

ACTION FICHE FOR FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
PRIORITY AREA 1: SUPPORTING THE DELIVERY OF INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC GOODS CONTRIBUTING
TO FOOD SECURITY THROUGH RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY
“2009-2010 GLOBAL PROGRAMME ON AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FOR DEVELOPMENT (ARD) –
NON CGIAR”

1. IDENTIFICATION

	Title	2009-2010 Global Programme on Agricultural Research for Development (ARD) — non -CGIAR CRIS decision N°: 2009 / 021-076		
	Total cost	EUR 5 million		
	Aid method / Management mode	Call for proposals — <i>Centralised</i>		
	DAC-code	52010	Sector	Food Security

2. RATIONALE

2.1 Sector context:

The European Commission (EC) is firmly committed to achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015. The agricultural sector plays a crucial role in this. The linkages between agriculture and food security are particularly important, as the number of undernourished people is still very high. While food insecurity is often exacerbated by conflicts and political instability, regional agricultural marketing and food price developments are becoming increasingly important.

Agriculture Research for Development (ARD) is multi-dimensional research that addresses the agricultural development challenges of developing and emerging economy countries. The agricultural domain includes crop production and animal husbandry, agro-forestry, fisheries and aquaculture, agribusiness and related enterprises, animal and human health-related issues, and the sustainable management of natural resources on which farming depends and the socio-cultural and bio-diverse landscapes, food systems and ecologies in which it is embedded. ARD provides technological, economic and institutional knowledge and innovations contributing to sustainable development. It encompasses research of a national and international public-good character, as well as research that yields private gains.

At EU level, the European Initiative for Agricultural Research for Development (EIARD), that brings together EC and Member States plus Norway and Switzerland¹ stresses the need for greater and coordinated investments in ARD at global, continental and national levels in order to achieve the Millennium Development Goals.

In the “Thematic Strategy Paper” and the “Multiannual Indicative Programme 2007-2010” of the Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP), the EC recognises the importance of investing

¹ Communication (COM(97)126) on the “European Initiative for Agricultural Research for Development” (EIARD) was recognised by the Council and European Parliament in 1997.

in the provision of international public goods contributing to food security, in particular in the field of research and technology².

The FSTP addresses ARD along two dimensions:

1. The global level, which builds on a long-established cooperation with the Consultative Group on International Research for Development (CGIAR), while opening it up to new global partners to improve outreach and the impact of research at field level.
2. Continental/Sub-regional level in Africa, Asia, Central and South America.

The present action is specifically related to the first dimension outlined above, targeting global public goods in the field of agricultural research, to be provided by organisations other than the Centres of the CGIAR.

2.2 Lessons learnt on agricultural research for development

The 2008 Guidelines on Agricultural Research for Development, which have been developed by the EC, clearly spell out the lessons learnt at international and EU level.

The main lesson learnt from the past is that among the various rural investment categories, agricultural research for development can give very high benefits, provided that (i) there is careful identification of needs, priorities and opportunities, and of environmental externalities; (ii) a bottom-up approach is adopted, enhancing farmers' participation; and (iii) it is conceived as one component of agricultural development, taking into account the necessary links with other components (e.g. extension, inputs supply, financing institutions, markets, institutional development, infrastructure investment, capacity building, land, sustainable natural resources).

On the basis of past experience, there is now a trend towards more demand-based ARD programming, building partnerships between science institutions and public and private sectors with the equitable participation of smallholder farmers to maximise direct and indirect impact on food security. This represents a move from a linear top-down approach, linking research to farmers through extension services, to a new paradigm, involving rural and agricultural innovation systems which link public and private sectors with farmers, civil society organisations and the scientific community. The concept of "innovation system" encompasses not only the "technological innovation" itself, i.e. the diffusion of new products and services of a technological nature within the economy, but includes non-technological, e.g. institutional and organisational, forms of innovation.

Another important lesson learnt is that research needs to be integrated with appropriately designed and sustainable agricultural advisory services and dissemination mechanisms that are able to: support farmer innovation and experimentation; facilitate learning between farmers and researchers; and provide farmers with the information they need to make choices about sustainable agricultural practices. Innovation systems require research to be integrated, systemic and interdisciplinary (e.g. bio-physical and socio-economic disciplines). This approach, which has long been known, now needs to be scaled-up and generalised.

² As defined by the International Task Force on Global Public Goods: International public goods address issues that: i) are important to the international community, ii) cannot, or will not, be adequately addressed by individual countries acting alone, and therefore iii) are addressed collectively on a multilateral basis, by both developed and developing countries.

As part of this Agricultural Innovation Systems approach, it is crucial to encourage research players to develop ex-ante strategies and plans that identify potential beneficiaries, involve them and the representatives of various societal stakeholders in the design, implementation and monitoring of research projects; and identify and secure an effective pathway for the delivery and dissemination of research results to intermediate and end beneficiaries.

2.3 Complementary actions

This action is complementary to other elements of the FSTP and Framework Programme 7 — Food, Agriculture, Fisheries, and Biotechnology Thematic (FP7-FAFB) of the EC, as well as to actions run by the Member States. These are summarised here:

Food Security Thematic Programme:

- **FSTP — Global Research (CGIAR)** — EC contribution for 2008-2010: EUR 67.5 million (EUR 45 million in 2007): co-financing of 15 International Centres and 4 Challenge programmes (including EUR 6 million for Climate Change Challenge Programme) supporting 28 projects covering the five main priority areas of the CGIAR.
- **FSTP - Continental & Regional African Research.** 2008 (EUR 14 million) supporting FARA, AFAAS, and CARBAP³. 2009 (EUR 11 million) with proposed support for ASARECA, ICIPE and PAEPARD⁴
- **FSTP — Continental & Regional African Food Security Programmes.** 2007-2010 (EUR 94 million): in line with the EU Africa Strategy⁵, the Communication ‘Advancing African Agriculture’⁶ and the Joint EU-Africa Strategy⁷ the programme focuses on three key elements: policy development, natural resources and disaster & risk management.
- **FSTP — Contribution to the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development** 2008 (EUR 1.5 million) whose first objective is more effective international donor community assistance for ARD.

Framework Programme 7 — Food, Agriculture, Fisheries and Biotechnology Thematic programme:

Several topics in the current (2009) call for proposals are consistent with themes 2, 3 and 4 below. The FP7 FAFB programme for 2010 is currently being designed to be consistent with this action.

Complementary actions of **Member States** include:

3 FARA: Forum for Agricultural research in Africa, AFAAS: African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services and CARBAP: Centre Africain de Recherches sur Bananiers et Plantains.

4 ASARECA: Association for Strengthening Agricultural research in Eastern and Central Africa, ICIPE; International centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology, SADC: Southern African Development Community, PAEPARD: Platform for African-European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development .

5 COM(2005)489.

6 COM (2007)440.

7 Adopted in Lisbon, December 2007.

- France — “Promoting sustainable development in Agricultural Research Systems” — ICRA⁸ and ECART-CTA⁹ pilot programme with support from IFAD.
- UK with Canada — “Climate Change in Africa”
- Germany — “Adaptation of Africa Agriculture to Climate Change”.

2.4 Donor coordination for agricultural research for development

Member States have been consulted through EIARD and individually as appropriate. Several expressed their interest to join this action. In line with the commitments of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and the Accra Agenda for Action (2008) and wherever possible, calls for proposals will be coordinated with Member States’ actions in order to increase the coherence, aid effectiveness and visibility of EC/MS actions. To this end, a coordination mechanism will be established through EIARD.

Moreover, an auction floor of best proposals may be set up with Member States interested in co-financing.

2.5 Risks and assumptions

Given the small amounts available (initially at least, see § 3.7), the global call may not attract enough proposals.

The guidelines should provide for incentives for the selection of socially and environmentally sound proposals expected to achieve sustainable benefits.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE CALL FOR PROPOSAL(S)

3.1 Basic act and Financing source

The legal basis for the global programme on agricultural research for development is Regulation (EC) No 1905/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 establishing a financing instrument for development cooperation. The budget line is 21 02 01 for Food Security.

3.2 Objectives

The overall objective of the programme is to promote agricultural innovation for smallholder farmers in developing countries in order to improve food security, enhance adaptation/mitigation to climate change and strengthen economic development.

The specific purpose of the action is to generate research results on a broad range of themes relevant to smallholder farmers’ food security with the aim of supporting policy-making in this area while guaranteeing that research results reach the intended beneficiaries, the low-income smallholder farmers, through dynamic innovative systems.

⁸ International Centre for Development Oriented Research in Agriculture.

⁹ European Consortium for Agricultural Research in the Tropics — Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation ACP-EU.

3.3 Expected results and main activities

In April 2008 a workshop was held with FARA¹⁰ and EFARD¹¹ to discuss Agricultural Research Programming for FP7 and FSTP. The themes listed below are based on that consultation exercise with further input from members of the SAG¹². The resulting activities represent the views of agricultural research institutes of many developing countries, and the following six themes were identified as the most relevant for their countries, so as to ensure synergies with the research already being done by the CGIAR at worldwide level:

1 “Conservation agriculture” (based on Agroecology) to combat land degradation in dry land areas — to increase productivity based on improved soil fertility and a more efficient use of labour and other resources;

2 Innovation systems involving smallholder farmers and traditional knowledge in developing countries, resulting in improved productivity through better use of knowledge by smallholder farmers;

3 Empowering smallholder farmers in the access to markets — enabling farmers to generate cash income from selling produce at markets, leading to greater stability of income and increased agricultural production diversity;

4 Risk management in family agriculture in developing countries — making farmers less vulnerable to disaster through improved management of risks at local and regional levels;

5 Agricultural diversification (high value crops and underutilised species) — leading to increased farmer income through the introduction of high-value crops;

6 Improvement and/or development of new and more effective tools for the control of endemic neglected diseases and zoonoses affecting livestock production and human health in developing countries.

Project methodology

Each project will:

1. Deliver pro-poor scientific, technological innovations and policy options;
2. Develop and enhance the link between agricultural research and extension programmes, research capacity and institution building, responding to beneficiaries’ needs;
3. Enhance the active participation of low-income smallholder farmers, as the main beneficiary, as well as other civil society and private players, in research/extension programmes;

¹⁰ Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa .

¹¹ European Forum on Agricultural Research for Development.

¹² Southern Advisory Group: <http://www.era-ard.org/index.php?call=sag>.

4. Improve the exchange of information, experience and knowledge, through scientific and producers' associations networks and (multi)stakeholder platforms;
5. Promote the systematic introduction of an “innovation system approach” in ARD activities;
6. Lead to more innovation capacity among ARD players in developing countries;
7. Promote a better linkage between ARD activities supported by the EC and their rural development enhancement context.

Full details of the requirements will be included in the guidelines for applicants.

Indicators

Successfully completed research projects will represent the main indicator for this global programme.

Other indicators will be:

- Number of research papers accepted for publication in peer-reviewed scientific journals
- Number of project results presentations at international meetings
- Participation in policy workshops at national, regional or global level in different target regions
- Extent of successful interaction with policy-makers, civil society organisations (CSOs), the research community and other stakeholders such as farmers' organisations
- Complementarities and partnerships with relevant research players.

3.4 Risks and assumptions

Each proposal will include an analysis of risks and assumptions. The main overall risks are expected to be lack of cooperation between project partners, lack of capacity of partners to fulfil their responsibilities, loss of political and administrative support and intractable technical problems.

3.5 Crosscutting Issues

Mainstreaming environmental sustainability, gender equality, good governance and human rights will be common to all projects.

Climate change will be an overall crosscutting issue in all projects — it will be evaluated under the technical criteria.

3.6 Eligibility conditions

All non profit making legal persons such as non-governmental organisations, public sector operators, local authorities, international (inter-governmental) organisations as defined by Article 43 of the Implementing Rules to the EC Financial Regulation (Commission Regulation 2342/2002 as last amended by Commission Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 478/2007).

CGIAR centres may not receive funding from this call as they are funded through a separate subcomponent of the FSTP programme (see 2.3).

3.7 Essential selection and award criteria

The actions will be selected on the basis of a call for proposals launched by EuropeAid Cooperation Office at centralised level.

The essential selection and award criteria are laid down in the Practical Guide to contract procedures for EC external actions. The evaluation criteria are amended for improved selection of research proposals.

The maximum possible rate of co-financing for grants should normally not exceed 80% so as to allow specific countries to apply different (higher) rates as required. Full financing may only be applied in the cases provided for in Article 253 of the Implementing Rules of the Financial Regulations, where financing in full is essential to carry out the action in question.

Project proposals will be evaluated in a two-stage process — concept notes and full proposals.

No specific rules will apply to partnerships. However, in order to meet the requirements of the call it is expected that each proposal will include several partners from developed and developing countries, including the research community, CSOs and commercial and government organisations.

3.8 Schedule of calls for proposals

The indicative date for the publication of these calls for proposals is mid-2009.

Projects may not exceed 60 months duration from contract signature.

3.9 Indicative amount

The budget for this lot is €5 million. Subject to the adoption of the 2010 budget by the Budget Authority, an amount of €18 million to be financed from budget item 21 of the general Budget of the European Communities for 2010 will be added to finance selected projects under this Call for Proposals.

3.10 Performance monitoring

Taking into account the nature of the actions, performance will be monitored using milestones and achievements against the time schedule agreed for each action

3.11 Evaluation and audit

Audit rules will be laid down in grant agreements to be signed with the beneficiaries.

3.12 Communication and visibility

Standards regarding visibility will be derived from the “EU visibility guidelines for external actions” http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/documents/communication_and_visibility_manual_en.pdf

4. SUPPORT MEASURES

Annual audits and visibility activities will be covered by the budget, under grant contracts awarded under the calls

ACTION FICHE FOR FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
STRATEGIC PRIORITY 1: SUPPORTING THE DELIVERY OF INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC GOODS
CONTRIBUTING TO FOOD SECURITY THROUGH RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY
“SUPPORTING THE ASSOCIATION FOR STRENGTHENING AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH IN EASTERN AND CENTRAL AFRICA”

1 IDENTIFICATION

Title/Number	Support for “Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa’ (ASARECA) Operational Plan, 2008-2012		
Total cost	EC contribution: €4 million (and €14 million already committed under EDF) Other donors: DFID (€19,288 million) and CIDA (€8,207 million) through MDTF, USAID (€8,559 million), AfDB (€1,046 million), SIDA (€5,147 million), IFAD (€0,436 million), CIAT (€0,248 million) and Harvest Plus direct (€0,736 million)		
Aid method / Method of implementation	Project Approach-Joint management with the WB		
DAC-code	52010 Agriculture	Sector	Food security

4. RATIONALE**4.1. Sector context**

Eastern and Central Africa (ECA) has in recent decades been characterised by a steady increase in land productivity, but labour productivity has declined substantially. As a result, average yields for ECA’s major crops currently fall well below those elsewhere in Africa, and even further below global levels. These trends in productivity growth have translated into poor overall agricultural growth rates in individual ECA countries, and for the region as a whole, with agricultural growth not keeping pace with population growth. Most countries in ECA are net importers of most agricultural commodities. Given that the bulk of the region’s population resides in rural areas and depends on agriculture for income and sustenance, and given the low levels of productivity growth in the sector, hunger and malnutrition have deepened in ECA in recent years.

Environmental degradation is hampering agricultural production throughout most parts of ECA. Climate change is expected to have a significant impact on yields of both staple food crops and cash crops, and to affect large proportions of both pastoralist and nomadic groups, and sedentary farmers. Soil degradation, coupled with increasing prices for mineral fertilisers, restricts farmers’ options to increase yields in areas with reliable rainfall. ECA is therefore made up of countries which are progressively less able to meet the needs of their burgeoning populations. With agriculture looming so large in most national economies, sluggish growth in agricultural productivity has translated into sluggish overall growth and generally low per capita income levels. High levels of agricultural imports—particularly of staples—appear to be only partially meeting the consumption needs of a population lacking purchasing power, resulting in high levels of adult and child malnutrition and towering child mortality rates.

Agricultural research can contribute to a long-term strategy to increase productivity and pro-poor growth, and facilitate evidence-based policy making. Weaknesses in the agricultural research systems of ECA include limited financial support, inadequate human resources, weak communications, poor

coordination and internal linkages among the various players, structural impediments to collaboration and coordination problems. Opportunities centre on shared themes—such as technology and institutional foresight, socioeconomic analysis, communications and information, and monitoring and evaluation—where coordinated regional efforts or common facilities may be useful. Research results uptake by farmers and the dissemination of these results are essential if research is to have the expected impact.

Pillar IV of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) of NEPAD (New Partnership for Africa's Development) addresses challenges for agricultural research and technology uptake, and guides interventions at sub-regional and continental level. ASARECA drives the sub-region towards meeting the CAADP agenda, in partnership with COMESA (Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa), with whom ASARECA has signed a Memorandum of Understanding.

4.2. Lessons learnt

ASARECA's previous performance was assessed in a series of evaluations, notably (a) the Mid-Term Review (in 2005) of the EC-funded "Programme for Regional Support for Agricultural Research in East Africa" (run by ASARECA), (b) reports of the External Programme Review and Monitoring Panel (PRMP) from 2005 and 2006, and (c) the End-of-Programme Review of ASARECA Networks, Projects and Programmes in 2007. All evaluations confirmed the significant contributions that ASARECA is making to agricultural research in the sub-region, in particular to fostering sub-regional exchange and cooperation, and in addressing some of the most pressing agricultural constraints through its networks and grant scheme. The 2007 end-of-programme review of ASARECA networks, projects and programmes supported the re-organisation of networks into seven programmes, and an increased emphasis on organisational development and capacity building.

The main lessons drawn by ASARECA from experience so far¹³ with the programme were that (1) the ASARECA contribution of €9 335 000 for a 5-year period was too ambitious for an emerging programme with low absorption capacity and developing management systems; (2) future support to ASARECA should therefore put more emphasis on organisational development and on strengthening human capacity; (3) systems should be designed to be as simple as possible, yet effective and transparent; (4) frequent changes in administrative arrangements governing the EC-funded programme have adversely affected programme performance and de-motivated ASARECA staff and scientists, (5) some contractual arrangements and the way the CGS programme is run through the CGS Grant caused a considerable delay on the ground. A Multi Donors Trust Fund managed by the World Bank is in place for ASARECA to set up more appropriate procedures for CGS programmes.

