

Project Evaluation Series

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

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

Annex 5. Overview of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

Annex 5. Overview of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

Evaluation Question	Heading	Finding	Conclusion	Recommendation	Lessons learned
Evaluation Question 1- Relevance of Design and Approach	4.1.1. Project Relevance	<p>1. Both projects were relevant in the nutrition and food security context in Africa, with high levels of acute and chronic undernutrition. Collaboration with NEPAD was strategic to support CAADP and Malabo declaration commitments, and in light of the work towards SDG and WHA targets. Partnerships with RAAF, NEPAD, SUN and REACH worked well to support implementation across a large geographical space and multi-stakeholder arena.</p>	<p>1. The timing, set up and choice of partnership for both projects was relevant and strategic in the current context in West and Sub-Saharan Africa, and facilitated the achievement of project results.</p>	<p>1. Continued support to countries and RECs is necessary to ensure appropriate implementation of policies. To remain relevant, stock taking and learning from both projects on advancement and remaining gaps, needs to inform the next phase intervention. Current partnerships should be maintained and strengthened, and formalised with additional actors.</p>	
	4.1.2 Clarity of Project Design	<p>1. Output formulations and indicators for both projects were clear, logically structured and measurable. Outcome and impact formulations were vague and lacked concrete baseline and target values. Impact formulations lacked clarity in definition of indicators and were overambitious in link with the activities implemented and the available timeframe of both projects.</p> <p>Indicators were dropped and target values adjusted during the project.</p> <p>2. Both projects implemented a large variety and scope of activities, in terms of technical focus and geographical spread, ie. nutrition, food security, agriculture, social protection, agriculture extension, right to food, etc, across 15 countries in ECOWAS and 20 countries</p>	<p>1. Flaws in the formulation of outcomes and impacts and their baseline and target values, made it difficult to monitor and report on the impact and outcome achievements, and difficult to document the contribution of outputs to outcomes and impacts. Similar observations had already been noted in the evaluation of GER 454, with recommendation for improvements for GER 476 and 477. Additionally, the choice and formulation of the impact objectives are beyond the scope of the action, activities and what the projects were able to realistically achieve within the given timeframe. The projects main focus were on capacity building and policy change, with core elements of training, advocacy and support to policy formulation. A focus on the creation of an enabling environment would have</p>	<p>1. To enhance project formulation and design, enable improved monitoring and measurement of achievements, it is recommended that possible future proposals should consider a more structured approach, including the formulation of a theory of change, simplified and SMART monitoring framework and measurements, as well as higher level strategic support to improving the choice and formulation of impact and outcome statements and indicators, in coherence with project focus and timeframes.</p> <p>2. Structure and resource projects appropriately to ensure the scope and reach of activities within a given timeframe is achievable. Consider</p>	

Evaluation Question	Heading	Finding	Conclusion	Recommendation	Lessons learned
		<p>in SubSaharan Africa. To cater for all technical topics, good collaboration with FAO HQ technical teams especially on social protection and the right to food were facilitated. Some support activities were served short of need resulting in less depth for country support.</p>	<p>been a better measurement for the result of the activities implemented and outputs achieved, ie. training and capacity building, development of nutrition-sensitive agriculture policies and investment plans, etc. The discrepancies of impact formulation and choice of indicators vis-a-vis the project activities and focus, indicate that the causal relationship between the results and activity chains were not spelled out well. The development of a Theory of Change at the design phase of the projects would have been supportive of improving this.</p> <p>2. Due to the large reach of activities and space, the team at times had to spread itself thinly in terms of available resources and time across both projects. Either stronger prioritisation and reduction of focus, or additional dedicated expert resources would have been appropriate to ensure holistic and comprehensive support to all targeted countries. The project could have benefited from dedicated resources on technical expertise on regional level, ie communication, social protection, right to food, in addition to the nutrition consultants managing the overall projects.</p>	<p>regional dedicated resources to support technical elements of projects, ie social protection, right to food, to ensure continuity and quality of support to countries is ensured.</p>	

