



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the United
Nations

Office of Evaluation

Sudan Institutional Capacity Programme: Food Security Information for Action – South Programme (SIFSIA-S) – OSRO/SUD/621/MUL

Management response to the evaluation report

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Office of Evaluation (OED)

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

Permission to make copy, download or print copies of part or all of this work for private study and limited classroom use is hereby granted, free of charge, provided that an accurate citation and suitable acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright owner is given. Where copyright holders other than FAO are indicated, please refer to the original copyright holder for terms and conditions of reuse. All requests for systematic copying and electronic distribution, including to list servers, translation rights and commercial reuse should be addressed to copyright@fao.org.

For further information, please contact:

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

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of FAO concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

Management responses on final evaluation

Sudan Institutional Capacity Building Programme: Food Security Information for Action (SIFSIA) – South Sudan

OSRO/SUD/621/MUL

Submitted by TCE 17April 2012

Evaluation Recommendation	Management response Accepted, partially accepted or rejected and comment on the Recommendation	Management plan			
		Action to be taken	Responsible unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
For the remainder of the SIFSIA project (1)					
Recommendation 1					
Tripartite meetings to be held monthly between the chair of the SIFSIA (and SPCRP) Steering Committee, the FAOR, the EU (and other donors committed to future funding of information systems on food and nutrition security and policy-making) during this critical period of project phase-out and the introduction of new food security intervention (<i>Responsibility of the SIFSIA Steering Committee Chair</i>).	The recommendation is partially accepted . While a need for close tripartite consultation is acknowledged, there was not sufficient time to organize such meetings during the remaining time of the SIFSIA implementation period (NTE: 29 February 2012 in South Sudan). Nevertheless, two meetings were held, one steering committee meeting in December, 2011 and the second meeting for the final handing over of the SIFSIA project activities to the stakeholders in February, 2012.	FAO will ensure close consultation with donors and key GRSS stakeholders during the transitional period until the new Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building (FSPSCB) programme is operational.	FAO South Sudan in close consultation with donors and GRSS.	Until the new FSPSCB programme is operational.	N
Recommendation 2					
A review of the provisions of Spanish funding (agreed 25 November 2011) to determine what project costs relating to technical assistance at different levels can be sustained at the national level until EU and CIDA funding becomes effective (<i>Responsibility of FAO with Spanish Government</i>).	The recommendation is accepted. Although the Spanish contribution to the new Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme will focus mainly on Lakes State, there is a proportional funding allocated to various components (outputs) ensuring	The new Spanish project (e.g. GCP /SSD/001/SPA) is not yet operational. Funds were received in February 2012. The project will need to go through internal appraisal process before it becomes operational. It has been closely followed up by TCE and	FAO	By the first quarter of 2012, the project should be operational.	N

	technical assistance at different levels at the national level. This will ensure continuation and balanced support both at the targeted State level (Lakes State) and at the national level.	TCSR for PPRC etc.			
Recommendation 3					
An exit strategy to be finalized for presentation by the PSU to the Technical and Steering Committees in December 2011 identifying the operating costs of each component to be borne by GoSS effective from 1 February 2012 to ensure that the gains achieved through SIFSIA are not lost. Work plans to be developed with the FSTS, LAF, the CLiMIS secretariat, SSMA, the four working groups and the state level SIFSIA focal points for 2012 (<i>Responsibility of FAO/PSU with GoSS</i>).	The recommendation is accepted . The exit strategy was presented by the PSU to the Steering Committee in December 2011 identifying the operating costs of each component to be borne by GoSS effective from 1 February 2012. This is to make sure that the gains achieved through SIFSIA are not lost. Work plans for the various stakeholders were also developed.	No further action is required by SIFSIA PSU.	N/A	N/A	N
Recommendation 4					
The Food & Agriculture Policy Framework (FAPF) 2011-2015 should be finalised prior to project completion (<i>Responsibility of MAF/GoSS with technical support of PSU</i>).	The recommendation is accepted . The Food & Agriculture Policy Framework (FAPF) 2011-2015 was finalised prior to project completion in February 2012. SIFSIA PSU worked with the Planning and Programming Directorate of MAF to prepare the policy document for submission to the Council of Ministers for approval.	FAO will continue provide necessary technical support when/if requested by MAF.	MAF with technical support from FAO	Completed.	N
Recommendation 5					
The Food Security Council should be activated and consideration given to renaming it the Food and Nutrition	The recommendation is partially accepted . However, since the decree was released on 9 th October,	Progress has been made towards operationalisation of the FSC. A UN task force team was	MAF with technical support from	Jan-June 2012	Y. Additional funding is needed by