4.3. Complementary actions

This programme is one component of a series of global, continent-wide and regional programmes focusing on the R&D component of the NEPAD Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP), to be supported by the EU and other development partners. These include support for the CGIAR and other providers of global public goods (€153 million is allocated under this global component of research of the FSTP 2007-2010), the Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa FARA (€10 million), the other SROs (CORAF and SADC MAPP), research centres with a regional mandate – CARBAP (€2.5 million) and ICIPE (€1.5 million) and a number of national agricultural research systems. In addition support is provided to related sectors, such as agricultural advisory

¹³ ASARECA (2007): Regional Programme to Support Agricultural Research in East Africa. Short Report on Programme Implementation 2001 – 2007.

services, the private sector, and farmers' organisations, and to PAEPARD (the Platform for African-European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development – €5.5 million).

4.4. Donor coordination

The ASARECA Development Partner Group¹⁴ provides a platform for communication among development partners supporting ASARECA programmes and activities. The overall objective of the Group is to increase the effectiveness of development partners' efforts to support ASARECA in the delivery of its objectives on agricultural innovation under the CAADP agenda, as described in the FAAP (Framework for African Agricultural Productivity). Development partners have agreed on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The European Commission, CIDA and DFID are contributing to an existing Multi-Donor Trust Fund with the World Bank. The EC contribution is €14 million financed under EDF, and the duration of the MDTF will be till June 2014.

2 DESCRIPTION

This action will support regional agricultural research in Eastern and Central Africa through ASARECA. As a not-for-profit organisation established by the Director Generals responsible for national agricultural research for development institutes of 10 ECA countries¹⁵, ASARECA runs its programme through and in collaboration with the member NARSs (National Agricultural Research Systems). ASARECA devised an Operational Plan (OP) for the period 2008-2012, spelling out objectives, results, activities and indicators. Results are to be achieved through seven programmes: (1) Staple food crops, (2) Non-staple crops, (3) Livestock and fisheries, (4) Agro-biodiversity and biotechnology, (5) Natural resources management and forestry, (6) Policy analysis and advocacy, and (7) Upscaling and knowledge management

3.1 Objectives

The overall objective is “Enhanced sustainable productivity, value added and competitiveness of the sub-regional agricultural system”. The purpose of this action is “Enhanced utilisation of agricultural research and development innovations in eastern and central Africa”.

3.2 Expected results and main activities

The specific results and indicators are shown in annex 2 below.

3.3 Risks and assumptions

ASARECA has identified a number of assumptions and risks, which need to hold in order for outputs and purpose to be achieved; these refer primarily to the availability of resources and the existence and functioning of appropriate services and policies. At the purpose level, assumptions are: presence of effective innovation platforms in the ECA region, availability of inputs, existence of targeted financial services for agriculture. The risks of a lack of functional agricultural advisory systems and an efficient marketing system are recognised. Output level assumptions are: regional, and national mechanisms for approval of technologies/innovations/policies exist; adequate stewardship and oversight are provided by the governance body; adoption of an agricultural innovation paradigm by ASARECA member countries; Government, non-government, regional and national organisations operate effectively at appropriate level. The risks identified are related to the adequacy of human, financial and physical

¹⁴ Members include the AfDB, CIDA, DFID, EC-DG DEV, IDRC, IFAD, SIDA, USAID and the WB.

¹⁵ Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda.

resources within the NARS and other partner organisations, and to the existence of partnerships with adequate capacity for the generation and uptake of technologies and innovation.

Support by the Governments of the Eastern and Central African countries for agricultural policies is essential, and the lack of this support could represent a risk for the project.

3.4 Cross-cutting Issues

ASARECA has developed specific ways of mainstreaming cross-cutting issues, such as environment, gender and governance, in its Strategy, including a designated programme on Natural resources management and forestry. ASARECA recognises the need to address gender in agricultural research, and will build on the recently concluded project ‘Building Capacity in Gender Analysis and Gender Mainstreaming in the National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS) of ASARECA’. This project addressed the issue from various angles and offered insightful lessons and viable recommendations on how ASARECA can carry the issue forward.

3.5 Stakeholders

ASARECA’s main stakeholders are the NARS of its member countries, including NARIs (National Agricultural Research Institutes), universities, civil society (farmers' organisations, NGOs etc.), the private sector and agricultural advisory services. Other key stakeholders are CGIAR and FARA. FARA’s programmes on integrated natural resources management, development of sustainable market chains, policies for sustainable agriculture and science capacity building add value to ASARECA’s work. The ASARECA Secretariat will serve as a coordination mechanism for the ECA region and as the means of aggregating NARS perspectives in regional fora. ASARECA’s Partnerships and Capacity Development Unit will ensure that ASARECA will work with COMESA and FARA to give it a stronger role in the running of CAADP. ASARECA works with AFAAS, the African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services, to ensure that research findings are available to and meet the needs of service providers and farmers, and addresses the uptake of research results through its programme 7.

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1 Method of implementation

In accordance with Article 43 of the EC Financial Regulation Implementation Rules, the implementation method will be Joint management through the signature of an Administration Agreement worth €4 million with the World Bank. A MoU between ASARECA and its Development Partners (DPs) will be signed soon. The MoU is an expression of a common understanding among the parties on the general principles and procedures for harmonised support to ASARECA. The existing World Bank Trust Fund will thus become a Multi-Donor Trust Fund to channel EC, CIDA and DFID funds. The EC contribution to the Trust Fund will be governed by an administration agreement with the World Bank.

No provision is made for a financing agreement.

4.2 Procurement and grant award procedures [*/programme estimates*]

All contracts must be awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents laid down and published by the International Organisation concerned (as indicated in the Trust-Fund and Co-financing Framework Agreement of 08/11/01).

4.3 Budget and timetable

The overall budget for the 2008/09-2013/14 ASARECA Operational Plan is €75.371 million, as set out in Table 2 below. Of this, the Joint Financial Agreement (DFID, CIDA, and EC) is estimated to cover €45.496 million. The operational duration will be sixty months from the signature of the Administration Agreement.

Table 1: ASARECA costs by component (in € '000)

Component	Cost	Proportion of total (%)
Research for Development	63,432.030	84.2%
Governance	1,273,960	1.7%
ASARECA Management	7,537.010	14.1%
Total	75,371.000	100.0%

Note: Exchange rate used (20-Oct-08): 1€ = 1.2874 \$US

Table 2: Donor's contribution (in € '000)

Donor	Amount €m
EC (under FSTP)	4
EC (under EDF)	14
DFID	19.288
CIDA	8.207
USAID	8.559
AfDB	4.046
Sida	5.147
IFAD	0.436
CIAT	0.248
Harvest Plus	0.736
Total	64.667

4.4 Performance monitoring

Performance will be monitored jointly by the Development Partners, according to the principles of the MoU and the conditions set out in the Joint Financial Agreement. According to the draft MoU, a mid-term joint review of the 5-year Operational Plan will be carried out by ASARECA and the DPs in year three of its implementation. The terms of reference for this review will be decided upon jointly by the Signatories of this MOU.

4.5 Evaluation and audit


Under the Joint Financing Agreement, the development partners and ASARECA take joint responsibility for the external evaluation. As per the World Bank (WB) Trust Fund Agreement, ASARECA will monitor and evaluate the progress of the project and prepare project reports and a project completion report. In order to prepare the Completion report, ASARECA will employ consultants whose qualifications, experience and terms of reference are acceptable to the World Bank. ASARECA will ensure that a financial management system is maintained and have its financial statements audited. Each such audit will cover one fiscal year of ASARECA, and the audited Financial

Statements for each period will be furnished to the WB not later than six months after the end of such period. These procedures will be defined in the Administration Agreement between the WB and the European Commission. A mid-term joint review will be carried out by ASARECA and the DPs in year three of the OP. The terms of reference for this review will be decided upon jointly. ASARECA will contract independent auditors to conduct financial audits yearly. ASARECA has developed a draft governance manual that sets out the roles and responsibilities of its governing body, including its audit committee.

4.6 Communication and visibility

A multi-donor communication and visibility action plan will be drawn up by ASARECA in collaboration with the World Bank within the first three months of actionstart-up. The plan will identify key audience and target groups, objectives, activities, indicators (consistent with those set up in the logframe of the action), financial and human resources. The plan will be drafted making maximum use of the “Communication and Visibility Manual for EU External Actions” (April 2008), taking into account the complexities of multi-donor support.

ANNEX 1: ASARECA LOGICAL FRAMEWORK (2008 – 2012)

	Results Framework	ASARECA Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa	Name: ASARECA Results Framework Period: 2008- 2012 Revised in: May 2008	
Objective statement	Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions	
Super Goal				
Increased economic growth and improved livelihoods in the ECA while enhancing the quality of the environment	6% annual increase in GDP from agricultural sector by 2015 50% increase in people living on more than 1\$ per day by 2015 10% increase in biodiversity and forest cover by 2015 These indicators will be tracked by NEPAD and the UN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Government statistics - FAO and World Bank, ADB, Economic Commission for Africa statistics and reports - COMESA and other regional organisation reports - UN COM-TRADE statistics & reports - UNEP statistics and reports 		
Goal				
Enhanced sustainable productivity, value added and competitiveness of the sub- regional agricultural system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % increase in yield of selected crops % increase in labour productivity % decrease in production costs of selected commodities % increase in volume of processed agricultural products % increase in value of agricultural output 4% annual growth rate in TFP (<i>target in FAAP document</i>) ASARECA will not track this set of indicators: Instead we shall rely on activities of partner organisations such as COMESA and NEPAD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Government statistics - Economic Commission for Africa statistics and reports - FAO statistics - COMESA and other regional organisation reports - Selected CGIAR reports and publications: - External evaluation and impact assessment - Appropriate UN organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relevant regional and national policies are implemented - Governments continue to support agriculture and poverty reduction as priorities - Equitable distribution of benefits occurs - Agricultural transformation occurs in the ECA region occasioned by technical change 	

ASARECA LOGICAL FRAMEWORK (2008 – 2012) ... CONTINUED

Objective statement	Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
Purpose			
Enhanced utilisation of agricultural research and development innovations in eastern and central Africa	<p><i>The number of farmers, processors, and others who have adopted new technologies (FAAP Indicator)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. % increase in adoption of new varieties, breeds and management practices in selected development domains 2. % adoption of INRM practices in selected development domains by stakeholder groups 3. % increase in adoption of improved processing and handling methods by processors and other market intermediaries <p><i>The area under new technologies/number of improved animals (FAAP Indicator)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. % increase in area under improved crop varieties in selected development domains 5. % increase in area under irrigation in selected development domains 6. % increase in number of improved livestock breeds <p><i>Uptake by intermediate users</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. % increase in adoption of improved approaches to dissemination of agricultural innovations by public, private and the civil society sectors 8. Number of methods and approaches (protocols) used by scientists to develop technologies <p><i>Policy</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. % of policy options implemented by stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ASARECA impact evaluation reports - COMESA reports - East African Community - ILRI SAKSS - FARA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presence of effective innovation platforms in the ECA region - Availability of inputs - Targeted financial services for agriculture exists - Appropriate knowledge and technology delivery mechanisms operational - Functional advisory systems in place - Efficient marketing systems in place

ASARECA LOGICAL FRAMEWORK (2008 – 2012) ... CONTINUED

Objective statement	Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
Enhanced utilisation of agricultural research and development innovations in eastern and central Africa [continued]	<i>Efficiency and effectiveness</i> 10. % increase in funds take-up by ASARECA research for development partners 11. % decrease in cost of generating a portfolio of research outputs by 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ASARECA impact evaluation reports - COMESA reports - East African Community - ILRI SAKSS - FARA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presence of effective innovation platforms in the ECA region - Availability of inputs - Targeted financial services for agriculture exists - Appropriate knowledge and technology delivery mechanisms operational - Functional advisory systems in place - Efficient marketing systems in place
Results/Outputs			
1. Performance-driven governance and management structures and systems established and operational	ASARECA governance structure and procedures established and operational by end of 2009 1.2 50% increase in funding from development partners and/or private sector by 2012- Base year 2008 1.3 100% of ASARECA programme/plans endorsed by stakeholders by 2012 (over 2008 baseline) 1.4 100% increase in fund utilisation levels by 2012 (over 40% at 2005 baseline) 1.5 10% decrease in proportion of overhead costs over total portfolio (both for secretariat administration and PMU) by 2012 (baseline 2008) 1.6 10% increase in utilisation of existing capacity in ASARECA by 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ASARECA Annual Reports - Client Satisfaction Survey Reports - NARS Annual Reports - ASARECA Evaluation reports - Special Studies Reports - ASARECA Priority Setting Documents - ASARECA Information and communication strategy - ASARECA annual reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adequate human, financial and physical resources are maintained within the NARS and other partner organisations - Agricultural innovations paradigm is adopted by ASARECA member countries - Adequate stewardship and oversight provided by the governance body - Regional and national mechanisms for approval of technologies/innovations/policies exist.

ASARECA LOGICAL FRAMEWORK (2008 – 2012) ... CONTINUED

Objective statement	Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
2. Generation and uptake of demand-driven agricultural technologies and innovations facilitated	2.1 Demand articulation and priority setting processes developed and documented by 2008 (qualitative) 2.2 Priority research and development issues identified and documented by 2008 (at least one for each programme - 6 total) 2.3 50% of research and development portfolio addressing the needs identified during priority setting process by mid-term and 100% by 2012 2.4 Number of demand-driven technologies/ innovations generated by 2012 (at least one for each programme - 6 total) 2.5 50% of demand-driven technologies/innovations made available to uptake pathways by 2012. 2.6 Number of demand-driven technologies made available to uptake pathways by 2012 (at least 10 by 2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ASARECA Evaluation Reports - Programme annual reports - NARS annual reports - ASARECA information and communication priority setting document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partnerships with adequate capacity for generation and uptake of technologies and innovations exist - Adequate human, physical and financial resources are maintained within NARS and other partners - Government, non-government, regional and national organisations operate effectively at appropriate levels
3. Policy options for enhancing the performance of the agricultural sector in the ECA sub-region facilitated	3.1 Demand articulation and priority setting processes developed and documented by 2008 (qualitative) 3.2 Priority policy constraints on enhancing agricultural sector performance identified and documented by 2008 (at least one) 3.3 Number of appropriate policy options recommended to decision makers by 2012 (at least one) 3.4 Number of appropriate policy options for enhancing agricultural sector performance advocated to decision makers by 2012 (at least 1)		

ASARECA LOGICAL FRAMEWORK (2008 – 2012) ... CONTINUED

Objective statement	Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
4. Capacity for implementing agricultural research in the IAR4D approach in the ECA sub-region strengthened	4.1 Capacity strengthening strategy developed and priorities identified by end of 2008 4.2 Concepts and operating principles of IAR4D developed and documented by end of 2007 4.3 Capacity strengthening needs relating to the implementation of IAR4D identified by end of 2007 4.4 80% of the identified priority capacity building needs addressed by 2012 4.5 90% of ASARECA research and development portfolio implemented in IAR4D framework by 2012 4.6 90% of the relevant partners involved in the implementation of ASARECA R&D portfolio by 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ASARECA Evaluation Reports - Programme annual reports - NARS annual reports - ASARECA information and communication priority setting document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partnerships with adequate capacity for generation and uptake of technologies and innovations exist - Adequate human, physical and financial resources are maintained within NARS and other partners - Government, non-government, regional and national organisations operate effectively at appropriate levels
5. Availability of information on agricultural innovation enhanced	5.1 Guidelines and criteria for establishing stakeholder communication and information needs in place by end of 2007 (can move to activity milestone) 5.2 Stakeholder information and communication needs identified by end of 2007 (can move to activity milestone) 5.3 Number of appropriate information packages addressing identified stakeholder needs prepared by 2012 (at least one per innovation) 5.4 Number of information delivery pathways identified and used by 2012 (at least one for private sector, one for public and one for civil society organisations) 5.5 90% of packaged information/knowledge products delivered through the identified pathways by 2012		

Annex 2 — Results and indicators for ASARECA Operational Plan 2008-2012

Results/Outputs	Verifiable Indicator
1. Performance driven governance and management structures and systems established and operational	1.1 ASARECA governance structure and procedures established and operational by end of 2009 1.2 50% increase in funding from development partners and/or private sector by 2012 - Base year 2008 1.3 100% of ASARECA programme/plans endorsed by stakeholders by 2012 (over 2008 baseline) 1.4 100% increase in fund utilisation levels by 2012 (over 40% at 2005 baseline) 1.5 10% decrease in proportion of overhead costs over total portfolio (both for secretariat administration and PMU) by 2012 (baseline 2008) 1.6 10% increase in utilisation of existing capacity in ASARECA by 2012
2. Generation and uptake of demand driven agricultural technologies and innovations facilitated	2.1 Demand articulation and priority setting processes developed and documented by 2008 (qualitative) 2.2 Priority research and development issues identified and documented by 2008 (at least one for each programme - 6 total) 2.3 50% of research and development portfolio addressing the needs identified during priority setting process by mid-term and 100% by 2012 2.4 Number of demand-driven technologies/ innovations generated by 2012 (at least one for each programme - 6 total) 2.5 50% of generated demand-driven technologies/innovations made available to uptake pathways by 2012 2.6 Number of demand-driven technologies made available to uptake pathways by 2012 (at least 10 by 2012)
3. Policy options for enhancing the performance of the agricultural sector in the ECA sub-region facilitated	3.1 Demand articulation and priority setting processes developed and documented by 2008 (qualitative) 3.2 Priority policy constraints on enhancing agricultural sector performance identified and documented by 2008 (at least one) 3.3 Number of appropriate policy options recommended to decision makers by 2012 (at least one) 3.4 Number of appropriate policy options for enhancing agricultural sector performance advocated to decision makers by 2012 (at least one)
4. Capacity for implementing agricultural research in the IAR4D approach in the ECA sub-region strengthened	4.1 Capacity strengthening strategy developed and priorities identified by end of 2008 4.2 Concepts and operating principles of IAR4D developed and documented by end of 2007 4.3 Capacity strengthening needs relating to the implementation of IAR4D identified by end of 2007 4.4 80% of the identified priority capacity building needs addressed by 2012 4.5 90% of ASARECA research and development portfolio implemented in IAR4D framework by 2012 4.6 90% of the relevant partners involved in the implementation of ASARECA R&D portfolio by 2012
5. Availability of information on agricultural innovation enhanced	5.1 Guidelines and criteria for establishing stakeholder communication and information needs in place by end of 2007 5.2 Stakeholder information and communication needs identified by end of 2007 5.3 Number of appropriate information packages addressing identified stakeholder needs prepared by 2012 (at least one per innovation) 5.4 Number of information delivery pathways identified and used by 2012 (at least one for private sector, one for public and one for civil society organisations) 5.5 90% of packaged information/knowledge products delivered through the identified pathways by 2012

ACTION FICHE FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
STRATEGIC PRIORITY 1: SUPPORTING THE DELIVERY OF INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC GOODS
CONTRIBUTING TO FOOD SECURITY THROUGH RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

‘SUPPORT FOR ICIPE (INTERNATIONAL CENTRE OF INSECT PHYSIOLOGY AND ECOLOGY)’

1. IDENTIFICATION

Title	Validating and initiating the diffusion of pro-poor and poor-environment tsetse repellent technology		
Total cost	EC contribution: €1.5 million (79%) Other contributing donors: ICIPE €0.41 million (21%)		
Aid method	Project Approach – centralised management (direct)		
DAC-code	52010 Agriculture	Sector	Food Security

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

Tsetse flies, the vectors of nagana (Animal African Trypanosomiasis) and sleeping sickness (Human African Trypanosomiasis) are unique to Africa. These flies occur in 37 sub-Saharan countries covering nearly 9 million km², representing about one-third of Africa’s total land area. In tsetse-infested countries, at least half of the population characteristically suffers from food insecurity. The overall negative economic impact of African Animal Trypanosomiasis (AAT) on the agriculture and livestock sector is estimated at US\$4.75 billion per annum. Particularly affected are the pastoral and agro-pastoral communities, numbering about 260 million people, who are among the poorest in Africa.

