and the three theme coordinators confirm that the coordinator carried out satisfactorily the last three of these functions (the latter with the help of one TCAP officer). He also led the definition of criteria for allocation of the 25 percent unallocated funds in a way that addresses the second and third function. However, his other responsibilities do not leave him sufficient time to be sufficiently knowledgeable of the details of various activities undertaken by the programme to be able to carry out well enough his first three functions. He currently devotes 6 to 8 weeks of his time to FNPP annually, which the evaluation team felt to be insufficient. For example, it was while accompanying the team in their Asian leg that the coordinator actually visited for the first time an FNPP country. Finally, the last objective of increasing links with TCA which is largely decentralised was only partially met. Only very few TCA officers are involved significantly in the implementation of the programme (see below) through technical backstopping missions (Bhutan and India).

166. The three *theme coordinators* are respectively responsible for each of the three FNPP themes. This includes financial responsibility as they are budget holders for the three projects through which finance is being channelled to the themes¹⁴. They chair more or less formalised coordinating structures that guide management of the three individual themes. Out of the three themes, the forests theme was found to have the most formal management mechanism (the FNPP Forests Task Force, chaired by the theme coordinator, responsible officers for each country programme with alternate coming from headquarters and from Regional Offices). The food security theme coordinator is assisted by a full time FNPP staff, in charge of the day-to-day coordination. It also had an Inter-Departmental Task Force which met regularly between July 2004 and January 2005 to complete the country selection process. The agro-biodiversity group appears to be managed more informally by the corresponding theme coordinator with major responsibilities held by country task teams. The three theme coordinators are very busy, two of them being service chiefs. They allocate around six to eight weeks per year to FNPP.

167. For each country in which the programme is active, **country coordinators** have been nominated (located either in headquarters or at country level – in the case of Kenya, an international officer and then a national staff member were hired by the programme, the cost being shared by the three themes). Some difficulties have been met recently, particularly for the food security theme, to find coordinators and backstopping staff from headquarters as they are busy with many other tasks.

168. **FAO Representatives** play an important role of coordination and liaison with governments at country level. They are also responsible for the management of resources spent at country level (funds are directly transferred to them by theme coordinators). This system seems to be working well.

169. The **approach adopted for the financing of activities** has been, in conformity with the FAO-Netherlands agreement, to allocate 25 percent of the total budget to each of the three themes, leaving the remaining 25 percent unallocated but for a small proportion used to fund programme management costs. The FNPP coordinators group decided on the process and the criteria to be used to allocate funds. Activities eligible for unallocated funds should: deepen or expand activities already undertaken by FNPP at country level, or fund new activities in countries in which FNPP is already active; help consolidate lessons learned; and further the knowledge on particular topics in line with FNPP's underpinning principles and objectives.

Some Issues of Management and Coordination to be addressed

1.

¹⁴ There is a fourth project which serves to fund overall programme management and for which the budget holder is the Chief, TCAP (TCAP being the unit liaising with the donor).

170. The structure of leadership and management seems to be adequate. The group of coordinators functions well and reflects the team spirit necessary for the cohesion of the programme. It is too early to assess whether one theme management structure is more efficient than another. The management structure for the Forests theme is likely to be more conducive to delegation (which is key for such a complex programme) and more inclusive both horizontally (other divisions) and vertically (decentralized offices).

171. The above review highlighted a number of issues that will need to be and can be addressed in the coming years of the programme:

- (i) The need to increase the involvement of the programme coordinator in the programme implementation in order for him to fully play his role at headquarters as well as vis-à-vis those involved in the decentralized offices (regional and country levels).
- (ii) As the programme is expanding country-level activities, the need to provide incentives for FAO staff to take on more responsibilities in the implementation of the programme, in particular as regards country coordination and backstopping.
- (iii) Country level coordination was found weak in general. In countries where the FNPP is implemented, the administrative and technical management appears to be quite demanding (various small activities with different interlocutors in country and with FAO headquarters) adding a burden to the FAO country office's already stretched capacity. In countries where they have been appointed, FNPP coordinators reduce this constraint. However, the evaluation team noticed the insufficient orientation of newly recruited staff, especially taking account of the liaison role with government officials they are expected to play.
- (iv) Country visits found that the programme was perceived as headquarters-driven. This feeling was also strongly expressed in RAP. In Lao PDR, Kenya and Mozambique, references were made to decisions taken by headquarters without full understanding of the rationale. FNPP coordinators at country level felt even more a disconnect with a limited understanding of the greater whole within which their position fits. Coordinators and local consultants met did not know the management structure at headquarters, in particular, the existence of a "counterpart" at headquarters with the programme coordinator. All these call primarily for greater communication between those involved at various levels and greater clarification of the respective roles of headquarters and country level staff.
- (v) The low level of involvement of Regional Office (RO) and Sub-regional Office (SRO) staff is a concern of the evaluation team. Forestry stands out as an exception as forestry officers in ROs/SROs are quite involved in FNPP activities either with the main responsibility or as alternate. Headquarter staff explain it by the low level of response from the concerned staff or by the skills of ROs/SROs officers not meeting the needs of FNPP activities. Regional staff members met by the mission (RAP-Bangkok) explain that lack of response, when it occurred, was a consequence of the Regional Office being consulted at a late stage in the formulation process "to provide inputs and comments" rather than to make proposals. There are in general not staff directly involved in bio-diversity work in the regional offices and ESA counterparts in the regions are largely TCA officers. When proposals were made, they were generally rejected by headquarters. There was little involvement of the Regional Office in identifying countries (apart from forestry). The example of forestry shows that when real opportunities to lead country work is provided to Regional Office staff and when there is mutual trust and the necessary competencies, Regional Offices can be "in the driving seat" for FNPP country activities and successfully lead country activities. In forestry, headquarters and the RO were found to be partners.

4.4. Ways of Working

Flexibility: A major feature of the Programme

172. All involved in FNPP recognize *flexibility* as one of its most important and positive characteristics¹⁵. Flexibility can be found in the funding, formulation and implementation of activities. The programme is characterised by much less “bureaucracy” than other similar FAO activities. The yearly work plan does not specify detailed activities to be implemented under the programme, but only identifies the main outputs and outcomes the programme is expected to achieve in major headquarter and country programmes.

173. In the FNPP, the activities proposed need to be technically cleared by the theme coordinator or the corresponding thematic task force or group to which technical and financial responsibility is fully delegated. No additional formal approval is required, as the programme as a whole has already been approved at the appropriate level within the Organization (PPRC, ADG-TC).

174. Formulation missions can be rapidly funded from the concerned themes, and changes can occur in programme activities, budget structure as need arises, provided the corresponding theme coordinator agrees. There have been cases in which country programmes have been postponed or stopped when it was realised that there were no prospects for achieving outcomes due to institutional dysfunctions or over-crowding of donor support.

175. A particularly innovative characteristic of the FNPP is that 25 percent of the funds are unallocated. These resources can be used during the year for activities that satisfy a set of criteria that can be summed up as follows: deepen or expand activities already undertaken by FNPP at country level, or fund new activities in countries in which FNPP is already active; help consolidate lessons learned; and further the knowledge on particular topics and allow FAO, through the FNPP, to explore related areas of work. These funds are also used to finance programme management activities.

176. In 2005, the use of these unallocated resources has been rather slow to take off: they mostly funded the IPM facility, a working group meeting to review the format and indicators for reporting on the progress of the WFS Plan of Action, and the support provided to the Farmers’ Commission in India. Several other proposals are in the pipeline that will be implemented in 2006.