<p>Security Council because food security and nutrition security are intrinsically linked and both require a multi-sectoral approach; a Secretary General must be appointed before the start-up of the new South Sudan Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme (<i>Responsibility of GoSS</i>).</p>	<p>2009 for the establishment of the FSC without the term “Nutrition”, it is advisable to deal with the operationalisation of the FSC as a matter of priority and deal with the change of naming at a later stage once it is operational and when it is more appropriate. Otherwise the existence of the FSC will remain theoretical without any meaningful intervention as functional institution in the GRSS. It is important to note that the Government of South Sudan has instituted austerity measures and these have affected recruitment of new personnel in Government.</p>	<p>established (FAO, UNICEF & WFP) to push for the operationalisation of the FSC. TORs for the Secretary General to be appointed and the Secretary (MAF Minister) have been developed. The tentative organogram of the FSC has been developed. The appointment of the Secretary General is under consideration. Lobbying and dialogue with the high level official of GRSS will be continued under the new FSPSCB programme.</p>	<p>FAO</p>		<p>GRSS but considerable financial support will be foreseen under the new FSPSCB programme.</p>
---	---	--	------------	--	---

For the South Sudan Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme					
Recommendation 6					
FAO must make a concerted effort to recruit a strong and committed technical team for the new project by adopting a more direct recruitment strategy (head-hunting, use of recruitment agencies, advertising within the East Africa Region) for identifying suitably motivated individuals with the requisite skills and experience (<i>Responsibility of FAO</i>).	This recommendation is accepted . Intensive efforts have been made to identify most suitable candidates for the technical team. FAO had issued already twice the Vacancy Announcement of the key technical/managerial staff of the new FSPSCB programme and at the same time trying to head hunt qualified candidates through various networks and contacts.	Recruitment of key technical/managerial positions are under way. It is expected to be completed within the second quarter of 2012.	FAO	2nd quarter of 2012	N
Recommendation 7					
The project should start up with minimal delay and should prioritize states with highest chronic food and nutrition insecurity and particular attention should also be accorded to areas bordering Sudan which are especially vulnerable to issues of food security exacerbated by the secession of South Sudan from the north (<i>Responsibility of GoSS/FAO/donors</i>).	The recommendation is partially accepted . Although it is of all stakeholders' interest to start up the new programme with minimal delay, in order to maintain momentum created by SIFSI, the selection of State for the intervention is subject to various factors. Since the Spanish contribution to the new FSPSCB programme will be the first intervention to start, the State where the intervention can be initiated will be Lakes State, rather than the States bordering Sudan which are especially vulnerable.	Close consultation between FAO, donors and GRSS will be required to accelerate the preparation of the new programme start up (negotiation of contractual agreement, internal appraisal in FAO as well as GRSS inter ministerial project approval. A revised project proposal was submitted to the EU on 8 March 2012.	GRSS, FAO, donors	2nd quarter of 2012	N
Recommendation 8					
The Food (and Nutrition) Security Council should meet on a six monthly basis (except where meetings to review special and urgent circumstances are	The recommendation is accepted . The meeting schedule for the F(N)SC will be re-affirmed. The Technical committee (encompassing FSPSCB,	The modalities of operations between the FSC and the States will depend on the existing institutions that will be	GRSS with technical support from FAO	ongoing	N (it is covered by the new FSPSCB