Evaluation Question	Heading	Finding	Conclusion	Recommendation	Lessons learned
	4.1.3 Theory of Change	<p>1. Neither project had a TOC developed during proposal or implementation stage, leading to a lack of clarity on causal relationships of change, influencers of change and achievements.</p> <p>2. No joint TOC, capturing both projects' activities and objectives was developed. No country level engagement TOCs were developed following the initial country scoping capacity assessments.</p> <p>3. As part of the evaluation process, two retrospective linear TOCs, one for each project, were developed. A joint TOC, capturing both projects' initiatives was developed, demonstrating a dynamic and cyclical process of policy change.</p>	<p>1. The establishment of a clear and detailed TOC based on a Change Model could have improved the overall understanding of dynamics between activities, identified challenging components, and defined chronology of activities for project implementation.</p> <p>2. The development of a programme TOC featuring activities of both projects together, could have established a coherent way of linking activities and reaching outcomes, creating a joint vision of change to be achieved, which could have amplified and formalised the collaboration between the teams and resources used.</p> <p>3. Country level TOCs could have clarified expectations for the technical assistance and collaboration with governments, supported the monitoring and follow up of achievements on country level contributing to the larger impact goal, and could have created greater ownership and understanding at the country level, defining an entry point for political advocacy and policy change, paving the way for ownership and sustainability of the policy development and implementation.</p>	<p>1. Systematically develop TOCs at project proposal stage, and review during project inception. If multiple projects have similar objectives and goals in the same target areas, map multiple projects in one overall programme TOC, ie GER 476, Ger 477 and the Spanish project.</p> <p>2. For country level engagements, consider to develop a TOC for action and change to be achieved on country level, together with local stakeholders.</p>	

Evaluation Question	Heading	Finding	Conclusion	Recommendation	Lessons learned
	4.1.4 Project Approach and Process	<p>1. Regular project steering and management team meetings were facilitated with FAO support team, project team and donor representation. These were important for smooth implementation and processes. No partners, ie. REC, countries, NEPAD or else were invited or contributed to the meetings. No joint meetings between the two projects were facilitated.</p> <p>2. FAO internal programme subregional and regional coordination capacity was weak and has affected the vision and integration of projects to achieve the biggest change.</p> <p>3. No structured approach to facilitate the understanding of stakeholder behaviour change through a stages of change model or similar, was applied. The application of a Stages of Change model approach indicates that both projects have supported countries and RECs to reach the <i>preparation</i> stage, which has laid the foundation for the advancement into <i>action</i> and <i>maintenance</i> stages, and eventually achieving the overall goal of ending hunger and malnutrition in Africa.</p> <p>4. Neither project proposal makes reference to the FAO Capacity Development approach, although capacity development is central to both projects. Not all elements of FAOs capacity development approach have</p>	<p>1. The steering committee could have provided more support to the facilitation of critical project elements, ie. political advocacy, partner mobilisation, synergies with other initiatives, etc. The creation of a management group including key stakeholders, ie RECs, countries, NEPAD, Hub Rural, etc. could have enhanced the synergies and implementation, creating additional commonalities and momentum.</p> <p>Given the similarities of the two projects' activities and approach, the projects could have benefited from a joint steering process to strategically manage both projects together for improved overall and resource management, as well as alignment to FAO's Strategic Frameworks, ie geographical reach, activity coordination, training coordination, advocacy coordination, etc.</p> <p>2. The lack of dedicated internal coordination capacity on sub-regional and regional level has limited opportunities to create coherence and coordination of the two and other projects in the region and subregion.</p> <p>3. Applying a Stages of Behaviour Change model could have supported the overall understanding of how change happens, and the structure and design of the two projects, the development of their synergies, the considerations of chronology of</p>	<p>1. Consider the implementation of a joint steering committee management process for similar projects implemented in the same region. For projects with focus on stakeholder involvement, consider their participation and role in the project management and oversight.</p> <p>2. Consider the establishment of dedicated, full time sub-regional programme coordinators to ensure the improved management and coherence of interventions implemented in the same region, establishing a long term vision in line with FAOs strategic framework, and optimise resource utilisation and partnership/stakeholder management.</p> <p>3. Consider the use and application of a stages of change model/ behaviour change model for policy change projects, their conception and implementation to improve strategic vision and planning of longer term engagement and strategy.</p> <p>4. Ensure a more rigorous and systematic application of FAOs capacity development approach the design and implementation of CD projects. Concrete CD expert support for the development and implementation of a next phase could be helpful.</p>	