Current interventions to fight AAT comprise: i) parasite control through the use of trypanocidal drugs; ii) promotion of trypanotolerant livestock; iii) vector control through the use of traps and insecticide-treated targets baited with attractant odours (where available for specific tsetse species); iv) insecticide-treated animals; v) aerial spraying with insecticides; and (vi) Sterile Insect Technique (SIT). Each method has its advantages and limitations, but, generally, none has proven to be viable and sustainable.

The purpose of this initiative is to adapt and facilitate the availability and uptake of tsetse-repellent technology as a key component of integrated vector and disease management. The development of animal health packages for pastoralists based on tsetse-repellent technology aims to ensure the availability of repellents at affordable prices.

Two types of repellents are available nowadays. One is derived from molecular optimisation of a mild natural repellent present in the urine of cattle; this is known as ‘synthetic’ repellent despite the fact it is obtained from ‘natural’ ingredients. The second is the Waterbuck repellent blend, known as ‘natural’ repellent, which has been identified in the waterbuck, on which tsetse flies do not like to feed in nature.

The main constraints associated with tsetse-repellent technology which the project needs to address include: i) availability of key repellent constituents and robust controlled-released dispensers (modelled on the available prototype) in quantities and costs that are favourable for initial launch and trials at cost-effective level; ii) adequate exposure of members of target communities in project countries to the technology and its performance at levels that would allow sufficient feedback on the performance of the technology, its socio-economics, and the feasibility of uptake among target stakeholders; and iii) generation of sufficient interest in the national systems in project countries to ensure the necessary project backstopping and follow-up dissemination of the technology.

2.2. Lessons learnt

Recent research at the International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE) (with initial funding from the EC — European Commission — and subsequently from IFAD) has led to the development of a new technology that not only expands the arsenal of techniques for Trypanosomiasis control but also potentially reduces the use of trypanocides. This new technology involves the controlled release of a potent repellent from a prototype dispenser (specifically designed to facilitate release of the repellent at a constant rate) that individual cattle wear around their necks. ICIPE owns all the technologies it develops. These technologies are considered international public goods to be made available to developing countries. In particular, ICIPE has a Kenyan Patent (No KE 00185) and plans to apply for a waterbuck repellent patent early next year. Furthermore, ICIPE is one of the few institutes to have a fully developed intellectual property policy.

Initial field tests show a reduction in disease incidence among cattle ranging from 40% in areas such as Maasai Mara to about 70% in the coastal areas of Kenya. This is in spite of problems associated with a relatively large proportion of lost or damaged prototype dispensers, and leakage and maintenance problems with the dispensers worn by cattle during the evaluations. Indeed, field experiments under controlled conditions suggest there is a potential for reducing disease by more than 80%. Surveys of the perceptions of pastoralists in the trial areas on the repellent technology are also very positive. They are happy with it because it is simple, mobile, and consistent with their nomadic life-style; their cattle can graze in areas where previously they could not. Drug use is reduced and the cattle are more restful and are protected from other biting flies. In addition to pastoralists and agro-pastoralists, repellents may be useful to other livestock keepers in open rangelands. Toxicological studies of the repellent indicate no adverse effects on the health of exposed animals.

2.3. Complementary actions

As far as complementarity with other projects under the FSTP programme is concerned, the ICIPE proposal is one component of a series of global, continent-wide and regional programmes focusing on the R&D component of the New Partnership for Africa's Development's (NEPAD) Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP), to be supported by the EU and other development partners. These include support for the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR — €153m is allocated under FSTP 2007-2010) and other providers of global public goods, the Forum for Agricultural Research in African (FARA — €10m), the Sub-Regional Organisations (CORAF/WECARD, ASARECA — €4m and €14m under the EDF), research centres with a regional mandate (CARBAP — €2.5m) and a number of national agricultural research systems. In addition, support is provided to related sectors, such as agricultural advisory services as well as private-sector and farmer organisations, and to PAEPARD (the Platform for African-European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development — €5.5m).

2.4. Donor coordination

ICIPE is sponsored by many development partners (from governments to private organisations and universities) with 'restricted' and 'unrestricted' funding up to €8m per year. During 2006, substantial unrestricted funding was provided by the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), the Swiss Development Corporation (SDC), and the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA). During the same year, ICIPE received restricted funding from, among others, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), many private institutions and foundations, etc.

ICIFE is also an affiliated centre of the European Initiative for Agricultural Research for Development (EIARD), and has relied on various forms of collaborative and networking arrangements (national institutions, African universities, NGOs and most essentially the communities) in order to fulfil its core mission of technology transfer. In fact, this project will be part of the coordinated European support for ICIFE including European states: Switzerland, Denmark, Sweden, Germany and France through EIARD. Various forms of linkages have been developed with international agricultural research centres (IARCs), continental/regional initiatives and organisations such as NEPAD, the Forum for Agriculture Research (FARA) and the African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services (AFAAS) in Africa, the Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa (ASARECA), and the African Union (AU) initiatives for implementing the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) and restoring food security in Africa. With respect to AAT, ICIFE is involved in many coordinating initiatives such as i) the Pan-African Tsetse and Trypanosomiasis Eradication Campaign (PATTEC) and (ii) the ‘Programme against African Trypanosomiasis’ (PAAT).

By promoting this initiative at a comprehensive level via a continental organisation such as ICIFE, it is possible to add value to national efforts and ensure coordination, synergy and complementarity with other existing initiatives and organisations. The creation of a ‘Stakeholder Committee’ (SC) will further facilitate donor coordination (cf. 3.1).

2.5. Objectives

The overall objective of the ICIFE initiative is ‘to contribute towards the improvement of the welfare, food security and general prosperity of poor livestock keepers in Africa, particularly in pastoralist and agro-pastoralist systems’. The specific objective is ‘to contribute to improving livestock health and reducing key constraints in animal productivity’.

2.6. Expected results and main activities

To achieve the initiative’s specific objective, seven key results must be attained: i) Result 1 — Awareness created among key stakeholders; ii) Result 2 — A cheap, robust repellent dispenser developed, manufactured and ready for delivery; iii) Result 3 — Efficacy of repellent dispensers and repellents in reducing disease incidence, with evaluation of chemotherapeutic use; iv) Result 4 — Integrated use of repellent (push) and bait technology (pull) with/without drug use assessed; v) Result 5 — Socio-economic and gender impacts of the repellent technology assessed; vi) Result 6 — Technology for large-scale production of repellents passed on to entrepreneurs for manufacture and delivery to target livestock keepers; vii) Result 7 — Awareness created among pastoralists and stakeholders at regional level.

Five activities were identified as necessary:

- Activity 1: Mobilisation of stakeholders in the dissemination of repellent technology
- Activity 2: Development of robust repellent dispensers and repellent compounds
- Activity 3: Large-scale repellent technology validation trials with active participation of pastoralists (Uganda) and agro-pastoralists (Kenya)
- Activity 4: Integration of repellents with other tsetse control tactics (Kenya)
- Activity 5: Commercialisation and wider dissemination of repellents in partnership with entrepreneurs and stakeholders

2.7. Stakeholders

The main stakeholders in the transfer, delivery and adoption of the tsetse repellent technology are the marginalised pastoralists and agro-pastoralists living in the poor semi-arid and sub-arid areas of tsetse-affected Africa, recognised as among the poorest people in the world.

Other key stakeholders operating at continental level are the African Union – Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR), FARA, and the African Agricultural Technology Foundation (AATF). In East Africa, the main stakeholders are: ASARECA, representing national agricultural research systems (NARS), AFAAS and EAFF (East African Farmers' Federation). Key stakeholders at national level are the universities, the NGOs, the private sector, the Ugandan National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAAS), etc. At national level, ICIPE, which specialises in the development of innovative bio-control technologies for tsetse control, is working in partnership with the Kenya Agricultural Research Institute – Trypanosomiasis Research Centre (KARI-TRC-Kenya), the Kenya Industrial Research and Development Institute (KIRDI), the Gulu University in Uganda, and the Livestock Health Research Institute (LIRI-Uganda). Other important stakeholders are: ILRI (International Livestock Research Institute), with a continental livestock mandate, CIRDES (Centre International de Recherche-Développement sur l'Élevage en zone Subhumide) in West Africa, the African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS), the Ethiopian Science and Technology Commission, etc.

2.8. Risks and assumptions

ICIPE has identified a number of assumptions that need to hold in order for outputs and purposes to be achieved. The main assumptions are:

- National and institutional stability is maintained.
- Effective partnerships are developed and maintained, including support from NARS livestock and extension services.
- The active participation of local communities is secured.

Major risks include:

- Competitive public/private intervention takes place.
- The political environment does not remain conducive for implementation of project activities.
- Unusual weather conditions adversely affect project activities and the interpretation of results.
- Insufficient commercial interest is generated due to an adverse financial climate.

Most of these assumptions and risks have been taken into account within the proposal. That is to say, they have been built into the mechanisms for the implementation of the proposal.

2.9. Cross-cutting issues

The selected initiative is ecologically friendly because the use of repellent reduces both the incidence of animal diseases and drug use (e.g. acaricides), while the proposed dispenser is designed in such a way that animals have no direct contact with the repellent compound (they breathe it, however). Toxicological studies undertaken by ICIPE to examine the health of exposed goats over a nine-month period showed no adverse effect on the health of the animals. Haematological parameter counts were all within normal ranges for the species and did not differ between treated and control animals. Similarly, biochemical factors, monitored over the same period of time, were not affected by exposure to the repellent. The synthetic repellent also did not affect the weight of the treated animals. Histopathological analysis (post-mortem) of the treated and control animals at the end of the trials also showed no adverse effects. These findings led ICIPE to conclude that the repellent has no adverse effect on the health of the exposed fauna (goats) and hence human consumption of meat and milk should be safe. Furthermore, it is recalled that the waterbuck repellent blend is entirely natural (so really should have no negative impact on human consumption of meat and milk) and even the synthetic blend is made up of natural ingredients. In addition, both the synthetic and waterbuck repellent compounds are volatile and as such degrade very rapidly. However, exactly how rapidly these compounds will degrade needs to

be quantified, and this can form part of further studies. Therefore, long-term studies may need to be undertaken, including the determination of residues in meat and milk over a long period of time. These could be launched by ICIPE prior to dissemination of the repellents on a much wider scale. This is recommended to ensure that no accumulative effect occurs over a longer time-scale, in fact well beyond the project duration. Independent monitoring of residues will be carried out in close collaboration with national institutes that have the facilities to do this. Social and economic analyses will be carried out at pastoral and agropastoral project sites to determine:

- The impact of repellent use on cattle productivity in terms of milk offtake, growth rates, etc.
- Farmers' perceptions, attitude towards the technology and potential demand for the technology.
- The relative economic returns and social welfare benefits of the repellent technology and its impact in gender terms.
- Technical, financial and economic incentives for and constraints on the uptake of repellent technology.

As far as the gender impact is concerned, it has been shown that the upscaling of innovations (such as the introduction of dispensers and the use of repellents in pastoralist areas) might create synergies enabling research institutions to address new dimensions of community participation and facilitating the introduction of gender analysis tools. Recognising the existence of gender inequality and social barriers to women's equal participation in pastoralist areas, ICIPE is in fact very much in favour of supporting community participation and promoting equitable and sustainable pro-gender economic growth. This will be investigated during implementation and a specific activity has been included to this end. A consultant will carry out gender analysis within the pastoralist and agropastoralist communities. The aim is to address inequalities in power before engaging potential beneficiaries in research activities. During the research work, the emphasis will be on how resources and tasks are allocated within families with respect to gender and social structure, and which aspects are relevant in planning tsetse control activities. The participation of local institutions and NGOs promoting gender equality will be facilitated at this stage.

3. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

3.1. Implementation method

The project will be implemented under direct centralised management, through the signature of a Grant Agreement in the amount of €1.5m between ICIPE and the European Commission. In accordance with the provisions of the Financial Regulations applicable to the General Budget of the European Communities (PRAG 6.3.2), the direct award of a grant is justified by a 'de facto' monopoly. Some of the reasons for assuming a de facto monopoly are: i) ICIPE is an African institution operating at continental level; ii) it is a centre of excellence for research and capacity building in insect science and the only international research centre working on arthropod research and development in the tropics; iii) there will be a positive impact on the programme as ICIPE has a legal regional mandate covering the two countries where the project will be implemented; iv) ICIPE has developed appropriate technologies for plant, animal and environmental health and has in-depth experience in capacity building and training activities.

The programme is designed to put in place multi-stakeholder collaboration to ensure that the tsetse repellent technology is optimised, validated and ready for upscaling by project stakeholders. The programme will be guided and supervised by the ICIPE's Project Coordinator, who will be assisted in his/her duties by a Project Management Group (PMG) comprising selected ICIPE scientists as well as senior representatives from NARS designated by collaborating institutes: KARI-TRC from Kenya and Gulu University in Uganda. Representatives from KIRDI and BridgeWorks (private company) will also be part of the PMG, as both these institutes will provide important links with the private sector for the upscaling of repellent products.

The formation of a Stakeholders Committee (SC) chaired by AU-IBAR will facilitate synergies and complementarities with existing initiatives. Other important members of this Committee include representatives from FARA, ASARECA, AFAAS, and the East Africa Farmers Federation (EAFF), etc., all of whom have a mandate to deliver pro-poor scientific and technological innovations at regional and continental level in Africa. A representative of PATTEC, which has a mandate for tsetse control/eradication in Africa, will also be a member of the Committee. Other important development partners such as the EC, IFAD, PAAT and WHO will be also invited to attend meetings and workshop sessions as observers.

3.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

All contracts for implementing the action must be awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents laid down and published by the Commission for the implementation of external operations, in force at the time of the launch of the procedure in question. When derogations to these principles are applied, they must be justified. The essential selection and award criteria for the award of grants are laid down in the Practical Guide to contract procedures for EC external actions. They are established in accordance with the principles set out in Title VI ‘Grants’ of the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget.

3.3. Budget and timetable

The expected EC contribution is €1.5m (79%) out of a total cost of €1.91m. The administrative costs will be limited to a maximum of 7% of the EC contribution. ICIPE and partners will contribute 21% of the implementation costs.

The operational duration will be thirty six months from the signature of the grant agreement.

3.4. Performance monitoring

The Stakeholders Committee (SC) will review progress and agree with other stakeholders the work plans and budget for the ensuing year. The project coordinator will be the liaison between the Project Management Group (PMG) and the SC, and will also be responsible for organising the launching meeting of the SC and subsequently its annual meetings.

3.5. Evaluation and audit

ICIPE’s Finance Department will provide professional accounting support and will oversee the administrative and financial management of the programme. It will also be responsible for providing annual audited financial reports to the European Commission. ICIPE’s auditors (Ernst & Young) will also serve as external auditors to the project on a yearly basis. The annual SC meeting, where European Commission representatives and/or consultants invited by the European Commission will be present if need be, will be used to review project progress and agree on the work plans and budget for the ensuing year.

3.6. Communication and visibility

ICIPE will ensure that adequate visibility is given to the EC, using, where applicable, the EC guidelines “Communication and Visibility Manual for EU External Actions” published in April 2008 and available at:

http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/documents/communication_and_visibility_manual_en.pdf

A communication strategy will be developed by ICIPE jointly with the SC to ensure that the EC contribution is adequately publicised among all ICIPE stakeholders as well as non-African key collaborators.