177. Although by no means unique to the FNPP, flexibility also translates in changes in initial plans and budget structure without requiring any special administrative procedure such as budget revisions or updating of work plans. A number of examples illustrate how flexibility can contribute to greater efficiency and cost-effectiveness. In Bhutan, it was decided not to organize the survey as initially envisaged, and to analyse existing data instead. The budget saved will be used to support the implementation of the food security strategy developed with support from the FNPP by facilitating greater decentralization and participation of stakeholders through consultations at the sub-national level. In Vietnam, provincial field consultations on the national forest strategy could be organized which without rapid funding through FNPP would not have taken place in a timely fashion. In the Forests theme, an author’s contract could be rapidly initiated by the Regional Office in Bangkok, when no initial provision for this type of expenditure was foreseen in the allotment that had initially been made by the budget holder in headquarters.

178. The full realisation of the potential flexibility within FNPP is sometimes constrained by the wish of some cooperating governments to sign and adhere to formal agreements, by hesitation on the part of some of the administrative staff and generally by the lack of information of technical staff.

Pluri-disciplinarity and Internal Collaboration

179. All three themes of the programme are broad and complex. They require the expertise of a broad range of disciplines. A quick assessment by the evaluation team showed that altogether 20 divisions from six departments are actively taking part in the programme.

1.

¹⁵ FNPP – Lesson Learning Workshop (11/10/05): Summary of Main Points

180. The staff involved in the FNPP and the evaluation team, both recognize that the programme has been conducive to more cross-divisional and cross-departmental cooperation which has helped to adopt pluridisciplinary approaches. FNPP has been facing some difficulty in changing its image as a headquarter-based and driven programme. This is partly heritage from Phase 1 which was primarily normative. Phase 2 has been designed to be country-oriented and theme coordinators were encouraged to inform and consult with Regional, Sub regional and Country Offices. While country offices have been involved in the programme both at the formulation and implementation stage, the involvement of Regional and Sub-regional Offices remains limited.

181. While the heavy workload of some of the decentralized officers and in some cases the poor matching of skills available at the decentralized level with needs of country activities identified may explain this situation, there is a need to take a more proactive stance in eliciting their involvement. Suggestions are made in that regard in the overall recommendations below.

External Partnership

182. Partnership with other organizations can be valuable in increasing the likelihood of impact from limited resources, although it also has transaction costs. From a quick survey with FAO staff involved in the programme, a number of partnerships are being developed in particular at country level. Country visits gave also some indication on partnership. Bhutan is a good example where there are active partnerships with SNV as well as with WFP. However, as can be seen from the previous sections, the number of examples identified of active country-level partnership was limited. As the programme appoints country-level coordinators, the ongoing contacts should strengthen possibility for partnership.

Inter-Disciplinarity/Cross thematic integration

183. There is no thematic integration as per design of the Programme. Nevertheless, efforts have been made to foster greater integration in some countries. In most countries where more than one FNPP theme are active, integration is limited but exceptions include Angola and Mozambique where design seeks an explicit linkage between Forests and Food Security, and Mali where Forests and Agro-biodiversity are cooperating. This has been largely due to joint formulation of these country programmes. Further opportunities for cross-thematic cooperation exist in countries where activities have already started. For example, the evaluation mission identified a need for agro biodiversity and forestry contributions to the food security strategy work conducted in Bhutan.

184. Major obstacles to joint formulation and implementation appear to be: (i) the organisational structure of FAO with a tendency to compartmentalisation which FNPP tries to bridge – each of the FNPP themes is being led by a different department; (ii) equivalent compartmentalisation of government agencies dealing with the three FNPP themes; (iii) different approaches and time-lines adopted in the three themes (see the section on the design of the Programme); and (iv) different time-lines in national policy formulation processes.

185. FNPP has now adopted a mode of operation which seeks to provide some incentive for cross-thematic cooperation. The approach adopted in allocating budget to the three themes (25 percent of total resources to each theme, plus 25 percent unallocated) is expected to be more conducive to a programme approach in the future as the criteria chosen by the group of coordinators for the use of unallocated resources favours activities in which there is cross-theme complementarity and cooperation. It may be useful to complement this, at country level, by more systematic thinking on opportunities for cooperation, complementarity and synergy among the three themes.