Evaluation Question	Heading	Finding	Conclusion	Recommendation	Lessons learned
		<p>been systematically applied during the implementation of both projects.</p> <p>5. Both projects employed different processes of selecting countries for policy support, ie. GER 476 followed ECOWAS suggestions, GER 477 followed support requests from countries or RECs. Both projects were successful to establish pre-engagement capacity assessments for all countries supported through the projects' activities.</p> <p>6. Government representatives and other UN affiliates were surprised that FAO was supporting nutrition integration into policy, rather than another UN agency. The success of both projects is influenced by the credibility and positioning of FAO, as the go-to-partner for nutrition, and nutrition integration into agriculture policy and investment plans.</p> <p>7. The German Government was flexible and supportive to changes and requests for no-cost extensions and necessary adjustment to both projects. Representatives of the German Federal Government were involved in different aspects of project proceedings, ie. steering committee meetings, opening meetings at symposia, workshops and trainings, etc. Support to establish linkages or coordination with partners or initiatives, ie. negotiation with ECOWAS for the financial contribution,</p>	<p>activities, and planning of the timeline to achieve change.</p> <p>4. FAOs CD approach was not fully applied and hence the projects were not able to benefit from the structured and holistic approach to CD. Technical and individual capacity development was overrepresented in most activities throughout the projects. Organisational and functional capacities were weak in the promotion of capacity development.</p> <p>5. Prioritisation of countries by ECOWAS has influenced the effectiveness of activities, given a top down approach for engagement with countries. A more demand-driving process as used by GER 477 could be more constructive to build ownership. The country capacity assessments were supportive in structuring the engagement with countries, although did not take FAOs CD approach sufficiently into consideration, balance CD components..</p> <p>6. Stronger senior level representation, advocacy and communication efforts on project achievements could support the manifestation of FAOs positioning and credibility on nutrition work.</p> <p>7. Regular interaction, beyond receipt of standard reports could support the coherence and understanding for BMEL on the advancement of the projects, and facilitate additional external and</p>	<p>5. Country selection for support should be demand-driven, and in case prioritisation is needed, consider critical criteria, ie. food security and/ nutrition needs, the state of the national sectoral policy or investment plans, existing capacity levels and motivation of the country to engage into policy support, and country interest in the improvement of its policy and practice around nutrition, etc. Capacity assessment tools should be reviewed and updated to align with the FAO CD approach and structure.</p> <p>6 .FAO needs to strengthen its approach to communication and sensitisation of partners and stakeholders of its role and mandate in the promotion of nutrition in the agriculture and rural development sector.</p> <p>7. BMEL/GoG could use its investment more strategically for leveraging partners, facilitating linkages to other initiatives, and promoting its internal <i>Ending Global Hunger</i> strategy.</p>	

Annex 5. Overview of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

Evaluation Question	Heading	Finding	Conclusion	Recommendation	Lessons learned
		linkages to IFPRI's TRANSFORM Initiative, etc., was weak.	internal linkages to initiatives of the German Governments' <i>Ending Global Hunger</i> Strategy.		