Annex 1: Logical Framework for “Validation and Initiation of diffusion of pro-poor and poor environment tsetse repellent technology”

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	ASSUMPTIONS & RISKS
<p>GOAL: To contribute towards the improvement of the welfare, food security and general prosperity of poor livestock keepers in Africa, particularly in pastoralist and agro-pastoralist systems</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved living conditions of target communities - Wide spread and effective use of tsetse repellent technology - Reduction in disease and drug use - Enhanced food supply and social/gender protection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UNDP, UNEP, FAO, World Bank, ADB, Economic Commission for Africa statistics and reports - COMESA and other regional organisation reports - UNEP statistics and reports - FARA, ASARECA, AU-IBAR reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relevant pro-poor regional and national policies are implemented - Development of livestock production systems in pastoralist and agro-pastoralist systems continues to be considered a desirable development objective - Equitable distribution of benefits occurs
<p>PURPOSE: To contribute to improve livestock health and reduce key constraint in animal productivity among resource-limited pastoralists and agro-pastoralists</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased livestock productivity in tsetse affected areas - Increased meat and milk production in tsetse affected areas - Increased off-take of meat and milk in tsetse affected areas - Reduced level of trypanosomosis and chemotherapy in tsetse affected areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Government statistics - Perceptions of pastoralists in project sites surveys and reports - Epidemiological and social economic analysis in selected project sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presence of effective innovation platforms in the ECA region - Governments continue to support agriculture and poverty reduction as priorities - No pandemics or other natural disasters occur in the region - Government policies and private investments are complimentary to improve livestock production and marketing, and livestock disease control.
<p>OUTCOMES: Effective tsetse repellent technology ready for up-scaling</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tsetse repellent technology validated by pastoralists and agro-pastoralists in selected project sites in Kenya and Uganda - Technology impact assessed including on gender - Potential markets for technological innovation assessed (e.g Kenya and Uganda) for validation, up-scaling and commercialisation at sub-regional level - Large-scale commercial production system set up and potential entrepreneurial group (s) identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ICIPE’s ex-ante financial, social and economic impact assessments reports - Project documents - Client Satisfaction Survey Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No competitive public/private interventions take place. - Governments create favourable policy environments for the private and cooperative sectors involvement. - Political environment is conducive to implementation of strategies.

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	ASSUMPTIONS & RISKS
Output 1: Awareness created among key stakeholders about repellents and their use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commitment of project's stakeholders for wider validation, commercialisation and dissemination of the technology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholders minutes and reports - Number of TANs Distributed - MoU signed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respective stakeholders willing to cooperate
Output 2: A cheap robust repellent dispenser, requiring minimum servicing, developed, manufactured and ready for delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Favourable assessment by participating livestock keepers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pastoralist surveys in selected sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Field trials appropriately designed to permit adequate farmer evaluation and technology adaptation
Output 3: Efficacy of repellent dispensers and repellents (both synthetic and natural) in reducing disease incidence and chemotherapeutic use evaluated in pastoral and agro-pastoral areas of targeted countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The incidence of trypanosomiasis (disease incidence) and trypanocide (drug) use reduced by 50% - Livestock productivity enhanced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monitoring reports on disease levels and livestock productivity in selected sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confounding factors sufficiently controlled in field conditions.
Output 4: Integrated use of repellent (push) and bait technology (pull) with/without drug use assessed in selected sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Statistical analysis from trials designed to compare repellent-only to "push-pull" strategy - The incidence of tsetse populations (reduced by >90% and , trypanosomosis and trypanocide use reduced by >50% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Statistical results - Monitoring reports on disease and tsetse population levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No overwhelming confounding factors (e.g. unusual weather conditions) affect interpretation of the results.
Output 5: Socio-economic impact of the repellent technology and its impact on gender assessed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ex-ante and ex-post financial, social and economic impact assessments - 2 times increase in milk off take - At least 50% decrease in drug use - Number of farmers who have adopted technology as a result of exposure - More than 50% farmers willing to adopt the technology - Statistical analyses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessment reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Field trials successfully completed - Good cooperation with farmers, extension workers
Output 6: Technology for large-scale production of repellents passed over to entrepreneurs for manufacture and delivery to target livestock keepers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Large-scale production of repellent products initiated - Repellent technology can be successfully converted into a viable commercial venture - Production taken over by entrepreneurs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of expression of interest from commercial/local companies to explore development of dispensers and repellents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential markets for a commercial product are sufficiently large and lucrative to attract commercial interest

<p>Output 7: Awareness created among pastoralists and stakeholders to support introduction of repellent products and their application in integrated control strategies at regional level.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Knowledge among target groups about repellents and their use facilitated. - At least 4 training courses held - More than 400 farmers attend dissemination sessions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MoUs signed with Stakeholders - Media articles - Number of copies of TANs disseminated - Reports on training courses held 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respective Stakeholders willing to cooperate

Activities	Means	Assumptions and risks
Activity 1: Mobilisation of Stakeholders in the dissemination of Repellent Technology		
<p>1.1 Contact and select stakeholders aiming at generating complementarities and synergies and at establishing a “Stakeholder Committee (SC)” with oversight functions.</p> <p>1.2: Delineate and shape functions between “SC”, grassroots organisations, service providers and the private sector for technologies identification, selection, validation and diffusion</p> <p>1.3 Develop, agree with key stakeholders annual work plans and budget, M&E systems and communication strategies to put in place</p> <p>1.4 Establish and pilot internal mechanisms for exchange of information with key partners</p> <p>1.5 Organise a launching and follow up meetings/operational workshops in Nairobi to review progress and work-plans.</p>	<p>From ICIPE: One Project Coordinator; one Senior Project Officer; one Project Assistant from permanent staff (<i>This personnel will also be involved in Activities 2, 3, 4 & 5</i>)</p> <p>From Stakeholders and Donors: Representative from AU-IBAR, ASARECA, AFAAS, EAFF, PATTEC, FARA and ICIPE management (permanent members with oversight function of the SC) and the EC, IFAD, AATF, PAAT and WHO (invited members of the SC).</p>	<p>Representatives from AU-IBAR, ASARECA, AFAAS, AATF, EAFF, PATTEC, FARA and ICIPE management accept to be permanent members of the SC. Representatives from the EC, IFAD, PAAT and WHO will attend meetings and workshops sessions on regular basis and cover relative costs.</p> <p>Costs will cover the functioning of the SC except for donors, and organisations supported by donors for similar activities (e.g. EC, IFAD, PAAT, WHO, etc.).</p>
Activity 2: Development of robust repellent dispensers and repellent compounds		
<p>2.1 Produce a series of commercial prototype dispensers for synthetic repellent (SR) and natural waterbuck repellent (WB) based on design concept of ICIPE laboratory prototype</p> <p>Task 1 Identify dispenser designs which have optimum robustness and constant release rate for long periods in community herds</p> <p>Task 2 Determine feeding efficiency of flies with developed dispensers (both SR and WB) and monitor disease levels in protected herds in project sites with active community participation</p> <p>2.2 Carry out field performance evaluation in partnership with KIRDI and other interested organisations.</p> <p>2.3 Optimise SR and WB production and yield in collaboration with KIRDI and other interested organisations</p> <p>2.4 Scale-up production of both repellents and dispensers for large scale validation trials in selected project sites with active community participation</p>	<p>From ICIPE: One Consultant Repellent & Dispenser Technologist <i>also for Activities 3,4 & 5</i>; Two Technicians (<i>also for Activities 3 & 4</i>) Two Driver Technicians (2) (<i>also for Activities 3 and 4</i>) Two Field Assistants (<i>also for Activities 3 & 4</i>)</p> <p>From NARS – KIRDI: One Chemical Engineer (<i>also for Activities 3, 4, & 5</i>) Two Production Technicians (2) (<i>also for Activities 3, 4, & 5</i>)</p>	<p>National and institutional stability maintained.</p> <p>Effective partnerships developed and maintained, including support from livestock and extension services of NARS</p> <p>Active participation of local communities secured.</p>

Activities	Means	Assumptions and risks
Activity 3: Large scale repellent technology validation trials with active participation of pastoralists (Uganda) and agro-pastoralists (Kenya)		
<p><i>Repellent Trials</i></p> <p>3.1 Identify, bring together, delineate functions and establish, firm up collaborative links with pastoralists and agro-pastoralists and identify suitable sites for field trials</p> <p>3.2 Evaluate SR and WB in ‘push’ mode in selected project sites in community herds</p> <p>3.3 Monitor monthly disease incidence, drug use and PCV-levels in protected and unprotected herds (control)</p> <p>3.4 Compare performance of SR and WB</p> <p><i>Social and Economic Analysis</i></p> <p>3.5 Determine impact of repellent use on cattle productivity in terms of milk offtake, growth rates etc.</p> <p>3.6 Document farmers’ perceptions, attitude and potential demand for technology.</p> <p>3.7 Evaluate the relative economic returns and social welfare benefits of the repellent technology and its impact on gender.</p> <p>3.8 Identify technical, financial and economic incentives and constraints to uptake of repellents and any further adaptive research required.</p> <p>3.9 Undertake participatory training of livestock health service staff, and farmer groups in deployment of repellent technologies</p>	<p>From ICIPE (full time staff): One PDF – Entomologist (<i>also for Activity 4 & 5</i>) One PDF – Socio-economist (<i>also for Activities 4 & 5</i>) Two Field Enumerators (<i>also for Activity 4</i>) <i>From NARS Partners (part time staff):</i> Gulu University (Uganda): One Scientist (<i>also for Activity 4</i>) Field Assistants (2) (<i>also for Activity 4</i>) Field Enumerators (2) (<i>also for Activity 4</i>) Driver Technicians (2) (<i>also for Activity 4</i>) KARI – TRC (KENYA): Scientist (<i>also for Activity 4</i>) Field Assistants (3) (<i>also for Activity 4</i>)</p>	<p>National and institutional stability maintained.</p> <p>Effective partnerships developed and maintained, including support from livestock and extension services of NARS</p> <p>Active participation of local communities secured.</p> <p>No overwhelming confounding natural or socio-political events occur.</p> <p>The effects of trypanosomosis control can be distinguished from other factors affecting outcomes.</p> <p>Technical services available and affordable and eager to participate.</p> <p>Adequate staffing support continues.</p>

Activities	Means	Assumptions and risks
Activity 4: Integration of repellents with other tsetse control tactics – evaluation of ‘push-pull’ in agro-pastoral areas (Kenya)		
<p>4.1 Identify potential sites for large-scale field trials</p> <p>4.2 Compare tsetse suppression rates and efficiency using traps (pull) with and without cattle treated with synthetic repellent (push) (ICIPE, KARI-TRC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task 1: Identify two semi-isolated areas and within each area, determine at least 4 blocks within which herds are separated by > 5Km distance • Task 2: In randomly selected blocks treat cattle herds with the following treatments: i) Unprotected cattle herds (control); ii) Cattle herds with repellent collars (push); iii) Cattle herds with repellent collars and the area in which; iv) they graze having traps (‘push and pull’); v) Unprotected cattle herds in an area with only traps (‘pull’) • Task 3: Monitor monthly tsetse densities and suppression rates in • experimental blocks • Task 4: Monitor monthly disease Incidence, drug use and PCV-levels in herds in treatment blocks <p><i>Social and Economic Analysis</i></p> <p>4.3 Determine impact of repellent use on cattle productivity in terms of milk off-take, growth rates etc.</p> <p>4.4 Document farmers’ perceptions attitude and potential demand for technology.</p> <p>4.5 Evaluate the relative economic returns and social welfare benefits of the repellent technology and its impact on gender.</p> <p>4.6 Identify technical, financial and economic incentives and constraints to uptake of repellents and any further adaptive research required.</p> <p>4.7 Undertake participatory training of livestock health service staff, and farmer groups in deployment of repellent Technologies</p>	<p>Icipe: Cf. activity 1, 2, 3</p> <p>NARS Partners (KARI – TRC-Kenya): Cf . activity 2 & 3).</p>	<p>National and institutional stability maintained.</p> <p>Effective partnerships developed and maintained, including support from livestock and extension services of NARS</p>
Activity 5: Commercialisation and wider dissemination of repellents in partnership with entrepreneurs and stakeholders		
<p>5.1 Identify prospective entrepreneurs for large scale production of the repellent technology.</p> <p>5.2 Pass know-how of repellent production to identified entrepreneurs.</p> <p>5.3 Identify market potential of repellent technology.</p> <p>5.4 Produce TANs for wider information dissemination.</p>	<p>Icipe: Cf. activity 1, 2, 3</p> <p>Consultant Economist (3 months)</p> <p>Collaborator: BridgeWorks</p>	<p>Repellent technology can be successfully converted into a viable commercial venture</p> <p>Potential markets are sufficiently large and lucrative to attractive commercial interest</p> <p>Stakeholders interested in up-scaling the technology and assist in wider dissemination</p>

Annex 2: Indicative budget

Specifications	Amount (€)	(%)
Human Resources	897,929	50
Travel	36,129	2
Equipment & Supply	80,387	4,5
Local Office	422,800	23
Other Costs	348,122	19
Total Operational costs	1,785,367	100
Administrative Costs	124,976	7
TOTAL (€)	1,910,343	

ACTION FICHE FOR FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
STRATEGIC PRIORITY 1: SUPPORTING THE DELIVERY OF INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC GOODS
CONTRIBUTING TO FOOD SECURITY THROUGH RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY
" SUPPORTING THE PLATFORM FOR AFRICAN-EUROPEAN PARTNERSHIP ON AGRICULTURAL
RESEARCH FOR DEVELOPMENT (PHASE 2)"

1. IDENTIFICATION

Title/Number	Support to “Platform for African-European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development –Phase 2” (PAEPARD II)		
Total cost	Total cost: 6.85 M€; EC contribution through FSTP: 5.5 M€over 36 months Consortium members contribution: 1.35M€		
Aid method / Method of implementation	Project approach – centralised		
DAC-code	52010 Agriculture	Sector	Food security

2. RATIONALE**2.1. Sector context**

In the field of Agriculture Research for Development (ARD), there has been long tradition of scientific and technical collaboration between Africa and Europe through bilateral and multi-lateral cooperation mechanisms. In 2006, to enhance these strategic partnerships, the European Commission (EC) approved funding for a one-year project (April 2007 to March 2008, extended to September 2008) under Framework Programme 6 (FP6) to build the Platform for African-European Partnership on ARD (PAEPARD I) to enable mutual learning and knowledge sharing. The implementation plan of PAEPARD I included five work packages: 1) Assessment of European and African cooperation on ARD; 2) Consultation on priorities, opportunities and mechanisms for the building of the Platform for African-European partnership on ARD; 3) Setting-up and launch of the Platform; 4) Development of an information and communication strategy for promoting participation of ARD stakeholders from Europe and Africa in the platform; 5) Management and coordination activities.

An assessment was made of selected African–European partnerships in ARD with EC-funding, complemented by an online survey of European and African stakeholders (PAEPARD report, 2007). The main findings indicate that the European and African partners value these partnerships as relevant and that they contribute to achieving their global institutional objectives. However, there are major constraints to ensuring the continued success and inclusiveness of ARD partnerships. The number of EC-funded agricultural research projects focused on Africa is relatively small, and these projects involve African institutions from only two or three countries. Most of these partnerships are driven by the European partners with a limited contribution by African partners in priority setting and management. Under FP7 – where the former INCO-DEV component has disappeared – scope for such collaborations has decreased rather than increased.

Major restrictions identified by European and African stakeholders in ARD partnerships are (1) lack of information and knowledge on funding opportunities, difficulties in finding adequate partners, as well as full understanding of the complex and elaborate mechanisms of fund raising; (2) concentration of partnerships on only two institutional categories of actors (universities and national research institutes), with very limited participation from the private sector, extension/advisory services and civil society organizations (CSOs) (e.g. farmers' organisations); (3) existing EC funded coordination mechanisms are not maximizing their role in facilitating interaction between different stakeholders; (4) European institutes, who are more familiar with the EC mechanisms initiate the partnerships and tend to be the coordinators of EC-funded projects; (5) dissemination of innovations is rated lowest amongst the outcomes of research partnerships as compared to publications, training and access to funding; and (6) the EC instruments that support ARD are difficult for African partners to access, and their administrative and financial rules are difficult to follow.

2.2. Lessons learned

The development of PAEPARD II builds on lessons learned from PAEPARD I, which was implemented in partnership between FARA (the Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa) and EFARD (the European Forum for Agricultural Research for Development), through ECART (the European Consortium for Agricultural Research in the Tropics) and NATURA (the Network of European Agricultural - Tropically and sub-tropically oriented – Universities and scientific complexes, see also Section 2.9). PAEPARD I made good progress in identifying constraints in order to increase and strengthen African-European ARD collaboration through consultations, and in developing an “Information and communication strategy to promote partnerships of ARD stakeholders from Europe and Africa”. In terms of project management, experience from PAEPARD I suggests that (a) bringing non-scientist research stakeholders on board requires a concerted effort and involvement of partners with relevant experience in building multi-stakeholder innovation platforms, and (b) a full-time project coordinator both in Africa and in Europe is required to ensure that the expanded PAEPARD II can handle more complex arrangements which involve CSOs.

These lessons have led to the current project design of PAEPARD II, which places a strong emphasis on more inclusive research partnerships with relevant non-research stakeholders. PAEPARD I and other initiatives¹⁶ have shown that real partnerships need neutral intermediaries, who can facilitate communication and assist in the formulation of inclusive and mutually beneficial initiatives. PAEPARD I consultations identified the need for mechanisms and resources to facilitate dynamic partnerships, and effective information system that can deliver relevant and timely information on funding opportunities that the partnerships can utilise. A better coordinated European ARD community with well articulated programmes that are easily understood by potential non-European partners would make it easier to forge partnerships that have the relevant set of skills and knowledge to produce the much needed innovations for poverty reduction and environmental sustainability. Finally, successful partnership in agricultural research is not only a question of representation but also a question of how various research and non-research actors are involved in the conceptualization, implementation and evaluation of the research project. This is one of the reasons why the EC is actively supporting the *innovation system approach* in agricultural research, which is intended to be the guiding concept of PAEPARD II.

2.3. Complementary actions

This programme is one component of a series of global, European and African programmes focusing on (a) increased coordination of European and global financial and technical support to ARD in Africa, and (b) the fourth pillar on Agricultural research and technology dissemination and adoption of the NEPAD Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP), supported by the EU and other development partners. The former includes links with the ongoing FP7-INCONET S&T coordinating instruments dedicated to Sub-Saharan Africa-CAAST-Net, the GDPRD (Global Donor Platform for Rural Development) and EIARD (the European Initiative for Agricultural Research for Development). The latter includes support to the CGIAR and other providers of global public goods, the FARA, the sub regional research organizations (SROs) (i.e. ASARECA¹⁷, CORAF/WECARD¹⁸, NASRO¹⁹ and SADC-FANR²⁰), research centres with a regional mandate (e.g. CARBAP²¹ and ICIPE²²) and a number of national agricultural research systems. In addition, support is provided to related sectors, such as agricultural advisory services, the private sector, and farmers' organizations.