<p>convened) and assume overall coordination and monitoring of the all food and nutrition security interventions. Linkages between the F(N)SC at national level and any future functioning state level F(N)SC need to be defined. The Food (and Nutrition) Security Technical Secretariat (F(N)STS) should have direct reporting lines to the Secretary General of the FS(N)C. The Technical Committee (encompassing SIFSIA, SPCRP and SAFDP) should continue to meet on a quarterly basis and brief the FS(N)C as it previously briefed the Steering Committee (<i>Responsibility of GoSS</i>).</p>	<p>SPCRP) will continue to meet on a quarterly basis.</p>	<p>strengthened at state level during the inception phase based on the actual reality of each States being targeted. Based on the lessons learned, the best <i>modus operandi</i> will be proposed to ensure smooth flow of information to the Secretary General and ultimately to the FSC as well as the success of the new programme.</p>			<p>programme).</p>
<p>Recommendation 9</p>					
<p>The project should collaborate with other initiatives to develop an early warning capacity within the SSRRC/MHA for more effective disaster preparedness and risk management and support (particularly IT training follow-up through remote, on-line tools) should continue to be provided to statistical units within MAF, MARF, the Nutrition Division of MoH, which are essential and important technical links to the F(N)STS (<i>Responsibility of GoSS/FAO/donors</i>)</p>	<p>The recommendation is accepted. Collaboration with other initiatives is important to maximize resource use.</p>	<p>The project will explore all other efforts by partners in order to collaborate in developing an early warning system. In terms of IT training, the new programme will build on the trainings conducted by SIFSIA and lessons learned from the SIFSIA project and developed focused training plan with clear terms of reference and delivery of specific milestones by IT staff in the partners organisations.</p>	<p>GRSS, FAO and Donors</p>	<p>ongoing</p>	<p>N (it is covered by the new programme)</p>
<p>Recommendation 10</p>					
<p>The South Sudan Meteorological Office functions require review to determine future capacity and service provision</p>	<p>The recommendation is partially accepted. The South Sudan Meteorological Office functions</p>	<p>Efforts by SIFSIA project were to develop and strengthen the Agrometeorology unit of the</p>	<p>GRSS with support from FAO</p>	<p>ongoing</p>	<p>Y (if it goes beyond the support to the</p>

<p>(beyond just aviation) and the line of communication through to the F(N)STS (<i>Responsibility of GoSS</i>).</p>	<p>were already reviewed under the SIFSIA project and the support was provided specifically for food security purposes. However, other functions of the meteorological office are under the mandate of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and not FAO. FAO's support will be restricted to meteorological information related food security.</p>	<p>meteorological office. However, other functions of the meteorological office also benefited from the capacity building. FAO should continue supporting the improvement of communication with FSTS and technically advice on agrometeorological monitoring and crop yield forecasting activities for food security. FAO will continue liaising with WMO to facilitate their interaction with SMO, if it deemed necessary and requested by SMO.</p>			<p>agrometeorology unit).</p>
<p>Recommendation 11</p>					
<p>A Food & Nutrition Security Analytical Framework (FNSAF) for South Sudan should be developed through a consultative process with principal stakeholders to articulate the contribution of different elements of information to different stages of analysis (it should be illustrated on a wall chart) and an information flow diagram should be developed to supplement the FNSAF. The FNSAF should identify current gaps in data/analysis and also other sources of information that could contribute to the system (<i>Responsibility of F(N)STS with PSU technical support</i>).</p>	<p>The recommendation is partially accepted with clarification. Lack of articulation of the Food Security Analytical Framework by some partners should not and does not imply there was no analytical framework but should rather be considered that there is a need for further consolidated capacity building to entrench the food security concepts and analytical framework.</p>	<p>The new project will build on the food security conceptual framework started during SIFSIA and make sure the partners fully appreciate the analytical framework and based on the understanding allow partners to undertake data gaps and analysis and identify ways and means of filling the gaps and roles of the various food security in data collection.</p>	<p>FSTS with technical assistance from FAO</p>	<p>ongoing</p>	<p>N (it is covered by the new programme).</p>
<p>Recommendation 12</p>					
<p>The profile of nutrition and gender concerns within the food security</p>	<p>The recommendation is accepted. While the recommendation is valid</p>	<p>The new programme will endeavour to raise the profile of</p>	<p>GRSS, FAO and donors</p>	<p>ongoing</p>	<p>Y (only limited inputs</p>