	<p>4.1.5 Resources and Timeframe</p>	<p>1. Both projects' activities were tightly budgeted with 2million USD each for 3 years. The projects' timeframes were appropriate and realistic to carry out the proposed activities and achieve the respective outputs. Countries and RECs have been able to formulate policies and investment plans, but have not adopted or started implementation yet. The available timeframe and resources were insufficient for the achievement of the outcomes and in particular the formulated impacts.</p> <p>2. Both projects were short staffed, and lacked dedicated general managerial support for prioritisation of activities, political advocacy, stakeholder engagement and support, to ensure more time for the Nutrition consultants to focus on the technical content of the work. The replacement of the Senior Nutrition Officer took 15 months, during which one nutrition consultant covered both positions.</p> <p>3. Overall communication and marketing of project activities was weak. The absence of communication and marketing elements in the proposal led to a lack of structured communication and advocacy strategies throughout the project. The project team was able to contribute one article to the FAO Africa Regional Overview of Food Security and Nutrition (2017) publication.</p>	<p>1. More resources could have allowed for a more intensive and in-depth approach to country support, creating stronger ownership, political will and sustainability at country and REC level. The outcome and impact level should have focused on achievements which were feasible and realistic within the projects' given timeframe and scope. Or, alternatively, the projects should have been adapted and extended in their timeframe to ensure feasibility of reaching the proposed impacts.</p> <p>2. Dedicated project management support as defined in the project proposal through the Senior Nutrition Officer, would have supported the management, prioritisation of activities and political engagement and functional development with stakeholders and partners, and enabled the technical nutrition officer to deepen engagement with countries on technical level.</p> <p>3. A clear communication and marketing strategy for both projects would have improved the promotion of the purpose of the action, ie. importance of nutrition, linkages of agriculture and nutrition, etc. Specifically clear messages for communication and advocacy campaigns, ie. different type and formulation of messages, advocacy and message targets and allies, identification of champions and key stakeholders, advocacy opportunities, could have been improved. This is a</p>	<p>1. See recommendation on improved formulation and conception of project result frameworks and TOCs.</p> <p>2. Consider establishing a consultant roster which can support rapid interim filling of critical project and programme staff gaps. Turnover is inevitable, but can be managed more strategically and efficiently.</p> <p>3. Consider the systematic integration of communication and marketing strategies in mid and long term projects and programmes, or alternatively significantly reinforce the communication and marketing on FAO region and sub-regional level.</p>	
--	---	--	--	--	--

Annex 5. Overview of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

Evaluation Question	Heading	Finding	Conclusion	Recommendation	Lessons learned
			missed opportunity to showcase FAO's significant work in collaboration with governments and RECs on nutrition.		

Evaluation Question	Heading	Finding	Conclusion	Recommendation	Lessons learned
	<p>4.1.6 Alignment to FAO's strategic framework and nutrition strategy</p>	<p>1. GCP/RAF/476/GER- directly contributed to SO1 with its formulation and action. Additionally the project worked along three out of the four working axis of SO1 – 1. Policies, programmes and legal frameworks, 2. Human and financial resources, and 3. Governance, coordination mechanisms and partnerships. GCP/RAF/477/GER – the project's impact is aligned to SO1 formulation, albeit less closely than GCP/RAF/476/GER. Outcome and Output formulation refer to SO2, 3 and 4, demonstrating the contributing effects towards the higher SO1, and project impact formulation. The project worked along all four working axis of SO1 – 1. Policies, programmes and legal frameworks, 2. Human and financial resources, 3. Governance, coordination mechanisms and partnerships, and 4. Evidence-based decision-making.</p> <p>2. Both projects under evaluation were designed and implemented along the main axes of the FAO Nutrition Strategy, a) improved knowledge and awareness on nutrition and agriculture linkages, b) improved capacity to formulate and implement policies on national and regional level, and c) improved governance and coordination mechanisms for nutrition and food security/ agriculture.</p>	<p>1. The formulation and implementation of both projects was aligned to SO1, with additional linkages and contributions to SO2, SO3 and SO4.</p> <p>2. It can therefore be concluded that the formulation of both projects were closely aligned to FAOs Nutrition Strategy objectives and outcomes, and have contributed to its achievement.</p>		