2.4. Donors' coordination

European donors are fully supportive of PAEPARD, which is integral part of the newly adopted Strategy of the European Initiative on Agricultural Research for Development (EIARD). The aim of this

¹⁶ E.g. the Sub-Saharan African Challenge Programme (SSP CP), aims to demonstrate that multi-stakeholder innovation platforms operating in a paradigm of Integrated Agricultural Research for Development (IAR4D) can more effectively address constraints to agriculture in Africa than conventional research approaches.

¹⁷ Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa

¹⁸ West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development

¹⁹ North Africa Subregional Research organization

²⁰ Southern Africa Development Community – Food, Agriculture and Natural Resource Directorate

²¹ Le Centre Africain de Recherche sur Bananiers et Plaines

²² International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology

initiative is to replicate the “PAEPARD model” in Asia and Latin America. PAEPARD II will facilitate coordination of European donors through increased mobilisation and coordination of European ARD stakeholders and service providers (under Result 1) and through coordinated actions between African and European stakeholders (under Result 5). In addition, PAEPARD will advocate (under Result 6) greater consistency of the EU Research Framework Programme with the MDGs²³ as well as the other EC funding instruments supporting ARD programs (see complementary actions). It is expected to influence other European bilateral donors through fora such as EIARD and ERA-ARD, with which PAEPARD will liaise closely to ensure that European donors' strategies and programmes are in line with the requirements of African and European ARD stakeholders.

3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectives

The overall objective of the project is to build joint African-European multi-stakeholder partnerships in agricultural research for development contributing to achieving the MDGs. The specific objective is “Enhanced, more equitable, more demand-driven and mutually beneficial collaboration of Africa and Europe on agricultural research for development with the aim of attaining the MDGs”. PAEPARD II aims to move from the currently largely supply-driven approach in ARD towards a demand-driven approach. ARD initiatives of high quality will be implemented by multi-stakeholder African-European partnerships responding to stakeholder demand. PAEPARD II will not duplicate existing initiatives (i.e. coordinated by FARA, SROs, DFID RIU, PROLINNOVA) rather, it will add value by identifying and proposing solutions to challenges towards effective partnership development between Africa and Europe. PAEPARD II will nurture partnerships to increase the quantity and quality of joint proposals (leading to more funded initiatives). PAEPARD II will not only focus on FP7, but will include other EC (EDF, EC Budget through the FSTP) and bilateral funding instruments supporting ARD that might be mobilized for emerging ARD partnerships.

3.2. Expected results and main activities

PAEPARD II will have 6 expected results shown in Table 1 below.

3.3. Risks and assumptions

Success and impact of PAEPARD II will depend on several factors and if its assumptions remain valid. PAEPARD II objective assumes that increased number of high quality, demand-led ARD programmes and projects can be achieved if there is: i) increased mobilisation and coordination of European ARD stakeholders, ii) increased knowledge about European funding opportunities among African ARD stakeholders, and iii) support for partnership development that address the constraints of the non traditional stakeholders.

For the respective results to be achieved, PAEPARD assumes the following;

Results 1

- existing European and African ARD networks and consortia are able to mobilise and engage existing and operational stakeholders including non-research groups at the European level;
- European member states increase or maintain funding for ARD in Africa ;
- European ARD networks and consortia agree on and are willing to participate in a reassessment of their functions and strategies jointly with non-research partners;

Results 2

- African research and non research stakeholders are open to dialogue, organised and mobilised to build partnerships with similar European platforms.

Results 3

- the African Diaspora can be mobilised for ARD;
- access to timely information is preventing ARD stakeholders from submitting high quality proposals;

²³ Millennium Development Goals

Results 4

- capacity development initiative can identify and support the most relevant ARD actors;
- non-research stakeholders are interested and can be mobilized to participate in multi-stakeholder platforms and partnerships; and non-research stakeholders are coherent and organized
- African ARD stakeholders allow their staff time and space to develop their capacities by building multi-stakeholder partnerships

Results 5

- African States comply with their commitment to increase their support to African S&T and agriculture²⁴.
- European ARD organisations are in agreement with African organizations in developing and implementing joint proposals;
- African and European research organisations agree to and actively seek involvement of non-research stakeholders to build inclusive innovation partnerships;
- seed funding for proposal development results in better partnerships and better research proposals;

Results 6

- the EU remains committed to employ ARD as a tool towards achieving the MDGs;
- agreement can be reached on prioritisation of research topics between European and African organisations and;
- EU member states endorse an ARD research agenda that emphasises attainment of MDGs.

3.4. Crosscutting Issues

Environmental sustainability, gender equality, good governance and human rights are already addressed in the guidelines of FP7 and other European research programmes. These guidelines will be applied and relevant cross-cutting issues will be identified and integrated in the implementation of the activities of PAEPARD II.

3.5. Stakeholders

The main beneficiaries of the project are European and African ARD stakeholders, who will be better organized, coordinated and capable to successfully participate in European and other research programmes because of more appropriate mechanisms and partnerships. These include the constituents of FARA and EFARD.

At the African level, FARA's Operational Plan (2008-2012) already addresses some topics that are of direct relevance to PAEPARD, including knowledge management, capacity development, and innovation platforms. PAEPARD is integrated into FARA's programs. It is considered as one of its time-bound projects under its Networking Support Function 5 on Partnership and Strategic Alliance. PAEPARD will benefit from and contribute to the networking support given by FARA to its stakeholders. FARA stakeholders and partners include SROs, continental bodies of farmer organisations, NGOs, and the private sector. In particular there will be a strong partnership with the farmers' organisations represented in PAEPARD II by the Pan-African farmer's forum and its regional members: ROPPA²⁵, EAFF²⁶, PROPAC²⁷ and SACAU²⁸. Other African partners include the Sub-Saharan Africa NGO Consortium (SSA-NGOC), the Pan-Africa agribusiness consortium (PanAAC) and the Regional Universities Forum for Capacity Building in Agriculture (RUFORUM).

At the European level the main stakeholders are the constituents of the European Forum on Agricultural Research for Development (EFARD), whose mission is to strengthen the contribution of European Agricultural Research for Development to poverty alleviation, food security, and sustainable development in developing countries. EFARD provides a platform for strategic dialogue among and between

²⁴ At the 8th AU Summit in Addis Ababa (January 2007), the Assembly urged Member States to promote Africa's Research and Development(R&D) and develop innovation strategies for wealth creation and economic development by allocating at least 1% of GDP of national economies by 2010 , as agreed by Khartoum Decision. This Summit also endorsed the Abuja Declaration on Food Security, affirming the commitment made in Maputo in 2003 to increase resources for Agriculture and Rural Development to at least 10% of national budgets within 5 years.

²⁵ Réseau des organisations paysannes et des producteurs agricoles de l'Afrique de l'ouest

²⁶ East Africa farmer's federation

²⁷ Plateforme régionale paysanne de l'Afrique Centrale

²⁸ Southern African Confederation of Agricultural Unions

European stakeholder groups in order to promote research partnerships between European and Southern research communities. European partners include the European Consortium for Agricultural Research in the Tropics (ECART - a consortium of seven leading European Institutions working in the field of development-oriented research for sustainable agriculture and natural resources management); the Network of European Agricultural (Tropically and Subtropically oriented) Universities and Scientific Complexes Related with Agricultural Development (NATURA); ICRA (a European Centre specialised in strengthening capacity for rural innovation); COLEACP (an inter-professional network promoting sustainable horticultural trade); NGOs (including the European Food Security Group of CONCORD), and other European ARD actors.

EIARD is currently coordinating ARD support by European member states at governmental level, and PAEPARD II will closely liaise with EIARD (through EFARD) for results 1 and 6. Other key stakeholders include CTA²⁹, which has the mandate to facilitate the exchange of information among ARD stakeholders for the EU's strategy "Advancing African Agriculture", and will contribute in particular to result 3.

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Method of implementation

The project will be implemented under direct centralised management, through the signature of a Grant Agreement of an amount of 5.5M€ between the Consortium (leader of the consortium) and the EC. In accordance with the provisions of the Financial Regulation applicable to the EC General Budget (PRAG 6.3.2) the direct award of the grant is justified by a "de facto" monopoly. Some of the reasons justifying its de facto monopoly are: i) the consortium is composed, among other, by the main institutions who implemented PAEPARD I (FARA, EFARD, ECARD and NATURA), ii) ECART and NATURA are the only available pan-European tropical agricultural research and academic organisations. The operational duration will be 36 months from the signature of the grant agreement.

The Forum for Agricultural Research for Africa (FARA) has been selected as the leader of the implementing consortium, which is composed of partners from Europe and Africa, representative of the key PAEPARD stakeholders. The partners are selected based on their mandate, commitment and capacity to contribute to achieving the PAEPARD objectives. The partners include from Africa, the Pan African Farmers' Forum, SSA NGOC, PanAAC and RUFORUM. European partners are EFARD, ECART/NATURA, EFSG, COPA, COLE/ACP and ICRA. In addition, CTA, a bi-regional institution, will be actively involved. The Consortium partners will be actively involved in the design and implementation of actions and activities. As such, they have the possibility to lead one of the PAEPARD results. PAEPARD will have consortium associates who will be working closely with the PAEPARD partners in implementing activities. Consortium associates are sub-regional coordinating bodies from research and civil society organizations from the African research community: ASARECA, SADC-FANR, CORAF/WECARD, NASRO, SADC-FANR and FANRPAN; and African regional farmer organizations: ROPPA, EAFF, SACAU, PROPAC.

PAEPARD will have a steering committee providing oversight in its operation and decision making. All the consortium partners and associates from Europe and Africa will nominate a candidate for each of the seats assigned, i.e. ARD regional coordinating organization at continental and sub-regional level, farmers' organization, private sector, NGO, research/education. Total members of the Steering Committee should not be more than 12 persons. Nominations and selection will be conducted during the work program planning.

The coordination of PAEPARD will be through a facilitation unit composed of a European and Africa Resource Person working full time for the project. The African Resource Person will be based at the FARA Secretariat to ensure that he/she is well informed of African ARD issues and can easily share PAEPARD knowledge with the most appropriate partners. The European Resource Person should be located at the most strategic location where he/she has access to European Commission's information as well as the European ARD community.

Implementation of the activities will be grouped based on expected results, with each result having identified specific activities as shown in Annex 2. Leadership of each result will be selected through an open and transparent process such as use of capability statements or expressions of interest.

²⁹ Technical Centre for agricultural cooperation of the European Union with Africa, Caribbean and Pacific countries

4.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

All contracts implementing the action must be awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents laid down and published by the Commission for the implementation of external operations, in force at the time of the launch of the procedure in question. When derogations to these principles are applied, they shall be justified. The essential selection and award criteria for the award of grants are laid down in the Practical Guide to contract procedures for EC external actions. They are established in accordance with the principles set out in Title VI "Grants" of the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget.

4.3. Budget

The total budget of the project is €6.85 million and the expected EC contribution is €5.5 million.

Each of the consortium members will contribute to a total of 1.35M€. The consortium contribution will vary based on the available resources within each institution, but will cover institutional and technical support to the project, and honorarium of Steering Committee members. Besides the project coordinators, each consortium member will not be charging for the supervisory human resources fee from the project budget, this will be in-kind contribution. The operational duration will be thirty six months from the signature of the grant agreement. The breakdown of the total budget is shown in Annex 2.

4.4. Performance monitoring

The PAEPARD logframe indicators provide the basis for performance monitoring of the project. More detailed indicators will be developed by project partners, once detailed activities, roles and responsibilities are agreed, and these will be reflected in the project document. Baseline information about existing African-European ARD partnerships is available from PAEPARD I, and will be used to measure progress of PAEPARD II.

4.5. Evaluation and audit

As no evaluation of PAEPARD I was envisaged and carried out, an early mid-term external evaluation will be carried out in year two of PAEPARD II. Terms of reference for this review will be decided upon jointly by EU, EFARD and FARA. The implementing consortium will submit quarterly financial reports and annual reports.

4.6. Communication and visibility

PAEPARD will elaborate a communication and visibility action plan within the first three months of implementation of the action. The plan will identify key audience and target groups, objectives, activities, indicators (consistent with those set up in the logframe of the action), and financial and human resources. The plan will be drafted using to the extent possible, the "Communication and Visibility Manual for EU External Actions" (April 2008).

Table 1 – Results and indicators for PAEPARD II (proposed lead organisations for each result are shown in brackets)

Results	Verifiable Indicator
6. European agricultural research and development actors, (including non-research stakeholders and the African diaspora,) are increasingly mobilized and coordinated for ARD initiatives targeting African-European priorities of mutual interest and benefit	1.1 Number and quality (relevance and diversity) of European ARD actors mobilised 1.2 Strategy for coordination of European ARD developed, piloted and agreed. 1.3 EFARD evolved into a multi-stakeholder platform of European ARD actors
7. African multi-stakeholder platforms, including non-research stakeholders, are effectively mobilised to develop dialogue and build alliances and partnerships with similar European platforms.	2.1 African-European partnerships of multi-stakeholders platforms for agricultural and rural innovation are initiated and documented.
8. African and European stakeholders, including the African Diaspora in Europe, have access to timely and relevant information and are actively engaged in sharing knowledge on ARD partnership opportunities and best practices	3.1 Number and quality of information tools and products on European funding instruments effectively disseminated to African ARD stakeholders. 3.2 Increased number and more balanced source of information and communication products 3.3 Number of case studies on successful ARD partnership mechanisms (identified under result 1 and 2) documented and shared 3.4 Number of proposals initiated by PAEPARD users and partners 3.5 Diversity in sources of contributions to database 3.6 African and European stakeholders' awareness of funding and partnership opportunities for joint initiatives on agricultural research, training and innovation
9. Enhanced capacities of African actors to initiate, mobilise, facilitate, participate, lead and evaluate joint multi-stakeholder ARD innovation partnerships with Europe.	4.1 Number and relevance of capacity building initiatives on European funding instruments addressing African ARD stakeholders 4.2 Number of African-led ARD partnerships applying for funding under the RTD Framework Programme and other European instruments (equivalent to indicator 5.1) 4.3 Proportion of African and European ARD partnerships that benefited from PAEPARD capacity development initiatives 4.4 Proportion of PAEPARD supported partnerships that result in successful project proposals funded by other donors (equivalent to indicator 5.4)
10. African-European ARD innovation partnerships, involving or led by relevant non-research stakeholders, initiated and supported / mentored to respond to ARD demands identified	5.1 Number of African-European partnerships supported through PAEPARD seed funding that submit proposals for funding through European instruments (equivalent to indicator 4.2) 5.2 Proportion of African-European partnerships that are led by African organisations 5.3 Involvement (at all stages: initiation, proposal /concept development, implementation, M&E) of relevant non-research stakeholders in ARD partnerships, supported by PAEPARD brokerage 5.4 Proportion of PAEPARD mentored-partnerships whose proposal is funded (equivalent to indicator 4.4)
11. Coherence of the EU research and development programmes with MDGs and other African-European common frameworks or agreements effectively advocated.	6.1 Number of consultations / events where African and European scientists jointly contribute to the European agricultural research agenda 6.2 Reflection of Africa-specific research themes, and of global themes with impact on Africa, in European ARD annual work-programmes and funding allocations

ANNEX 1: PAEPARD DRAFT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK³⁰

Intervention Logic	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
<p>Overall Objective Joint African-European multi-stakeholder partnership agricultural research for development initiatives contribute to achieving the MDGs.</p>			
<p>Specific objective Enhanced, more equitable, more demand-driven and mutually beneficial collaboration of Africa and Europe on agricultural research for development with the aim of attaining the MDGs</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number of funded (through European funding mechanisms) joint and mutually beneficial African-European agricultural research for development projects supportive of the Millennium Development Goals 2. Feedback of stakeholders on the effectiveness of PAEPARD in the partnership development process 	<p>Records of all EC funding instruments (including FP7, EDF, FSTP and others). PAEPARD stakeholder survey</p>	<p>Increased mobilisation and coordination of European ARD stakeholders, increased knowledge about European funding opportunities among African ARD stakeholders, and support for partnership development will lead to increased number of high quality ARD proposals</p>
<p>Result 1 European agricultural research and development actors (including non-research stakeholders and the African diaspora) are increasingly mobilized and coordinated for ARD initiatives targeting African-European priorities of mutual interest and benefit.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Number and quality (relevance and diversity) of European ARD actors mobilised 1.2 Strategy for coordination of European ARD developed, piloted and agreed. 1.3 EFARD evolved into a multi-stakeholder platform of European ARD actors 	<p>PAEPARD, EFARD and EIARD reports</p>	<p>Existing European ARD networks and consortia are able to mobilise existing non-research stakeholders organised at European level European member states and the EC increase funding for ARD or at least do not reduce it European ARD networks and consortia agree on, are willing to and have resources to participate in a reassessment of their functions and strategies</p>

³⁰ Activities are indicative and will need to be further developed by the implementing consortium