<p>agenda must be raised significantly and incorporated into any future information systems and analysis. Technical expertise in (food-based) nutrition and gender must be factored into the project both at state level and more strategically at the national policy level. It is highly recommended that international technical assistance be attached to the F(N)SC for 24 months (<i>Responsibility of GoSS/FAO/ donors</i>).</p>	<p>and relevant, finding technical expertise in nutrition and gender (especially national staff) at State level may be a challenge. The availability of experts in the context of South Sudan is a real constraint and should be factored in when it comes to financing external (international) technical assistance.</p>	<p>nutrition and gender in the information system by collecting gender disaggregated data to feed into the analysis and national policy. At national level, an international expert is planned for to support the secretariat which will be headed by the secretary general and ultimately supporting the FSC. However this international technical assistance will not be 24 months as recommended.</p>			<p>of international technical assistance on gender and nutrition within the new programme. Further financial resources from donors will be required in order to cover full 24 months international expert)</p>
<p>Recommendation 13</p>					
<p>The element of policy development has to be addressed more strategically (especially in a new political context such as South Sudan) and should be better supported institutionally by FAO through technical assistance with the appropriate skills set. An international policy expert attached to the F(N)STS should facilitate a more strategic approach (drawing more effectively on FAO's institutional capacity) with the inclusion of livestock production and animal health as much as crop production within the policy frame. Cross-cutting issues including climate change, environment, gender and social</p>	<p>The recommendation is accepted partially with corrections. The policy development will be addressed more strategically as proposed. However, the international policy expert will not be attached to the FSTS but will be supporting the FSC which will have a Secretariat that will have a couple of units of which the FSTS is one of them. Therefore, the policy expert will support the Secretariat and its units rather than FSTS only. The new programme will try to focus and priorities key policy matters, and not spread itself thinly by taking up a lot of activities such</p>	<p>Detailed actions will be defined during the inception phase of the new programme.</p>	<p>GRSS with support from FAO</p>	<p>ongoing</p>	<p>N (it is under the framework of the new programme).</p>

exclusion as well as nutrition concerns must be more effectively incorporated (<i>Responsibility of GoSS with support from FAO</i>).	as climate change and environment unless absolutely necessary and stronger and direct linkage with food and nutrition security. However, gender is an important component.				
Recommendation 14					
The F(N)STS should work with LAF to review the livelihood zones (with reference to the land cover data set) and update the livelihood profiles in South Sudan; the information base at state level should include more rigorous analysis of household food and nutrition insecurity taking into account the different livelihood zones (<i>Responsibility of F(N)STS with support from FAO</i>).	The recommendation is rejected . While the importance of reviewing the livelihood zones is acknowledged, updating it is a huge undertaking beyond the scope of the new FSPSCB programme, or regular assessment such as Crop and Food Security Assessment Mission (CFSAM) for example. It requires considerable human resource, training of enumerators and huge logistical arrangements and substantial amount of funding. This can only be undertaken as a separate project.	FAO can prepare a concept note or a project document for livelihood zones updating should there be any donor interest to support such undertaking. The livelihood zones are due for updating as they are beyond 5 years in which livelihoods are likely to change. This could also be an important issue to discuss amongst the Food Security and Livelihood Cluster which FAO is co-chaired with WFP.	FAO, FSTS with food security partners and donors	ongoing	Y
Recommendation 15					
A communications strategy must be developed to considerably enhance the visibility of the intervention, the effective dissemination of information and analysis generated, as well as electronic access to these products. As part of this strategy, the CLiMIS website should be adopted as the portal for the F(N)STS and renamed accordingly (<i>Responsibility of F(N)STS with support from FAO</i>).	The recommendation is accepted . Communication strategy is important for effective dissemination of information and analysis generated for decision making.	The new programme will develop a comprehensive communication strategy to enhance visibility of the interventions. A provision of international short-term technical assistance to develop communication strategy foreseen. The project will work closely with the FAO Communications officer based in Juba.	FSTS with technical support from FAO	ongoing	N (it is under the framework of the new programme).
Recommendation 16					
CLiMIS should be expanded to include	The recommendation is accepted .	Continued following up will be	FSTS with	ongoing	N (it is under