Evaluation Question	Heading	Finding	Conclusion	Recommendation	Lessons learned
Evaluation Question 2 – Effectiveness achieving Results	4.2.1 Outcomes and Impact Measurement and Learning	<p>1. GCP/RAF/476/GER's outcomes and impact have only partly been achieved. Unachieved components are due to flawed indicators and timeframes for implementation. Not all achievements are attributable to the project success due to their global nature.</p> <p>2. GCP/RAF/477/GER's impact indicators are not contributing to the measurement of the impact formulated. Impact and outcomes have partly been achieved. Not all achievements are attributable to project success, and not all parts are fully verifiable.</p>	<p>1. The choice of indicators, lack of clarity on indicator formulation and lack of systematic monitoring on impact and outcome levels reduce the ability to fully demonstrate success and achievement of both projects.</p> <p>2. Some of the chosen indicators are relevant, although incomplete, but the timeframe available for achievements was too short, ie stunting, wasting, etc.</p>	<p>1. See recommendation on M&E frameworks under 4.1.2 Rec 1.</p> <p>2. Align nutrition indicators to other global monitoring and result frameworks, ie. Use stunting as a nutrition indicator like WHA and SGDs.</p>	
	4.2.2 Nutrition Integration in Regional and National Policies	<p>1. Both projects achieved their targets, with 23 countries and 6 RECs supported in the development of their policies and investment plans. All are at different stages in the policy implementation stage.</p> <p>2. A nutrition marker has been developed to assess the quality of nutrition integration. The marker has been applied to Nigeria, Namibia and Seychelles country and ECOWAS and IOC regional policies and programmes.</p> <p>3. Countries have identified critical challenges for the implementation of their policies, with critical capacity gaps identified.</p>	<p>1. The project support has led to the achievement of formulation of policy documents on country and regional level.</p> <p>2. Through the assessment of quality and depth of nutrition integration into the documents, and key informant interviews, critical capacity gaps for policy implementation have been identified.</p> <p>3. Support to knowledge and capacity gaps will be crucial for the policy implementation success.</p>	<p>1. Continue to work on support to policy completion and implementation for countries and RECs, focus on critical gaps identified and provide capacity development for technical and functional levels, in all three dimensions.</p> <p>2. Apply nutrition marker to all policy documents produced, to create a baseline for the next project phase.</p> <p>3. Facilitate dedicated learning exchanges across countries to exchange on challenges and successes. Focus on dedicated documentation and evidence creation of policy implementation and experiences.</p>	

Evaluation Question	Heading	Finding	Conclusion	Recommendation	Lessons learned
	<p>4.2.3 Integration of Agriculture and Social Protection in Nutrition Policy</p>	<p>1. GCP/RAF/476/GER exceeded deliverables under output 2, with 6 countries integrating social protection into their national policies, and a guidance note developed. The presentation of the social protection approach in the concept note (2012) was not in line with FAO corporate approach, which was developed later (2015).</p> <p>GCP/RAF/477/GER achieved outputs under social protection objective, only 14 out of 20 target countries were able to achieve output 2. Questions remain on the attribution and sustainability of staff positions created and seconded to regional and country offices. Regional initiatives' trickle down effect to countries remains unclear.</p> <p>2. While social protection as a topic was deemed relevant by key informants, it was perceived as an additional new concept on top of nutrition integration, which needed more time.</p> <p>A detailed review of quality of social protection integration in the Nigeria and Seychelles policy has been facilitated.</p>	<p>1. Implementation was completed, although conceptually and quality-wise needs to be clarified. Indicator set up was simple for GER 476, but complex and diffused for GER 477, with social protection, nutrition integration and agriculture combined in one indicator. Additional concepts new to country government might need additional time and effort to promote. The timeframe for design <u>and</u> implementation of policies with social protection was too short.</p>	<p>1. Ensure coherence of FAO's social protection approach being systematically applied and rolled out.</p> <p>2. Monitor the regional initiatives' trickle down effects and influence on country level initiatives.</p> <p>3. Continued efforts should be out on the integration of the concept of nutrition-sensitive social protection in agriculture policies, with a strong focus on technical capacity development on for governments and RECs. Facilitate cross country learning and exchanges, and documentation of experiences on social protection.</p>	
	<p>4.2.4 Integration of Nutrition in Food Security</p>	<p>1. In contrary to proposal definition, the activities focused on integration of nutrition indicators into monitoring activities. Key indicators promoted were dietary diversity, women minimum dietary diversity and the food insecurity experience scale. Close collaboration</p>	<p>1. This output was not implemented as intended. Monitoring systems are an important component of policies, however, not having promoted nutrition indicators in agriculture and food security information systems across countries and regions remains a missed</p>	<p>1. Consider conversations with CILSS / Cadre Harmonise, and the SADC VAC system to promote the integration of nutrition-sensitive indicators.</p>	