186. At Headquarters level, country task forces have been set for Kenya, Mozambique and Lao PDR. When active, these country task forces can help strengthen integration. FNPP will also promote stronger cross-thematic linkages and cooperation at country level through: joint formulation in “new” FNPP countries; fielding of missions to FNPP countries by specialists in the themes which are as yet inactive so as to identify opportunities for strengthening ongoing work; organisation of exchange among staff involved in FNPP themes in a given country to identify opportunities for cooperation.

187. The FNPP theme coordinators are currently working on a proposal to initiate a new cross-thematic project, tentatively in Central America, with pilot projects in Honduras and Nicaragua. Countries in the region are separately developing Poverty Reduction Strategies, National Forest Programmes, and National Biodiversity Action Plans. The FNPP would work with existing regional processes (Central American councils of Environment Ministers and Agriculture Ministers) and key national agencies to try to ensure that forests, agriculture, and food security are effectively addressed and integrated into national planning processes.

Linking Normative Work and Technical Cooperation - Knowledge Building and Management

188. Some themes have an important normative content by design, in particular the Food Security theme: PE1 (Emergencies) with specific normative outputs and PE2 Objective 2 (Food Systems) with its research orientation. While there is not always clarity as to how it is planned to build on country level experience, draw lessons and develop good practices, a number of activities carried out during this first year directly contributed to FAO's conceptual and normative work. These include:

- a) activities undertaken under the first programme entity of the Food Security theme, dealing with the *Assessment of Food Security and Nutrition in Emergencies: Methodology for Improved Assessment and Response*. This activity is clearly of a norm-setting nature, but the production of a Needs - Response working paper, significant contribution to a Need Assessment- Response framework was built on the direct support to and interactions with FAO emergency coordinators;
- b) activities under the second objective of the second programme entity of the Food Security theme, dealing with *policies for facilitating the adjustment of small farmers and rural communities to a more globalized and urbanized food economy*, while intending to strengthen the ability of policy makers will also, through the results of the studies conducted at country level, feed into FAO's normative policy work; and
- c) under the Forests theme, FNPP was instrumental in funding a case study in Vietnam on forest ownership and tenure which contributes to a larger study conducted by FAO's Forestry Department.

189. Another potential linkage is country level assistance using or testing conceptual materials. The initial intention of the Food security theme in Bhutan was to test the concept note on *Review and Update National Agricultural, Rural Development and Food Security Strategies and Policies* developed by ESA and TCA in 2003. However, the very specific context of Bhutan made it that the work conducted in the country does not fit very closely with the approach proposed in the concept note.

190. There is no built-in mechanism in the FNPP structure for good practice identification or overall lesson learning, either for the overall Programme or individual themes. Given the various themes, broad range of activities as well as the large number of countries covered by the Programme, it is important to put in place a system to document and share learning. The coordinators are all aware of the need for such mechanisms and one of the criteria for the unallocated funds relates to lesson learning. Shortly before the Evaluation, a workshop was organised at headquarters to initiate a process of lesson learning. In line with the objectives of the Programme (focusing on the ways of working of the Organization), the discussion was on learning lessons in the area of *management and implementation arrangements*. This was a good initial step, and it was agreed in the workshop that it should be followed-up by a more in-depth discussion of some of the points raised and for the next workshop to be more productive, it should be preceded by the circulation of a list of negative aspects and issues so as to solicit more analytical inputs from the participants. It is also planned to hold such workshops at country level.

4.5. Effectiveness of Cooperation between FAO and the Netherlands

191. The first objective of the FNPP *to increase the effectiveness of the cooperation between FAO and the Netherlands*, assumes that through a programme approach based on a broad objectives- outcomes

framework, transaction costs between FAO and the Netherlands could be reduced, compared to a traditional project based cooperation, while achieving better outcome and impact.