<p>Result 2 African multi-stakeholder platforms, including non-research stakeholders, are effectively mobilised to develop dialogue and build alliances and partnerships with similar European platforms.</p>	<p>2.1 African-European partnerships of multi stakeholders platforms for agricultural and rural innovation are initiated and documented.</p>	<p>African research and academic institutions' strategies and annual reports Reports and statistics of FP7 and other EC instruments Minutes of SC meeting and other decision-making fora PAEPARD stakeholder survey and reports</p>	<p>African research and non research stakeholders are open to dialogue and organised and mobilised to build partnerships with similar European platforms</p>
<p>Result 3 African and European stakeholders, including the African Diaspora in Europe, have access to timely and relevant information and are actively engaged in sharing knowledge on opportunities and best practice on ARD partnership opportunities.</p>	<p>3.1 Number and quality of information tools and products effectively disseminated to ARD stakeholders. 3.2 Increased number and balance source of communication and information products users 3.3 Number of case studies of successful ARD partnership mechanisms (identified under result 1 and 2) documented and shared 3.4 Number of proposals initiated by PAEPARD Users and partners 3.5 Diversity in sources of contributions to database 3.6 African and European stakeholders' awareness of funding and partnership opportunities for joint initiatives on agricultural research, training and innovation)</p>	<p>Inventory and assessment of information tools User feedback PAEPARD stakeholder survey</p>	<p>African Diaspora can be mobilised for ARD Access to timely information is preventing ARD stakeholders from submitting high quality proposals</p>
<p>Result 4 Enhanced Capacities of African actors to initiate, mobilise, facilitate, participate in, lead and evaluate joint multi-stakeholder ARD innovation partnerships</p>	<p>4.1 Number and relevance of capacity building initiatives on European funding instruments addressing African ARD stakeholders. 4.2 Number of African-led ARD partnerships applying for funding under the RTD Framework Programme and other European instruments. 4.3 Proportion of African-European ARD partnerships that have benefited from PAEPARD capacity development initiatives 4.4 Proportion of PAEPARD supported partnerships that result in successful project proposals funded by other</p>	<p>PAEPARD reports Survey of PAEPARD stakeholders</p>	<p>Capacity development initiative can identify and support the most relevant ARD actors Non-research stakeholders can be mobilised to participate in multi-stakeholder platforms and partnerships African ARD stakeholders allow their staff time and space to develop their capacities by building multi-stakeholder partnerships.</p>

	donors		
Result 5 African-European ARD innovation partnerships, involving or led by relevant non-research stakeholders, initiated and supported/mentored to respond to ARD demands identified	5.1 Number of African-European partnerships supported through PAEPARD seed funding that submit proposals for funding through European or other funding instruments 5.2 Proportion of African-European ARD partnerships that are lead by African organisations 5.3 Involvement (at all stages: initiation, proposal / concept development, implementation, M&E) of relevant non-research stakeholders in ARD partnerships, supported by PAEPARD brokerage 5.4 Proportion of PAEPARD mentored-partnerships whose proposal is funded	Reports and statistics of FP7 and other EC instruments Project reports	European ARD organisations are in agreement with African leadership in developing and implementing joint proposals African and European research organisations agree to and actively seek involvement of non-research stakeholders to build inclusive innovation partnerships Seed funding for proposal development results in better partnerships and better research proposals
Result 6 Coherence of the EU Research Framework Programme with MDGs and with other objectives of African-European common interest and mutual benefit is effectively advocated.	6.3 Number of consultations / events where African and European scientists jointly contribute to the European agricultural research agenda 6.4 Reflection of Africa-specific research themes, and of global themes with impact on Africa, in European ARD programme annual work-programmes and funding allocations	PAEPARD reports EC RTD FP, EC Dev annual work programmes and reports	EU remains committed to employ ARD as a tool towards achieving the MDGs Agreement can be reached on prioritisation of research topics between EU and African organisations EU member states endorse an ARD research agenda that emphasises attainment of MDGs

<p>Activities for Result 1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop and implement a strategy to mobilize the European non-traditional research stakeholders (NGOs, private sector, diaspora etc.- with particularly attention to the ‘weak’ groups based on current representation in ARD partnerships) on joint African-European partnerships, through specific workshops and documented case studies (contributing to result 3) 2. Mobilise and coordinate European ARD stakeholders through appropriate fora and workshops, including promising national innovation initiatives, while taking advantage of EU and other events for increased awareness raising and other EC-funded coordination mechanisms such as ERA-ARD and EIARD. 3. Support EFARD secretariat to coordinate European ARD stakeholders and improve its governance systems to have active non-traditional research/non-research stakeholders 4. Monitor and evaluate the result through peer reviews and by providing relevant information to the PAEPARD monitoring and evaluation system
<p>Activities for Result 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mapping and validation of existing mechanisms of ARD non-research stakeholder collaboration (including analysis of their strengths and weaknesses, and identification of gaps) through small studies and workshops. Validation of African multi stakeholders platforms, including non research stakeholders, are mobilised to dialogue and build alliances with similar European platforms. 2. Development of action plans on consensus-building mechanism/framework for civil society to advise research on current and emerging agriculture challenges and opportunities 3. Support to the implementation of action plans at national level through facilitation, complementary financial and technical support, advocacy, information and knowledge sharing, capacity mobilization, and organisation of ARD coordination meetings 4. Use of the institutional mechanisms/ frameworks for ARD prioritisation 5. Monitor and evaluate dissemination of knowledge and good practices on ARD partnership
<p>Activities for Result 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop and maintain an information and communication strategy, building on and complementary to existing systems, focusing on linkages and user friendly guidelines (e.g. “where to find the information on what”), and based on PAEPARD I studies which identified and analyzed the user requirements 2. As part of this communication strategy, develop and maintain a web portal and specific information and communication tools with a database to share partnership case studies (from results 1 and 2), information on existing platforms, potential partners, funding opportunities (including both public and private sector), and target groups, ensuring that there is reference or linkages to existing platforms and fora (see NATURA proposal for PAEPARD information strategy). 3. Document partnerships brokered by PAEPARD II from conceptualization, implementation and impact assessment, i.e. production of brochures and practical manuals on the processes and challenges of developing ARD partnerships between Africa and Europe. 4. Document and disseminate (via the web portal and other information and communication tools) knowledge and good practices and key findings of ARD partnerships 5. Develop the capacity of different ARD stakeholders (focusing on the weakest, i.e. not currently participating effectively in ARD partnerships) to use and contribute to the information and knowledge exchange of the web portal 6. Monitor and evaluate PAEPARD information and communication strategy
<p>Activities for Result 4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct a participatory situation analysis of the different African ARD stakeholders and their inter-relationship (emphasis on the weakest ones) – linked to and coordinated with Result 5, activities 2 to 5. 2. Mapping of funding sources 3. Identify capacity needs of African ARD stakeholders to enable them to participate effectively in multi-stakeholder innovation partnerships taking into account existing studies 4. Exchange experiences and select mechanisms to meet the needs identified, making use of European and African ARD expertise and knowledge (including the identification of successful private-public partnerships in ARD, and drawing on lessons learnt as models for European and African partnerships) 5. Develop a strategy to implement the capacity development programme

<p>6. Implement the capacity development programme, including development of concrete and practical partnership tools from conceptualization to implementation and impact assessment (including incubation period of ARD partnerships)</p> <p>7. Monitor and evaluate the capacity development programme</p>
<p>Activities for Result 5</p> <p>1. Inception meeting / workshop to kick start the PAEPARD II project (including development of detailed TOR for all results)</p> <p>2. Develop guidelines through iterative process for collection of data on ARD i.e. Demand for (in Africa) and supply of (in Africa and Europe) ARD solutions, partnerships and partnership mechanism, funding opportunities (linking with results 1, 2 and 3)</p> <p>3. Diagnose complementarities between demand and supply of ARD</p> <p>4. Prioritise partnerships (e.g. thematic areas, geographical areas, time scale), undertake validation process of partners, initiate partnerships around priority areas. Disseminate calls for proposals (link with result 6) and undertake validation process (link with result 3)</p> <p>5. Carry out brokerage meetings/match-making between partners based on themes identified as priority; followed by facilitation/mentoring on proposal development, facilitate linkage to seed funding source, guidance for feasibility assessment, support on submission of proposal to appropriate funding source</p> <p>6. Management, monitoring and evaluation of partnerships / internal audits</p>
<p>Activities for Result 6</p> <p>1. Develop an advocacy strategy for greater coherence of the European agricultural research with MDGs and other African-European framework and agreements</p> <p>2. Implement advocacy strategy</p> <p>3. Monitor and evaluate advocacy strategy</p>

ANNEX 2: BUDGET

Result area / output	Amount (M€)
1. Mobilisation and coordination of European ARD stakeholders	0.400
2. Mobilisation of African multi-stakeholder platforms, building alliances with European platforms	0.450
3. Information, communication and knowledge management	0.600
4. Capacity development of African ARD stakeholders	0.900
5. Innovation partnership development	1.800
6. Advocacy, to increase MDG focus of European ARD programmes	0.200
7. Crosscutting project management functions (lead organisation overheads, African and European coordinator, SC meetings etc.)	2.500
Total	6.85

FICHE D'ACTION POUR LE PROGRAMME THEMATIQUE DE SECURITE ALIMENTAIRE

PRIORITÉ STRATÉGIQUE2: «LIEN ENTRE L'INFORMATION ET LA PRISE DE DÉCISION POUR AMÉLIORER LA SÉCURITÉ ALIMENTAIRE DANS LES PAYS DU CILSS ET DE LA CEDEAO»

1 IDENTIFICATION

Intitulé/Numéro	Lien entre l'information et la prise de décision pour améliorer la sécurité alimentaire dans les pays du CILSS et de la CEDEAO		
Coût total	10 millions d'euros		
Méthode d'assistance / Mode de gestion	Approche projet / gestion centralisée directe		
Code CAD	52010	Secteur	Sécurité alimentaire

5. MOTIF

5.1. Contexte sectoriel

Un large consensus existe parmi les acteurs œuvrant à la sécurité alimentaire sur le fait que certains principes de base devraient être mieux pris en compte dans le combat contre l'insécurité alimentaire, et notamment:

- les causes et déterminants de l'insécurité alimentaire doivent être mieux compris et partagés par toutes les parties prenantes. La sécurité alimentaire est encore trop souvent perçue comme un secteur alors qu'elle est un concept multisectoriel qui doit prendre en compte à la fois la disponibilité, l'accès, l'utilisation et la stabilité;
- des outils sont requis pour caractériser différentes situations de sécurité alimentaire sur la base de paramètres clefs, afin d'encourager le consensus et d'améliorer les réponses à ces situations;
- une meilleure coordination des réponses est nécessaire;
- le lien entre l'information produite pour suivre l'état de sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle d'une population et l'action pour prévenir ou gérer une crise doit être renforcé.

C'est dans ce contexte que le nouveau programme thématique de sécurité alimentaire (FSTP) a été conçu, traduisant la fermeté de l'engagement de l'Union européenne pour atteindre le premier objectif du millénaire (OMD-1) «Réduire de moitié la proportion de la population qui souffre de la faim» dans le monde. L'objectif stratégique du FSTP est *d'améliorer la sécurité alimentaire des plus pauvres et des plus vulnérables et de contribuer à atteindre le premier OMD via un ensemble d'opérations qui assure la cohérence globale, les synergies et la continuité des interventions de l'Union, y compris le lien entre l'urgence et le développement*. Le présent projet contribuera à atteindre les objectifs de la composante 2 «Lien entre l'information et la prise de décision pour améliorer la sécurité alimentaire» du FSTP.

En 2006, un protocole d'accord de coopération a été signé instituant officiellement le CILSS comme le bras technique de la CEDEAO dans les domaines de la sécurité alimentaire et de la gestion des ressources naturelles dans ses 15 États membres. Le projet contribue à permettre au CILSS d'assumer cette mission, ainsi que celle de centre d'excellence du NEPAD pour le pilier 3 du CAADP³¹.

³¹ Le CAADP offre une vision globale de l'agriculture et de son évolution d'ici à 2015 à l'échelle du continent mais elle s'appuie sur des plans nationaux et régionaux de développement agricole. Elle comporte 4 piliers; le troisième traite de la sécurité alimentaire.

5.2. Enseignements tirés

Depuis 1973, le CILSS permet aux États sahéliens de traiter les problèmes de sécurité alimentaire et de gestion des ressources naturelles à l'échelle sous-régionale et de proposer des mesures pour les résoudre. Il pilote des dispositifs régionaux d'information, de formation, d'analyse, de concertation et de proposition dans ces deux domaines, au service de ses États membres, des acteurs de la société civile et des partenaires de coopération. Ces nombreux acquis en font une institution de référence au niveau continental.

Le projet identifié prend notamment la suite du projet d'appui à la mise en œuvre de la SOSAR³² (Stratégie opérationnelle de sécurité alimentaire régionale) financé par l'UE et articulé avec les activités soutenues par des projets sous financements français et américains. Il capitalise les acquis méthodologiques du DIAPER et des projets ultérieurs en cherchant à renforcer l'harmonisation et la rationalisation des initiatives régionales et nationales dans le domaine de la sécurité alimentaire.

Courant 2008, une évaluation de la mise en œuvre du plan de travail 2004-2008 a réaffirmé la pertinence des mandats du CILSS dans le contexte actuel de l'Afrique de l'Ouest. Son efficacité a été positivement évaluée notamment en ce qui concerne l'appui aux États dans la mise en place des nouvelles procédures et méthodes (suivi des campagnes agricoles, prévisions, concertations, produits phytosanitaires) malgré une viabilité des résultats et moyens dépendante de ressources financières fragiles.

Malgré ses nombreux acquis, le dispositif régional de sécurité alimentaire souffre toujours d'une série de faiblesses. En matière d'analyse de la sécurité alimentaire, les systèmes d'information existants sont centrés sur les disponibilités en céréales et les prix. L'inclusion de nouveaux indicateurs dans ces systèmes est devenue une nécessité afin d'améliorer la capacité d'analyse structurelle et de mieux adapter les interventions aux situations spécifiques. L'expérience du CILSS doit être capitalisée et diffusée notamment aux autres pays de la zone CEDEAO pour une meilleure prise en compte des enjeux sur les marchés. La multitude d'indicateurs dans les différents pays doit être harmonisée pour permettre leur comparaison.

En matière d'opérationnalité des dispositifs nationaux de sécurité alimentaire, on constate un niveau insuffisant d'intégration des stratégies de sécurité alimentaire dans les politiques nationales. La priorité est trop souvent mise sur l'urgence. L'importance de raisonner sur le long terme est souvent négligée. De plus, les capacités de communication et de coordination doivent s'améliorer et les montages institutionnels complexes, du fait de la multidimensionalité de la sécurité alimentaire, doivent être simplifiés.

5.3. Actions complémentaires

Le projet sera complémentaire du programme global³³ qui sera mis en œuvre par la FAO dans le cadre de la composante 2 du FSTP (5,5 millions d'euros), ainsi que de celui qui sera mis en œuvre par le JRC (5 millions d'euros). En ce qui concerne le programme de la FAO, le projet va pouvoir bénéficier d'appuis techniques, notamment en lien avec des outils d'analyse, d'harmonisation et de dissémination de l'information, tout en mettant à disposition de la FAO des expériences concrètes dans ce domaine. Le projet JRC prévoit des appuis techniques spécifiques à différentes institutions régionales portant sur des outils de collecte et d'analyse et sur la conception et la définition des formations. Lors de la préparation des 2 programmes, il est prévu une phase de diagnostic où seront spécifiés les appuis proportionnés au CILSS en complément du présent projet.

³² Référence de contrat CRIS 85502

³³ EC Programme on linking information and decision making to improve food security DEC: 2008/019-728

De même, le projet est complémentaire des actions qui seront mises en œuvre sous la composante 5 du FSTP «Promotion de l'innovation dans la lutte contre l'insécurité alimentaire», notamment au Tchad (1 million d'euros), en Mauritanie (1 million d'euros) et au Niger (2 millions d'euros). Cette composante a pour objectif de stimuler, développer, valider et disséminer des approches locales innovantes. La coordination portera notamment sur la collecte et le traitement des données en rapport avec la durabilité des systèmes d'information au Tchad, la production et l'accès à l'information en Mauritanie, et les mécanismes de ciblage et les filets sociaux au Niger.

Au niveau régional, dans la continuité du protocole d'accord de coopération signé avec la CEDEAO, le projet contribuera de manière significative au nouveau système de données sur l'agriculture en Afrique de l'Ouest, dit «AGRIS» piloté par la CEDEAO, à travers le CILSS, et appuyant la mise en œuvre de l'ECOWAP. Ce système intègre les initiatives de l'UEMOA dans ce domaine. Ce projet viendra également compléter les acquis du projet appuyé par la DG-ECHO³⁴ et mis en place par la FAO.

Le projet est en adéquation avec le programme indicatif régional (PIR) du 9^e FED ainsi qu'avec le document de stratégie régionale et le PIR du 10^e FED (2008 – 2013). La sécurité alimentaire fait aussi partie du premier secteur de concentration du PIR 10^{ème} FED "Approfondissement de l'intégration régionale, amélioration de la compétitivité et APE". Des actions concernant "la mise en place et le fonctionnement des systèmes d'information de marchés, y compris les statistiques agricoles, et d'aide à la décision" sont également prévues dans le cadre du PIR 10^{ème} FED. Le CILSS est également identifié dans le PIR comme le "bras technique" de la CEDEAO en matière de sécurité alimentaire. Dans ce contexte, la mise en œuvre de la présente action doit se faire en étroite coordination avec la mise en œuvre du PIR afin de maximiser les synergies et tirer profit des complémentarités. Il participera au processus d'intégration régionale, élément clé des secteurs de concentration du 9^e et 10^e FED. Il contribuera directement à la mise en œuvre du plan de travail 2009-2013 du CILSS au sein duquel s'inscriront les actions de l'ensemble des PTF concernés par la sécurité alimentaire, notamment celles des coopérations françaises et américaines³⁵.

5.4. Coordination des bailleurs de fonds

En accord avec la déclaration de Paris et le programme d'action d'Accra sur l'efficacité de l'aide, des efforts sont faits pour harmoniser les approches des gouvernements, des acteurs et des PTF. Un cadre général de partenariat entre le CILSS et ses PTF a été signé en 2007 marquant la volonté conjointe de développer une approche programme.

La coordination des bailleurs de fonds au niveau stratégique se fait dans le cadre du Comité des partenaires du CILSS (CPC) et de ses déclinaisons par site notamment le Groupe de Ouagadougou qui se retrouve trimestriellement. La Commission européenne devrait présider le CPC à partir de 2010. La coordination des activités de l'ensemble des acteurs, notamment dans le cadre de la mise en œuvre du plan de travail 2009-2013, sera donc assurée. Par ailleurs, les principaux PTF (France, USAID, FAO) seront représentés dans le comité de pilotage du projet.