Evaluation Question	Heading	Finding	Conclusion	Recommendation	Lessons learned
	<p>Information Systems</p> <p>4.2.5 The advancement of the Right to Food</p>	<p>with NEPAD for promotion of inclusion in CAADP/Malabo results framework was facilitated. The Nigeria policy has been reviewed for its integration of nutrition indicators.</p> <p>1. GCP/RAF/476/GER has an explicit reference to the promotion of the Right to Food in its outcome indicator 1 and impact statement formulation. However, there is no further reference to the Right to Food (RtF) in the remaining results framework. Nevertheless, this aspect has advanced well and can be considered an achievement.</p>	<p>opportunity. Support to NEPAD was crucial for their advancement with indicator integration.</p> <p>1. Activities were aligned to another FAO project working with parliamentarians, lawmakers and civil society on the understanding and clarity of the meaning and concept of the RtF, enhancing their ability to make informed decisions on the formulation and integration of the RtF in local law and constitutions. 5 countries were able to benefit from the activity, with varying success to ingrate the RtF into their constitution and laws.</p>	<p>2. Continue collaboration and support with NEPAD on promotion of these indicators on regional and country level, for implementation and reporting.</p> <p>3. Collaborate and develop partnerships on systems and reporting mechanisms to foster and create low cost opportunities and systems. Private sector contributions for technology and systems should be an interesting opportunity.</p> <p>1. Consider follow up and continuation of the RtF component in future project phases.</p>	
	<p>4.2.5 Capacity of NEPAD, Regional and National stakeholders to integrate nutrition</p>	<p>1. Agriculture extension materials were completed, and promotion of nutrition in agriculture extension was successful, through a creative partnership with ENACT/ENAF.</p> <p>2. FAO capacity strengthening and maintenance in house was well facilitated through regular workshops</p>	<p>1. Planned results were achieved, and a great initiative with ENACT/ENAF promoted, creating a level of sustainability for the training materials.</p> <p>2. Great initiative of regional workshops to advance nutrition thinking internally to FAO. Its important to maintain high level awareness and understanding of</p>	<p>1. Continue to collaborate with ENACT/ENAF -like initiatives, facilitate a similar roll out to anglophone Africa, and conduct a follow up and learning exercise from the ENAF countries to inform other regional university networks. Consider interactive, low cost community agriculture extension</p>	

Evaluation Question	Heading	Finding	Conclusion	Recommendation	Lessons learned
		<p>on evolving topics in the nutrition sector.</p> <p>3. FAOs support and engagement in involvement in coordination on country level was successful.</p> <p>4. Collaboration with NEPAD was successful, with secondment of staff and close coordination for country support. Piloting the knowledge management platform with the SADC region was critical for capacity development and maintenance.</p> <p>5. FAOs CD approach and strategy was not fully applied, nor was it used and referred to in the proposal documents. The approach taken by both projects has largely focused on technical skills on individual level, and sidelined functional skills on organisational level. The depth and sustainability of capacity developed is unclear at this stage.</p> <p>6. In Namibia, FAO's engagement and conversation have partly influenced creation of a national university course on nutrition, FAO does not further engage with the implementation now, due to a lack of dedicated nutrition capacity at FAO Namibia office level.</p> <p>7. Advocacy, mobilisation and messaging focused primarily and successfully on technical level government staff. Additionally, high</p>	<p>latest global and regional developments in the nutrition arena.</p> <p>3. FAOs engagement and staff secondments supported NEPAD and RECs with the ongoing technical support to countries. Models like ECOWAS RAAF should be promoted with other regions.</p> <p>5. More focus was spend on technical individual capacity building on regional and national level. There was a lack of focus on organisational and functional development levels and dimensions. This might have influenced governments ownership and advancement in policy implementation, ie. governments facing a number of constraints for implementation.</p> <p>6. The lack of continued engagement in the promotion of NUST nutrition course in Namibia, is a missed opportunity for FAO and its position and contribution to the capacity development on nutrition.</p> <p>7. Advocacy and mobilisation managed to support and enhance technical understanding and technical will to promote nutrition. Lack of managerial and higher level government involvement from line ministries and support ministries, resulted in a lack of political will being built on national level.</p>	<p>worker engagement through new technologies.</p> <p>2. Continue to facilitate regular workshops to ensure FAO staff is up to date.</p> <p>4. Continue to work with NEPAD and RECs on capacity development and maintenance, focus on the sustainability and quality of capacity development. Consider ECOWAS RAAF structure and approach as a model to promote and support in other sub-regions.</p> <p>5. Systematically align proposals and action to FAO capacity development framework, balance technical and functional, and individual and organisational capacity development.</p> <p>6. FAO needs to maintain a local engagement and presence given competition from other nutrition actors.</p> <p>7. Promote a more balanced approach to technical and political advocacy on the various levels of national governments. Provide FAO internal senior management support to mobilise national level senior level ministries to promote nutrition and agriculture.</p>	