192. The Evaluation Teams believes that transaction costs have been reduced because of the approach adopted, as interaction between FAO (the FNPP programme) and the Dutch Government have been quite limited during the first year-and-a-half of operation of the programme. It amounted to:

- the annual FAO-Netherlands meeting (January 2004);
- five meetings between the Dutch Counsellor, responsible for FNPP in the Dutch Embassy in Rome, and the FNPP coordinator (October 2004; January 2005; June 2005; August 2005; and October 2005);
- some limited and informal discussions with the FNPP theme coordinators;
- the transmission of the Work Plan for 2005 (December 2004) and of a table summarising progress with programme activities (June 2005); and
- Exchange of correspondence regarding financial matters (payment of replenishment in September 2005).

193. This is clearly below what would have been required if the four global activities and the fourteen country activities had been treated as separate projects. On the other hand, FAO's Management and staff highly value the opportunities given by the annual meeting and other encounters for intellectual exchange. They brought better understanding on respective visions, new perspective and ideas and overall, contributed to build a "partnership".

194. There was no evidence of soliciting or receiving technical inputs from the donor (Embassies of the Netherlands), in any countries visited. However, in the case of Mozambique, a seminar was held in Maputo, with the presence of the Vice-Minister of Agriculture of the Netherlands and the Ambassador of the Netherlands. The program was presented to the main stakeholders, and the launch was a good occasion to increase visibility and awareness about FNPP objectives and activities. There is scope for synergies and technical exchanges with bilateral activities (in Bhutan, Kenya and Lao PDR), including for themes such as trade liberalization and small farmers in Africa and for agro-biodiversity and knowledge management. The embassies visited were all aware of the Programme but expressed the need for greater exchanges and whenever possible jointly planned activities.

195. The first objective also expected that FNPP could contribute to an enhanced and closer cooperation between the Netherlands and other donors regarding their extra budgetary funding. Progress on this dimension of the first objective appears to have been relatively slow. A number of donors participated in the annual FAO-Netherlands *meeting* and the FNPP is often cited as an example. However, so far, other donors seem to be prudently observing the programme, adopting some aspects of the FNPP approach to design their own programmes (e.g. the recently approved Programme Cooperation Agreement between the Government of Norway and FAO), but there seems still to be a long way to go before other donors join the FNPP.

4.6. Overall Recommendations

Programme Coordinator

196. The Programme Coordinator should be allocated more time (and funding) in order to fully play his role. In particular, the Programme Coordinator could help through country visits improve coordination at country level when it is weak, strengthen the country-Headquarters liaison, and assist in identifying opportunities for cross-thematic integration both at country and Headquarters levels. In addition, being located in TCA, the Programme Coordinator could also help ensure greater linkages between the programme and TCA for country-level policy assistance related activities and ensure greater support from Policy Officers to take over country responsibilities whether placed at Headquarters or in ROs/SROs.

Increase the Role of FAO's Regional and Sub-Regional offices

197. Suggestions to do this include: early consultation in the planning process; designation of focal points for the three FNPP themes in each office and funding of missions to identify and formulate new activities; and institutionalizing the link between ESA and TCA policy assistance staff in the regions.

198. Secondment of staff against payment should be welcomed for the technical inputs of officers which are not already paid by the Programme. In particular, mission costs should be borne by themes or funded under the 25 percent unallocated funds, as appropriate.

Country Level Coordination

199. The model of an FNPP Coordinator at country level should be expanded in other countries where more than one theme is implemented. Greater attention should be given to briefing at Headquarters of the country level coordinator.

Lessons learning/Knowledge Building

Regarding management and ways of working:

200. Regular meetings such as the first lessons learning workshop should be replicated on a regular basis. The focus should continue to be management and ways of working reviewed against related principles of the Policy Framework Paper. For some of the subject-matters, regional officers and FNPP country staff should be invited to participate depending on the focus of the meetings. Sub-regional meetings involving a small group of countries where the Programme is implemented could also better focus on country level issues. There is no need for a more formal mechanism but each meeting should be prepared and managed by a facilitator and a systematic documentation of the meeting should be circulated among all those involved in the Programme at Headquarters as well as decentralised levels. It will also help staff and consultants working on the Programme to feel part of a bigger team.