6. DESCRIPTION

Le projet constitue la déclinaison de la composante 2 «Lien entre l'information et la prise de décision pour améliorer la sécurité alimentaire» du FSTP au niveau de l'Afrique de l'Ouest (pays du CILSS et de la CEDEAO). Les 17 pays de la zone CILSS et CEDEAO sont éligibles à un appui direct ou indirect des fonds de ce projet.

³⁴ Projet FAO

³⁵ Actuellement, ces deux partenaires redéfinissent et reformulent la continuation de leur appui au CILSS. Le présent projet a été planifié après consultation avec ces deux acteurs de la coopération et coordonne étroitement ses activités avec eux.

Le projet durera 84 mois et sera composé d'une phase opérationnelle de 60 mois³⁶ pendant laquelle seront mises en œuvre les activités du projet via des engagements individuels et d'une période de clôture de 24 mois. Il est à noter que l'engagement individuel mis en œuvre par le CILSS aura une durée de 48 mois. La période entre la signature de la convention de financement et le démarrage des activités proprement dites sera utilisée pour la contractualisation.

Dans le cas des activités mises en œuvre par le CILSS, les 48 mois se diviseront en 3 phases: 1) phase de définition des besoins avec les pays (6 mois); 2) phase de développement des activités (27 mois); 3) phase d'évaluation et de consolidation des acquis (15 mois). L'ensemble des activités sera développé par le personnel des 3 institutions constituant le CILSS: le Secrétariat exécutif, l'Institut du Sahel (INSAH) et le Centre régional Agrhymet (CRA). Pour ce faire, elles bénéficieront de l'appui d'une assistance technique à court et à long terme (2 AT). Étant donné qu'il s'agit d'un projet de renforcement des capacités institutionnelles, organisationnelles et techniques du CILSS et des dispositifs nationaux de sécurité alimentaire, il impliquera un nombre important de missions d'appui aux partenaires du CILSS dans les différents pays de la zone CILSS-CEDEAO, de réunions et d'ateliers nationaux et régionaux de concertation, ainsi que du temps d'experts, des missions de collecte de données et des actions de communication et capitalisation des résultats (publications, ateliers de présentation). Le projet contribuera donc à financer ce type d'activités ainsi que le matériel permettant de renforcer les acteurs en charge des dispositifs visant la sécurité alimentaire. Ceci implique des résultats le plus souvent immatériels qui n'en demeurent pas moins capitaux dans l'optique de l'amélioration de la qualité de l'analyse des facteurs déterminant l'insécurité alimentaire et de la définition de stratégies permettant d'y faire face.

6.1. Objectifs

L'objectif global du projet est:

la sécurité alimentaire des groupes les plus pauvres et les plus vulnérables des pays membres de la CEDEAO, notamment la Mauritanie et le Tchad, est améliorée et les pays sont soutenus pour atteindre le premier OMD.

L'objectif spécifique du projet est:

- des décisions et stratégies efficaces de sécurité alimentaire sont mises en œuvre à travers le renforcement des acteurs régionaux et nationaux en charge de la collecte, de l'analyse et de l'utilisation de l'information dans le domaine de la sécurité alimentaire.

6.2. Résultats escomptés et principales activités

Le projet va contribuer aux principaux résultats visés ci-après au niveau national et régional.

L'information sur la SA est partagée, analysée de manière consensuelle et aboutit à des décisions stratégiques et opérationnelles permettant la mise en œuvre d'action de SA coordonnées (entre acteurs comme entre pays), et systématiquement associées à des mécanismes améliorés de suivi.

Les systèmes d'information sur la sécurité alimentaire collectent l'information de manière compatible et comparable et ont élargi leur gamme d'indicateurs afin de pouvoir analyser la sécurité alimentaire de manière holistique et avec une vision régionale (incluant notamment les

³⁶ La phase opérationnelle du projet commence à la date de signature de la convention de financement avec la CEDEAO.

flux); leurs capacités de communication sont améliorées afin de permettre la préparation de documents synthétiques et pertinents destinés à appuyer la prise de décision.

Les acteurs des dispositifs nationaux de sécurité alimentaire sont formés afin de pouvoir analyser les déterminants de l'insécurité alimentaire structurelle et conjoncturelle et prendre en compte les différentes dimensions de la sécurité alimentaire (disponibilité, accès, utilisation et stabilité) de manière satisfaisante.

Pour la mise en œuvre des activités, une approche séquentielle sera déroulée. La nécessité de permettre aux pays de s'approprier le projet et de s'impliquer dans la définition précise de leurs besoins en fonction des situations particulières à chaque pays impose la phase de préparation de 6 mois prévue en début de mise en œuvre du contrat CILSS. Cette phase implique de laisser une certaine flexibilité pour les activités prévues. Néanmoins, le projet développera 3 composantes. Les composantes 2 et 3 sont nécessaires pour créer ou renforcer l'environnement technique institutionnel au niveau régional et national ainsi que pour générer et analyser l'information et les capacités d'analyse nécessaires pour appréhender la sécurité alimentaire de manière globale. La composante 1 exploite les informations et les capacités générées par les deux autres composantes pour contribuer directement à l'objectif spécifique.

La composante 1 «Renforcement de l'appui et du suivi de la mise en œuvre des stratégies nationales et régionales de sécurité alimentaire» cherchera à mieux adapter l'information produite par les dispositifs de sécurité alimentaire aux besoins des décideurs et opérateurs. Les activités principales de cette composante sont énumérées ci-après.

- § L'appui et le conseil par les experts du CILSS aux acteurs en charge des dispositifs nationaux de sécurité alimentaire: par le renforcement des espaces de dialogue, des analyses communes et des prises de décision; par la mise en place d'un service technique national responsable de la centralisation de données; par la mise à niveau d'un certain nombre de dispositifs nationaux de sécurité alimentaire; par le renforcement du Conseil régional de sécurité alimentaire (CORESA)³⁷; par l'harmonisation des critères d'appréciation de la situation alimentaire et nutritionnelle et de la définition d'un mode d'articulation entre les pays et le CILSS plus efficace. Ces activités d'appui du conseil et de renforcement de capacités se feront principalement par le biais de missions, d'ateliers, de consultations.
- § La mise en place d'une assistance technique long et court terme pour renforcer les capacités d'analyse structurelle de la sécurité alimentaire et des stratégies de gestion des risques tout en contribuant à la caractérisation d'instruments de prévention et gestion de crise (lien avec le projet FAO également). Ces activités impliqueront l'organisation de nombreux ateliers dans les différents pays de l'espace CILSS-CEDEAO, ainsi qu'un accompagnement dans la définition d'applications pratiques des résultats des analyses.
- § La conception et la diffusion d'outils à proposer aux États face à une situation donnée en matière de prévention des crises, de traitement et d'analyse de l'insécurité alimentaire. Ces outils seront issus d'une l'analyse des bonnes pratiques et des expériences positives tout en tenant compte également des jeux des acteurs impliqués, du coût, des conditions nécessaires à la réussite, du manque de temps ou des perspectives de passage à l'échelle. Les thèmes concernés incluront les assurances agricoles; le changement d'échelle des réseaux de banques de céréales en lien avec la micro-finance; l'appui aux acteurs des

³⁷ Le CORESA est l'organe de concertation et de coordination sous-régional auquel participe l'ensemble des acteurs (États, OIG, PTF, société civile, secteur privé). Il assure le pilotage, le suivi et l'évaluation des stratégies régionale et nationales de sécurité alimentaire.

filières commerciales; les actions dans le domaine de la nutrition au niveau communautaire; les instruments de gestion des crises (filet de sécurité alimentaire, vente à prix social, distribution gratuite ciblée, diminution des taxes, HIMO / cash for work, banque céréalière, mini-projet, protection des fourrages, protection des terres, semences, etc.); les instruments de renforcement et de réhabilitation dans les zones structurellement à risques; et la décentralisation des dispositifs de sécurité alimentaire.

- § Le développement de partenariats avec différents instituts de recherche nationaux et internationaux, notamment via une forte implication du JRC à travers son propre programme.

La composante 2 «Amélioration des systèmes d'information sur la sécurité alimentaire et les marchés» contribuera à renforcer et mettre à niveau les systèmes nationaux via des missions d'appui des experts du CILSS. Les activités principales de cette composante sont énumérées ci-après.

- § La circulation et l'articulation au niveau régional d'un socle minimum de données de base d'intérêt régional recueillies de manière identique, applicables à l'ensemble des pays. Pour tenir compte des spécificités propres et sans reproduire des systèmes identiques à travers la zone, des sous-groupes de pays pourront également être constitués (autour d'un bassin de production commun, par exemple).
- § L'intégration concrète de nouvelles thématiques aux systèmes d'information, notamment relatives à la nutrition, aux produits non céréaliers et à l'élevage, aux populations urbaines. Des outils basés sur l'économie alimentaire des ménages seront renforcés (bilan alimentaire, cadre harmonisé). La notion de seuil de crise sera développée et associée à une batterie de réponses graduelles (cf. plan de contingence du Niger).
- § Des ateliers et des formations appuyés par de l'assistance technique à court terme et via les projets FAO et JRC pour renforcer les capacités dans les domaines de l'enquête agricole, de la gestion de bases de données, du suivi des marchés et de l'analyse des prix, des techniques de publication et de diffusion des données, de la télédétection et des systèmes d'information géographique.
- § La conception et la mise en place de mécanismes spécifiques pour faciliter la coordination et l'harmonisation des différents systèmes d'information nationaux tout en permettant leur intégration effective dans le système d'information sur la sécurité alimentaire régionale (SISAR) sont prévues. Le dispositif régional de prévention et gestion des crises alimentaires (PREGEC) sera un des acteurs clefs de l'articulation des systèmes d'information entre eux.
- § Des missions d'appui aux systèmes d'informations sur les marchés (SIM) permettront de soutenir et d'harmoniser ces derniers. Le suivi des flux transfrontaliers et des opportunités d'échange de produits agricoles sera mis en place. Le suivi des acteurs des filières vivrières et des marchés vers l'aval sera aussi développé.

La composante 3 «Renforcement des capacités des structures via une offre de formation adaptée» appuiera la conception et le lancement de trois nouveaux masters professionnels d'une durée de 1 an: le master «Sécurité alimentaire et politiques publiques», le master «Adaptation des pratiques agricoles au changement climatique» et le master «Protection des

plantes et agriculture durable». Cette activité sera menée avec le soutien du JRC. Les activités principales de cette composante sont présentées ci-après.

- § L'appui du projet en assistance technique pour la conception des mastères professionnels et l'appui des 4 premières promotions à travers des bourses d'études. Chaque promotion comptera environ 20 étudiants/mastère. Ainsi sur 4 ans, 240 candidats, en provenance de l'ensemble de l'espace CILSS-CEDEAO, devraient obtenir un mastère.
- § L'appui à la formation de techniciens supérieurs provenant de l'ensemble des pays de la zone CILSS-CEDEAO afin de renforcer les différents dispositifs nationaux de sécurité alimentaire. Ces formations porteront notamment sur la protection des cultures, l'agrométéorologie, la maintenance des outils de collecte et d'analyse de données ou la gestion du système informatique. Trois promotions de techniciens supérieurs seront formées, représentant une centaine de bourses. La durée de leur formation sera de 2 ans.

6.3. Risques et hypothèses

L'engagement, la stabilité et la volonté politique des décideurs sont des conditions *sine qua non* de l'application de stratégies et politiques de sécurité alimentaire adéquates. La durabilité et la réussite du projet dépendent du niveau d'appropriation et de soutien des États concernés, notamment envers leur propre dispositif national de sécurité alimentaire. De cette même volonté politique découlent la participation aux différents espaces de concertation et de décision mis en place dans le cadre du projet et le fait que les gouvernements prennent des décisions en fonction d'une analyse objective des situations de sécurité alimentaire et non en fonction de critères plus politiques. Aussi, un des risques est-il que l'engagement des États ne résiste pas à d'autres priorités. Toutefois, le contexte mondial actuel de crise lié à la cherté de la vie et à la volatilité des prix des produits alimentaires a rendu ce risque plus marginal.

Par ailleurs la viabilité et l'autonomie financière du CILSS sont des facteurs de risque à moyen terme si la convergence avec la CEDEAO n'est pas menée à son terme. C'est l'un des enjeux de l'association de la CEDEAO au montage de ce projet.

6.4. Questions transversales

À travers des analyses sur le changement climatique et la gestion de l'environnement, le projet contribue au développement durable. Il prend en compte la dimension du genre à travers des méthodes d'analyse de la sécurité alimentaire ventilées par genre. Il contribue à la bonne gouvernance du fait de son action d'appui à l'intégration régionale et à l'information des populations et acteurs du développement. Enfin, il contribue à offrir l'accès à l'alimentation pour les groupes les plus vulnérables et par là même au droit humain que constitue le droit à l'alimentation.

6.5. Parties prenantes

Les parties prenantes du projet identifiées sont les structures nationales, régionales et internationales qui ont pour mandat la lutte contre l'insécurité alimentaire: i) au niveau global, la FAO et le JRC à travers les programmes qu'ils gèrent dans le cadre de l'initiative globale du FSTP; ii) au niveau régional, la CEDEAO, le CILSS et leurs partenaires, notamment l'UEMOA et, iii) au niveau national, les services techniques nationaux, les partenaires techniques et financiers et les acteurs non étatiques (ONG, organisations paysannes et secteur privé). Les trois institutions composant le CILSS (Secrétariat exécutif, INSAH et CRA) seront les principaux acteurs du projet.

7. QUESTIONS DE MISE EN ŒUVRE

7.1. Mode de gestion

Une convention de financement sera signée entre la CEDEAO et la Commission européenne. Néanmoins, le projet sera mis en œuvre en gestion centralisée directe par la délégation de la CE au Burkina Faso. La CEDEAO présidera le comité de pilotage du projet et délèguera une partie de la mise en œuvre du projet au CILSS afin d'alléger la gestion du projet.

Dès le début 2009, un audit institutionnel («4 piliers») du CILSS sera lancé pour vérifier les prérequis à la signature d'une convention de contribution. Les conclusions sont attendues avant la fin de l'année 2009 (voir calendrier). Si les conclusions de l'audit sont positives, au premier trimestre 2010, le CILSS signera une convention de contribution avec la Commission, après accord de la CEDEAO sur la description des activités. Si l'audit ne s'avérait pas concluant, l'action serait mise en œuvre à travers un contrat de subvention.

Quelque soit le type de contrat signé (convention de contribution ou contrat de subvention), la CEDEAO sera consultée sur la définition des activités pour s'assurer de la cohérence avec les autres initiatives en cours ou programmées.

L'assistance technique sera mise en œuvre à travers des contrats de service. Les cahiers des charges seront élaborés en consultation avec les partenaires. Il est choisi de laisser l'assistance technique à long terme en gestion centralisée directe pour permettre une collaboration rapprochée avec la CE lors de la mise en place de l'approche programme prévue par le plan de travail 2009-2013. La mise en place de l'assistance technique en gestion décentralisée partielle, à travers l'ordonnateur régional - la CEDEAO - a été jugée peu opérationnelle.

Le comité de pilotage du projet se réunira deux fois la première année puis au moins une fois par an jusqu'à la fin du projet. Chargé de l'orientation stratégique du projet, il réunira un représentant de la CEDEAO, du CILSS, de la CE, de la France, de l'USAID et de la FAO. Pour le suivi technique et opérationnel rapproché de la mise en œuvre du projet, il est souhaitable de créer un comité de suivi restreint comprenant les principaux acteurs du projet et les partenaires du CILSS impliqués dans la SA, qui se réunira plusieurs fois par an (entre 3 et 4 fois).

Les autres partenaires et les pays seront informés de la tenue de ces comités et seront associés aux préparations des dossiers en fonction de leurs intérêts propres. De même, les conclusions des travaux seront reversées aux contributeurs, notamment lors des instances du CILSS et de la CEDEAO.

7.2. Procédures de passation de marchés et d'octroi de subventions

Tous les contrats mettant en œuvre l'action doivent être attribués et exécutés conformément aux procédures et aux documents standard établis et publiés par la Commission européenne pour la mise en œuvre des opérations extérieures, tels qu'en vigueur au moment du lancement de la procédure en cause. La participation au marché pour l'action décrite par la présente fiche est ouverte à toutes les personnes physiques et morales visées par les bases légales prévues par le règlement financier applicable au budget général.

Dans le cas où l'audit de système s'avérait non concluant, un accord préalable pour l'attribution directe d'un contrat de subvention au CILSS pour monopole de fait et une dérogation pour le financement intégral de l'action seront demandées.

7.3. Budget et calendrier

Le budget indicatif se présente comme suit:

A – Appui au programme de travail du CILSS		
Composante 1 – Appui et suivi des stratégies	2 300 000	23%
Composante 2 – Systèmes d'information	2 700 000	27%
Composante 3 – Formation	1 320 000	13,2%
Audit internes / Visibilité	200 000	2%
Coûts administratifs (6,8%)	480 000	4,8%
Total A	7 000 000	70%

B - Assistance technique		
Long terme (marchés de services)	1 200 000	12%
Court terme (contrats cadre)	1 000 000	10%
Total B	2 200 000	22%
C – Vérification financière / Évaluation (marchés de services)		
Vérification financière	200 000	2%
Évaluation	200 000	2%
Total C	400 000	4%
Imprévus	400 000	4%
Total projet	10 000 000 euros	100%

Le calendrier de mise en œuvre opérationnel du projet sera le suivant:

	An1			An2			An3			AN4			An5		
Activités															
Signature de la convention de financement															
Audit de système	A														
Signature de la convention de contribution															
Mise en œuvre des activités CC															
Assistant technique long terme 1	X														
Assistant technique long terme 2	X														
Assistant technique court terme															
Évaluation intermédiaire															
Évaluation finale															

A: lancement du recrutement pour l'audit système sur fonds de la C5

X: lancement de l'appel d'offres international restreint avec clause suspensive

Les activités de clôture seront réalisées ultérieurement.