Evaluation Question	Heading	Finding	Conclusion	Recommendation	Lessons learned
		level Pan- African parliament and Members of National Parliaments benefited from awareness raising and improved understanding on nutrition and agriculture. The higher level national government layers, ie. Ministers and Permanent Secretaries of line ministries and support ministries lacked attention and mobilisation.			
Evaluation Question 3 – Sustainability and Ownership	4.3.1 Regional and National Ownership	1. GCP/RAF/477/GER and NEPAD followed an appropriate process of demand-driving support provided to countries and regions. Countries work on their own pace to design and implement their policies, and their competing priorities need to be respected. The four countries visited are struggling with decision-making, and roles and responsibilities for the implementation of their policies or programmes. It is too early now to see if ownership and sustainability has been created, but time will tell if countries teams are able to maintain the momentum and proceed to implementation of their policies overcoming the current struggles.	1. Country struggle with policy implementation, might not be a sign for lack of ownership per se. It might be a healthy combination of lack of political awareness vs technical awareness, and lack of competencies and capacities to move policy implementation forward. Time will tell if countries are able to maintain the ownership and sustainability of the action. It is crucial to ensure nutrition action is owned and remains on the forefront of political interest in these most affected countries, in spite of regular political and government changes.	1. A structured mapping of gaps and support needs for policy implementation should be conducted to inform future project phases. 2. Emphasis needs to be on the definition of tools and frameworks for the implementation, monitoring and reporting of policies.	
	4.3.2 Multi-stakeholder Partnerships	1. Coordination fora and events have been supported, ie ECOWAS Nutrition WG, EASt Africa Nutrition WG, Namibia NAFN, SUN gathering, etc. Coordination remains a major challenge for countries and regional levels, to bring on board relevant stakeholders on regular basis.	1. Coordination remains a clear challenge and should be target of future project phase activities. 2 .NEPAD work on the integration of nutrition and nutrition indicators in CAADP framework, and its validation and promotion from regional to country	1. Continue to collaborate with SUN/REACH and other coordination mechanisms. A current research project managed by IDS is looking at the SUN multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms. Results from this research could be interesting for the implementation of other policy projects promoting	

Evaluation Question	Heading	Finding	Conclusion	Recommendation	Lessons learned
		<p>2. NEPAD collaboration was strong with efforts to promote nutrition and its indicators in the CAADP results framework and the knowledge management platform pilot in SADC.</p> <p>3. Opportunities to collaborate with ReSAKKS arose in the contribution to their annual report 2015 and the facilitation of a side session at the ReSAKKS 2016 event.</p> <p>4. The collaboration with the Hub Rural was proactive and constructive. It supported the facilitation and access to the 15 ECOWAS countries and the support to their NAFSNIPs.</p> <p>5. Both projects had limited engagement and collaboration with with NGOs and Academic or Policy institutions for the implementation of the projects.</p>	<p>level, and implementation on country level continues and needs support.</p> <p>3. ReSAKKS collaboration should continue to strengthen monitoring, knowledge management and evidence creation on nutrition and agriculture in Africa.</p> <p>4. Hub Rural collaboration provided opportunities for technical backstopping and support during, and after project end, enabling some sort of sustainable and continuing support to countries of the ECOWAS region.</p> <p>5. NGOs could be a critical partner on national level to continue advocacy and technical support in the absence of FAO nutrition capacity.</p>	<p>nutrition focused partnerships and coordination.</p> <p>2. Close collaboration with NEPAD and ReSAKKS working together on systems and reporting mechanisms could be interesting to foster and create low cost opportunities and systems. Private sector contributions through technology and systems should be considered.</p> <p>3. Strengthen and elaborate on further collaboration with the HubRural, especially on long terms sustainability and support to policy roll out and monitoring.</p> <p>4. Consider formalised collaboration and partnerships national and international NGOs to support advocacy and technical efforts in country, and with regional, sub-regional and national universities for measurement and evidence creation of policy impact.</p>	