Technical Subject-Matter

201. One first step towards increasing knowledge building from the Programme is to develop a framework identifying the main areas where lessons could be learned and good practices identified. The framework should cover theme and country perspectives. This will be technical in nature and may require different expertise taking into account the broad range of technical domains covered by the Programme. From such a review, should emerge areas relevant across themes or across countries and/or to individual theme.

202. The form and the timing through which knowledge will be built will vary depending on the subject matter, the scope of the contribution of the programme on the global knowledge in this area, and those who should be involved in such an exercise.

203. Proposals for regional policy harmonization related to the three FNPP themes, or for organising exchange of experience among FNPP countries in a given region (with participation of other FNPP-eligible countries) should be looked at favourably by FNPP for funding, as part of lesson learning and knowledge generation activities.

Netherlands-FAO Cooperation

204. Efforts should be made from both parties to exchange information at country level through more regular meetings between the FAO Representative and the Netherlands Delegation. Information on joint events should be systematically communicated to country offices (e.g., Progress reports, evaluation reports, minutes of meetings, etc.).

FAO-Netherlands Partnership Programme 2004-2007

Terms of reference for the First Evaluation Exercise (October-November 2005)

I. Background

The FNPP II was signed in July 2004 for a 3.5 year period and became operational during summer. In practice, its implementation started during the fall of 2004 and activities at country level started during spring 2005. The agreement stresses the results and impact “orientation” of the Programme. It plans reporting on outputs and their expected contribution to outcome on an annual basis. It also envisages in-depth assessments at the end of 2005 and 2007 on outcomes and progress towards achievements of objectives as established in the framework document.

II. Purposes of Evaluation

This first evaluation exercise will serve one or several of the following purposes, depending on the stages of Programme’s implementation:

Provide guidance to Programme Management on strategic and operational achievements and constraints so as to take corrective measures if need be and to improve the effectiveness of the Programme; and Provide accountability to the Donor on the effectiveness of FAO’s policy assistance to developing countries provided under the FNPP, and its working methods at country level; emphasis will be put on sustainable outcomes and impact.

The first evaluation will take place during the fall of 2005 so that results can also be used for the report to the Donor to be prepared in December. Taking into account the stage of implementation, this first evaluation will focus very much on issues of relevance. However, in countries and for some components, outputs and possibly outcomes will be analysed.

III. Scope and Issues to be addressed by Evaluation

The FNPP II has a country level and thematic focus. It is structured around three major themes: Food security, Agro-biodiversity and Forestry. It also has a programme approach to the extent that there is an overall funding allocation for the three components as well as 25% of the total budget unallocated. Furthermore, and as the Donor indicated, synergies and complementarities are sought between the themes and within each theme for greater effectiveness. However, the Programme is not designed in such a way that foresees joint outputs and outcomes between the three components. The evaluation will therefore cover **programme aspects** when they exist and examine possibilities for increasing them when relevant.

To the extent possible, it will also provide a preliminary assessment of **results and contribution to outcomes for each of the themes at country level** with particular attention to key principles/ focus underpinning the FNPP: poverty alleviation and the role food security plays, capacity building and sustainability.

The FNPP pays particular attention to a number of **processes** relating to FAO’s working methods, including:

- inter-disciplinarity;
- link and complementarity between normative and operational activities;
- coordination and harmonization with other FAO programmes and extra budgetary programmes of other donors;
- partnerships with external agencies;
- innovative flexible ways of cooperating with member countries;
- coordination and harmonization at country level in particular with the United Nations system.

These aspects will also be reviewed.

There will be two levels of analysis:

- one which relates to the **overall programme** (programme approach, methods of working and assessment of achievements across components and activities under the unallocated funds including those under the “**global programme**”); and
- the other relates to **achievements at country level and for each component**. Relevance, efficiency and results will be best assessed at country level.

Country- level and component assessments will be consolidated and used to assess the Programme.

Issues to be covered

The issues mentioned below are quite comprehensive. The extent to which the evaluation team will be able to address them will depend very much on the stage of implementation at the time of the country visits.