<p>data from key markets outside state capitals and potentially linked with other sub-regional initiatives such as Food Net (<i>Responsibility of F(N)STS with support from FAO</i>).</p>	<p>Effort will be exerted to expand the markets for data collection in the follow up project. SIFSIA PSU had meetings with GIZ and other partners implementing market related projects in South Sudan.</p>	<p>made under the new programme and also further engagement with NGOs involved in the Food Security Livelihood cluster including WFP to collect market information in the counties will be actively pursued.</p>	<p>support from FAO and WFP</p>		<p>the framework of the new programme).</p>
<p>Recommendation 17</p>					
<p>Capacity building at both national and state levels must be more strategic; it should focus on key functions within line ministries and the F(N)STS which contribute directly to the project outputs/outcomes; training must be tailored to deliver on the specific skills set required and as far as possible should be cyclical, on-the-job and supported through training of trainers and regular follow-up. Staff trained should indicate their commitment to the post for at least a period of three years (<i>Responsibility of GoSS with FAO support</i>).</p>	<p>The recommendation is accepted with clarification. Capacity building effort should be indeed strategic and the SIFSIA Project has been employed the same strategy of building capacity and worked incrementally upwards. Therefore, it is to re-affirm that the new programme will employ the same approach taking into account of the lesson learnt from the SIFSIA programme, particularly stronger emphasis on the issue of staff turnover to the State and national level GRSS counterpart.</p>	<p>FAO will continue to employ strategic capacity building approach and to advocate to GRSS that staff turn over to be minimized systematically.</p>	<p>GRSS with support from FAO</p>	<p>ongoing</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Recommendation 18</p>					
<p>Information systems depend entirely upon the quality of data generated from the field and so the focus of attention must initially be directed towards effective functional specification and building capacity at this level first and work incrementally upwards. Data quality assessments should be built into the information workflow to provide confidence in the products produced or</p>	<p>The recommendation is accepted. The SIFSIA Project for the last 5 years has employed the same strategy of building capacity and worked incrementally upwards.</p>	<p>There was substantial capacity building activities in order to address the issue of data quality already initiated under the SIFSIA and this effort should be continued under the new programme.</p>	<p>FAO</p>	<p>ongoing</p>	<p>N (it is within the framework of the new programme).</p>

at least information of explicit known knowledge.					
---	--	--	--	--	--

Generic recommendations					
Recommendation 19					
Information systems in post-conflict environments require long-term investment if they are to become relevant, effective and sustainable. Consistent and regular funding to support systems that are well institutionalized across a network of actors (both governmental and non-governmental) will have a greater impact than short cycle injections of resources and capital.	The recommendation is accepted. It is for this reason that FAO and the donor community have incorporated information systems in the follow up project to build on SIFSIA activities. This is critical element in order not to lose the investment already made by the SIFSIA programme in the past 5 years. Three donors (EU, Spain, CIDA) have shown commitment to support FS information systems.	FAO will continue lobbying and advocating this in close consultation with GRSS and development partners.	FAO, GRSS and development partners	ongoing	Y (long term commitments from development partners will be critical).