A. Programme Level

Programme Approach

- Is there a clear and explicit conceptual framework which links the three components of the programme? To what extent the design of the programme fosters (and/or could foster) a programme approach at various levels: (a) common or coordinated objectives; (b) common outcomes and impacts; (c) joint activities for common outputs.
- To what extent Programme coordination and management structures and functions facilitate a programme approach?
- Is there an effective mechanism in place to identify and help develop synergies and complementarities between components and within each component?
- What are the limits and constraints to a programme approach, taking into account in particular the various timeframes and levels of operations (from community-based interventions to policy level support) within and between the components?

Overall Programme relevance

- Extent to which the country work is relevant to:
 - wide group of countries (for replication);
 - gaps in “knowledge”;
 - strengthening FAO capacities to provide services;
 - FAO priorities; and
 - Millennium Development Goals.

Coordination and harmonization

- Internally: coherence, effective coordination and effective partnerships (when relevant) within the Organization with other programmes (RP and other extra-budgetary programmes);
- Externally: coherence, effective coordination and effective partnerships (when relevant) with the external agencies;

Inter-Disciplinarity

- Extent to which the design of the Programme fosters greater inter-disciplinarity?
- Extent to which the Programme uses FAO’s inter-disciplinarity mechanisms (e.g., PAIAs)?

Selection of countries for Programme implementation

- Extent to which the selection of countries reflects the Donor’s priorities and Programme’s objectives?

Programme Leadership and Management

- Efficiency of programme management structure and functions at Headquarters for the whole Programme and for each of the components? Do they ensure timely delivery and effective support to the Programme activities?
- Extent to which decision-making processes in the Programme give clear and coherent direction for Programme implementation and facilitate timely and smooth implementation of the FNPP's activities;
- Extent to which the Programme Management ensures flexibility and inclusiveness;
- Effectiveness of the monitoring and reporting system;

Linking Normative and Operational Activities

- What are the contributions of the FNPP to RP normative work (quality, value-added)?
- Extent to which the FNPP facilitates and promotes greater integration between normative work and operational activities (i.e., direct assistance to Member countries) at country level;

Global Programmes¹⁶

- Assessment of individual activities of a global nature: relevance, quality of outputs, possible outcomes and linkages with country-level components.

Unallocated Funds

- Extent to which criteria for funding activities under the unallocated funds are clear and appropriate;

Knowledge Building and Management

- Are there mechanisms to take stock and build knowledge, including lessons learnt and best practices developed within each component, between FNPP countries and at Programme level? What is their effectiveness?

B. Country Level

Each component ("project"¹⁷) will be evaluated along the structure below. Specific issues and focus will be defined by country by component on the basis of workplan, project document and/or any other document that explains objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities:

- Quality, clarity and adequacy of the formulation/design of FNPP's interventions;
- Relevance of project with respect to:
 - country needs, demand and priorities;
 - policy and strategy environment, in particular as it relates to poverty reduction and food security (including PRS);
 - existing programmes and other support including the UN system support.
- Efficiency and adequacy of implementation including:
 - the extent of national support and commitment;
 - the quality and timeliness of input delivery by FAO, the Government and other stakeholders;

1.

¹⁶ Up to now, the Global programme includes four activities: (i) Methodology for improved assessment and response in Emergencies in Emergencies;(ii) International conference on facilitating transformations in the food systems, (iii) Review of the format and indicators for reporting on the progress on the WFS Plan of Action and (iv) Global IPM facility.

¹⁷ The term "project" is understood here as a set of activities for the production of outputs and outcomes.....

- managerial and work efficiency, including clear responsibilities and mutual support between the Headquarters team and the FAO country office;
- the extent of consultation, coordination and collaboration with relevant external partners (partnerships based on comparative advantage);
- the quality and quantity of administrative and technical support by FAO Headquarters, regional offices and the country office;

implementation difficulties;

- adequacy of monitoring and reporting.

- Results, including a full and systematic assessment of outputs produced to date: quantity and quality as compared with work plans and prospects for contribution to outcomes. The basis for review of outcomes will include indicators defined in the Policy Framework Paper. Particular attention will be given to the following questions:

- value-added of FNPP's interventions and roles within the overall support provided to the country in that sector;
- knowledge building and management among all stakeholders;
- capacity building;
- gender aspects when relevant;
- contribution to food security and poverty reduction policy and strategy;
- prospects for sustainability (e.g. processes conducive to ownership);
- potential limits and constraints.

Country Level Programme Aspects

- Extent to which various components at country level are coherent, carried out in coordination;
- Extent to which complementarities and synergies are explored and realized;
- Effective learning and knowledge building mechanism among various components at country level;

Each **country case evaluation study** will provide conclusions, recommendations and guidance with a view to improving FNPP's effectiveness and efficiency in country.

IV. Methodology

The Evaluation will use traditional tools for evaluation, including structured individual and group interviews with staff (FNPP and non-FNPP) at Headquarters and at country level as well as with partners and potential partners, reviews of reports and other outputs produced within the framework of the FNPP, country evaluation case studies, and any other relevant materials.

The evaluation will be very consultative. Component Managers may be used as resource persons and be resource person (part-time) on the country missions with the Evaluation Team. A workshop should take place at an appropriate time during the evaluation process to discuss preliminary conclusions and recommendations as well as to start drawing lessons for the future.

Proposal for the First Evaluation Exercise (End of October – November 2005)

It is proposed to carry out country level missions in 6 **countries** selected primarily on the basis of status of implementation and other practical considerations. Among the countries visited, some must have all the three components under implementation. This is the case of Kenya so far. Missions will be an average of 3 to 4 days depending of field trips involved and of a week in Kenya. These country level missions will be supplemented by detailed information provided by the concerned component managers for countries not visited by the Evaluation Team.

As of June 2005, out of 18 countries and for at least one of the three components, activities have started in 10 countries, exploratory missions took place in 6 countries and a workplan is approved in one country. In one country, the planning was suspended for reasons of political instability.

Countries to be visited:

Africa: Kenya
Mali
Mozambique

Asia: Bhutan (incl.one day stopover in India)
Lao PDR
Vietnam

V. Deliverables**The following outputs will be produced:**

A short report on each country visited within 10 days of the end of the visit (to be circulated to staff, FAO Representatives in particular);
A workshop to discuss preliminary conclusions and recommendations;
An evaluation report covering all of the above issues and consolidating the results of country visits and the results of the analysis of the information provided on countries not visited (by 30th of November);
A short synthesis evaluation report for distribution to the Donor (by mid-December)
An internal lessons learned paper (by 31st of January)

VI. Team Composition and Responsibilities

The team will be composed of three experts:

- An Evaluation Leader: Policy and Food Security specialist
- Forestry specialist with experience in evaluation (Forest legislation/Policy specialist)
- Specialist in agro-biodiversity; knowledge of IPM and FFS approach.

All the experts will go on all missions. The evaluation team, under the responsibility of the team leader, will be responsible for an evaluation report.

PBEE will be responsible for the management of the evaluation, including selection and recruitment of consultants, organizing, providing advice and supervising the Team, reviewing reports. PBEE will participate to some of the field missions and contribute to the evaluation report. PBEE staff member will also be responsible for producing a short synthesis evaluation report for distribution to the Donor.

Staff involved in the FNPP will be collaborative and provide inputs and advice to the Evaluation Team.

VII. Tentative Time schedule for the First Evaluation Exercise (2005)

17- 22/10- Team at Headquarters: Assessment (programme level analysis, interviews with staff, information collection, information templates for countries not visited by the team, preparation of field work)

23/10-05/11: Field Missions: Bhutan/Vietnam/ Laos (4 days in each country)

06 - 19/11: Field Missions: Kenya/Mozambique/Mali (Kenya 5 days/ 4 days in the two other countries)

20– 26/11: Headquarters: Workshop and finalisation of conclusions and recommendations