La durée prévue du projet est de 60 mois de phase opérationnelle qui débute à partir de la signature de la convention de financement prévue au troisième trimestre 2009, qui seront suivis de 24 mois de clôture. Au sein de la phase opérationnelle, il doit être distingué une période 6 à 12 mois pour la contractualisation, puis une période de 48 mois qui correspond aux durées opérationnelles des engagements individuels.

7.4. Suivi de l'exécution

La mise en place d'un système de suivi-évaluation interne du projet constituera une activité à part entière du projet. Il sera suivi de près sur la base d'indicateurs clés - qui, pour les principaux, seront détaillés dans le DTA - présentés dans des cadres logiques et établis en lien avec chaque plan annuel de travail. Une matrice d'évaluation des performances sera également préparée annuellement pour permettre au comité de pilotage d'évaluer les avancées du projet. Cette matrice intégrera les critères classiques de l'évaluation, relatifs à la pertinence, l'efficacité, l'efficience, l'impact, la viabilité, la cohérence et la valeur ajoutée communautaire. Elle intégrera également des recommandations relatives à la suite du projet.

7.5. Évaluation et vérification financière

Le projet sera soumis à une évaluation intermédiaire externe au cours de son 5^e semestre de mise en œuvre opérationnelle. Une évaluation finale sera réalisée en fin de projet. Des vérifications financières seront effectuées par le CILSS. La Commission européenne ou la Cour des comptes se réservent le droit d'effectuer des missions de vérification financière additionnelles.

7.6. Communication et visibilité

Une stratégie de communication et visibilité adaptée à différents publics, dont les différents membres des organisations partenaires et de la Commission européenne, sera développée en tant qu'activité à part entière du projet. Les normes liées à la visibilité seront tirées du «Manuel de visibilité de l'UE pour les actions extérieures» http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/index_fr.htm

Sigles et acronymes

AGRIS	:	Agricultural Information System
AT	:	Assistant technique
CAADP	:	Programme détaillé de développement de l'agriculture africaine
CEDEAO	:	Communauté économique des États d'Afrique de l'Ouest
CILSS	:	Comité interétatique de lutte contre la sécheresse au Sahel
CORESA	:	Conseil régional de sécurité alimentaire
CPC	:	Comité des partenaires du CILSS
CRA	:	Centre régional Agrhymet
DIAPER	:	Programme de diagnostic permanent
EC / CE	:	Commission européenne
ECHO	:	Office humanitaire de la Commission européenne
ECOWAP	:	Politique agricole de la Communauté économique d'Afrique de l'Ouest
FAO	:	Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture
FED	:	Fond européen de développement
FSTP	:	Programme thématique de sécurité alimentaire
HIMO	:	Haute intensité de main d'œuvre
INSAH	:	Institut du Sahel
JRC	:	Centre commun de recherche
Mio EUR	:	Million d'euros
NEPAD	:	Nouveau partenariat pour le développement de l'Afrique
OIG	:	Organisation intergouvernementale
OMD	:	Objectif du millénaire pour le développement
ONG	:	Organisation non gouvernementale
PIR	:	Programme indicatif régional
PREGEC	:	Réseau de prévention et gestion des crises alimentaires
PTF	:	Partenaire technique et financier
SIM	:	Système d'information sur les marchés
SISAR	:	Système d'information sur la sécurité alimentaire régional
SOSAR	:	Stratégie opérationnelle de sécurité alimentaire régionale
UE	:	Union européenne
UEMOA	:	Union économique et monétaire ouest-africaine
USAID	:	Agence des États-Unis pour de développement international

ACTION FICHE FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
STRATEGIC PRIORITY 2: LINKING INFORMATION AND DECISION-MAKING TO IMPROVE FOOD
SECURITY RESPONSE STRATEGIES
‘TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC SUPPORT FOR FOOD SECURITY INFORMATION FOR DECISION-
MAKING IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA (HORN OF AFRICA)’

1 IDENTIFICATION

Title/Number	Technical and scientific support for food security information for decision-making in sub-Saharan Africa		
Total cost	€ million		
Aid method / Method of implementation	Project approach — Direct centralised management		
DAC-code	52010	Sector	Food Security

8. RATIONALE

8.1. Sector context

Progress towards hunger reduction has stagnated for more than a decade, with the number of undernourished people recently increasing to about 923 million in 2007, due mainly to soaring food prices. Significant progress in some regions and countries has been masked by setbacks in others. Sub-Saharan Africa remains the region of the world with the highest percentage of undernourished people.

On 4 May 2007 a new Thematic Strategy for Food Security was adopted by a decision of the European Commission under the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI). The new thematic programme (Food Security Thematic Programme — FSTP) reflects the Community’s continuing commitment to achieving the first Millennium Development Goal (MDG1) on hunger. The objective of the FSTP strategy is to improve food security in favour of the poorest and the most vulnerable and to contribute to achieving MDG1 through a set of actions to ensure the overall coherence, complementarity and continuity of Community interventions, including in the area of transition from relief to development.

In this context, and in the light of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action on Aid Effectiveness, efforts must be made to harmonise the approaches of donors and governments, considering the number and diversity of aid programmes in the field of food security information (FSI) and early warning systems (EWS) at the different geographical levels. The FSTP aims to address this problem by supporting governments, regional organisations, other development partners and the international community more broadly, in order to strengthen the links between food security information/early warning systems and the development of effective response strategies.

Key problems to be addressed by this programme are: the cross-border and regional dimensions of food security analysis; the need for objective data and methods derived from remote sensing and other sources; the importance of the inter-comparability of methods, indicators and analysis; the need for transparent and improved food security assessments; the insufficient capacities and resources for generating and analysing food security information at

national and regional level; the insufficient coordination among institutions concerned with generating, analysing and communicating food security information; and the potential role of regional organisations in coordinating food security information and responses.

8.2. Lessons learnt

This programme follows the Administrative Arrangement (AA) for ‘Technical Support for the Horn of Africa Food Security Information Systems and Assessments’, signed between the JRC and AIDCO on 23 December 2005 for a duration of three years and extended for one year in October 2008, as recommended by the mid-term review carried out in November–December 2007.

Reference is made to the progress reports and meetings for the programme, the JRC-AIDCO-DEV-ECHO meeting on food security held on 12 September 2007, and the related strategic note on the role of the JRC in food security. Reference is also made to the identification/pre-formulation study for Component 2 of the Food Security Thematic Programme, on Linking Information and Decision Making to Improve Food Security.

From discussions with European Commission (EC) services and the mid-term review report, the main lessons learnt and recommendations for the present programme are the following:

- Reinforce the demand-driven approach, with more input from the EC Delegations and national/regional stakeholders in the definition of work programmes.
- Focus on sub-Saharan Africa but keep the possibility to intervene in other parts of the world to meet actual demand and adapt to changing contexts.
- Further develop expertise in the following fields: rangeland and livestock monitoring; area estimates; food security analysis and access matters; market information and high food prices; and other possible areas of EC interest in food security.
- Reinforce capacity building activities for national and regional experts.
- Ensure full complementarity with other actions of Component 2 of the Food Security Thematic Programme.
- Maintain strong interaction with UN organisations (FAO, WFP Rome), improve support and interaction with national programmes and strategy with other EU donors and other technical actors, (e.g. FEWS-NET).
- Possibly ensure presence at regional level in Africa.

8.3. Complementary actions

Actions in Component 2 of the Food Security Thematic Programme

At the time of writing, only two other sub-components of Component 2, ‘Linking information and decision-making to improve food security response strategies’, are at the advanced

preparation stage: the global sub-component with the FAO and the regional CILSS/CEDEAO sub-component.

The FAO has proposed organising an international workshop in early 2009 to convene actors within component 2, to discuss and define the partnership and to prepare Memoranda of Understanding or any other form of agreement needed.

In the formulation phase, consultations were held to start on the thematic content of the partnership, both with the FAO for the global sub-component and with the EU Delegation in Ouagadougou, CILSS and the AGRHYMET Centre in Niamey for the CILSS/CEDEAO sub-component. The results of these consultations are discussed in part 3, under 3.2 Results and Activities.

Exchanges will continue with the FAO and CILSS to prepare the agreement(s), and consultations will also be held with other potential actors within the Component such as SADC.

Other complementary actions

The Regional Food Security and Risk Management Programme for Eastern and Southern Africa (REFORM): the financing agreement for this €10m programme funded under the ninth EDF was signed with IGAD in May 2007, with the operational implementation phase ending in June 2011. REFORM includes a capacity building component for the analysis of policies and programmes to manage chronic food insecurity and assess the potential of alternative social protection approaches, to be implemented primarily within the IGAD member states. Given the role of policy making in FSTP Component 2, linkage with this seems very important, particularly for the global sub-component. Linkages should also be explored with the other components of REFORM, for the JRC the most significant probably being the component for developing the capacity of Regional Integration Organisations in the field of food security.

Additional synergies will be developed with FEWS-NET, not only in food security analysis but possibly also in other domains such as joint crop assessment missions and methodology developments.

In the Horn of Africa specifically, strong links will continue to be developed with national food security information systems entirely funded by government or with the support of donors. This applies mainly to EC/FAO programmes/projects in food security, such as SIFSIA, the Ethiopia Food Security Information project and the Somalia Food Security Assessment Unit (FSAU). At regional level, special emphasis will be given to the link with IGAD. Attention will be given to involving the IGAD secretariat, in particular in capacity building and training activities. In the CEDEAO-CILSS region, apart from the CILSS and its AGRHYMET Regional Centre, natural partners are the national Food Security Information and Early Warning Systems. In the SADC region, there is the regional Agricultural Information Management System along with the regional and national Vulnerability Assessment Committees (VACs), in other areas of the world the different EU-funded projects in food security information systems.

Other important initiatives to be linked with include: the multi-donor (ECHO – CIDA – DFID) funded roll-out of the Integrated Phase Classification for food security (IPC) in Eastern and Central Africa and the IPC initiatives in West Africa and at global level; the EC-funded

AMESD project; the GMES initiative, in particular Geoland 2 and 'GMES and Africa'; the JRC-ACP Observatory for Sustainable Development; and the Thematic Programme 'AU-EU Strategic Partnership'. In addition, close attention will be paid to the development of the 'Global Partnership on Food Security' proposed by the French President, Nicolas Sarkozy, at the high-level conference on food security held by the FAO in Rome in June 2008, especially Pillar Two: 'Networking of scientific knowledge on world food security in order to diagnose, analyse and prevent food insecurity'.

8.4. Donor coordination

The JRC will actively contribute to information exchange between various food security information systems funded by governments, the EC, EU member states or other donors, following the principles of the Paris Declaration and the European Consensus on Development, and in full partnership with the other actors in FSTP Component 2. This coordination will be instrumental in the success of this programme and will inform the policy decisions of EC services.

9. DESCRIPTION

The programme aims to make a specific technical and scientific contribution to Component 2 of the Food Security Thematic Programme, on 'linking information and decision-making to improve food security response strategies'. It will support the FAO global element and the regional sub-components, such as CILSS and SADC, in areas where the JRC has expertise, such as the use and dissemination of satellite data and related capacity building. It will also complement the actions of other actors in the qualitative and methodological improvement of food security assessments and analyses. Finally, it will provide internal technical support and advice to EC services.

The main geographical focus is sub-Saharan Africa, though with actions in other areas of the world, according to demand and needs. The programme staff comprises the main team based in Ispra (I), which can make use of the infrastructure for the JRC's FOODSEC action under the Seventh Framework Programme. Institutional technical support and cooperation with the FAO and WFP will be coordinated by a technical adviser seconded from Rome. One JRC expert should be seconded at regional level, possibly to Addis Ababa, with the African Union Commission or the EU Delegation to the AU, or to Nairobi. In particular, this expert would provide support for Food Security Information Systems, assist in adapting methodologies to local conditions and needs, participate in food security analysis at national and regional level and contribute to capacity building within regional and national institutions.

9.1. Objectives

Overall objective: Improve food security in favour of the poorest and the most vulnerable and assist countries in achieving MDG1, by effectively linking food security analysis to decision-making.

Specific objective: Specific technical and scientific contribution to the programme for linking information and decision-making to improve food security response strategies with the main focus on sub-Saharan Africa, complementing other actors

Component 1: To contribute to improving food security analysis methodologies and processes through improving the use and dissemination of satellite data and derived information, together with other actions to complement the FAO contribution to the FSTP and in liaison with other

stakeholders such as FEWS-NET, continental and regional technical bodies, other UN agencies and NGOs.

Component 2: To contribute to building the capacity of regional and national institutions and experts on food security information systems, in a demand-driven way and complementary to and in synergy with other initiatives in this domain, particularly under the Food Security Thematic Programme.

Component 3: To provide technical support to EC services and Delegations on Food Security Information Systems.

9.2. Expected results and main activities

In Component 1, the first area of intervention is the use and dissemination of satellite data and derived information relevant to food security. The second is contributing to food security analysis, e.g. in the IPC initiative and in food security assessments and related studies. The JRC is already one of the technical agencies and forms part of the Steering Group for the IPC initiative, the global coordination of which is handled by the FAO. On food security assessments, strategic discussions on improving the CFSAM have been ongoing for several years with the FAO, WFP, AIDCO, JRC and USAID. The JRC has been contributing technically, and through observer missions, to the improvement of Crop and Food Security Assessment Missions. It has been doing same more specifically with WFP on the Emergency Food Security Assessments, including participation in the SENAC advisory group and on missions as observers. Component 2 is the JRC's contribution to improving the capacity of national and regional bodies in food security. The JRC will intervene in its areas of expertise, where it can offer a comparative advantage. Component 3 of the programme relates to the JRC's mandate to provide EC services and policies with science-based technical support.

Result Component 1:

§ Contribution to improving food security analysis methodologies and processes, through improved use and dissemination of satellite data and derived information and other actions to complement the FAO contribution to the FSTP and in liaison with other stakeholders such as FEWS-NET, continental and regional technical bodies, other UN agencies and NGOs.

Main activities:

- Acquisition and processing of satellite, meteorological and agro-meteorological data sets, with dissemination through the appropriate channels (GIEWS workstation and/or other)
- Continuing and improving the production of crop situation reports in the Horn of Africa until national bodies have taken over or following special request (e.g. by European Commission Delegation)
- Extending, according to needs and demand, and in coordination with other programmes, FoodSec crop analysis and early warning reporting (crop situation reports) to other countries/regions in southern Africa, central and western Africa, and a limited number of countries outside Africa.
- Developing/improving and adapting, in liaison with other stakeholders, methods and models for crop yield forecasting and for other aspects such as rangeland and livestock monitoring
- Developing/improving and adapting methods and models for crop acreage estimation, in liaison with other stakeholders
- Producing specific crop analysis reports for ad-hoc situations/countries and/or participating in assessment missions, e.g. for FAO/WFP Crop and Food Security Assessment Missions, or in the event of crises

- Carrying out specific studies and/or developing methodologies/systems to support food security assessments and analyses, including on food prices
- Participating as one of the IPC technical agencies in developing, improving and adapting the IPC
- Participating in demand-driven food security analyses at regional and national level

Result Component 2:

§ Improved capacity of regional and national institutions and experts in food security information systems, in a demand-driven way and complementary to and in synergy with the other initiatives in this domain, particularly under the Food Security Thematic Programme.

Main activities:

- Capacity building in the processing and use of satellite-derived and agrometeorological information for crop monitoring and forecasting, jointly with other actors, e.g. the FAO, WFP, FEWS-NET, where possible
- Capacity building on other subjects where the JRC has proven expertise, e.g. GIS, agricultural statistics, where appropriate and conducive to the objectives of the project.

Result Component 3:

§ Provision of technical support to EC services and Delegations on Food Security Information Systems.

Main activities:

- Technical support and advice for the analysis of methodologies and systems developed by third parties, and for the monitoring of EC-funded food security information system programmes
- Contribution to information exchange and technical reflection on food security information systems within the Commission, possibly with EU member states as well

Many of the main activities indicated above will be carried out in close partnership with the other actors within FSTP Component 2. The initial orientations for the thematic content of the partnership with CEDEAO/CILSS and the FAO are as follows:

CILSS/CEDEAO

Building on existing scientific and technical collaboration, the partnership under this programme would mainly address the primary thrust of the CILSS programme, i.e. support for the CILSS work programme and its component 2: improvement of food security information systems.

Tentative themes for collaboration:

- estimation of rainfall through remote sensing and other methods,
- remote sensing databases and dissemination,
- evolution and progress of crop forecasting models,
- pilot scientific studies on the impact of climate change on crop production,
- support for national food security information systems in selected areas of JRC expertise,
- scientific support for the Harmonised Framework and its development,
- scientific support for the improvement of crop and food security assessment methodology,
- other themes to be discussed: AMESD, post-harvest losses,
- analysis of prices,
- ad-hoc crop situation analysis, crop acreage estimation, etc.

Possible synergy between the JRC and the AGRHYMET Centre will also be investigated in Component 3: strengthening the capacity of regional and national structures through adequate training. In particular, the JRC could foster the exchange of experience between food security practitioners from different regions of Africa, in particular western Africa and eastern and southern Africa through the organisation of scientific workshops or other events.

This collaboration will be further discussed and refined via email exchanges with the EC Delegation in Ouagadougou, with the CILSS and on the visit of the Director-General of the AGRHYMET Centre to JRC Ispra next February.

FAO

The FAO global programme (Component 2 of the FSTP) is expected to foster and facilitate the harmonisation and technical development processes necessary to achieve the FSTP's global objectives. Specifically for this programme, a number of measures will be put in place with functional links between the JRC and FAO so that activities supported by the JRC fully contribute to harmonisation and technical development. In particular, a MoU, or any suitable form of agreement, will be prepared to define clearly the respective responsibilities of the FAO and JRC in line with their mandates. This will cover all four aspects of the FAO programme, namely 1) Harmonisation, building on partnership, 2) Development and fine-tuning and dissemination of food security analysis methods, 3) Global learning facility, and 4) Communication.

1) Harmonisation, building on partnership

The JRC and FAO will interact on a number of activities, including: participation in annual workshops for sharing lessons; fostering harmonisation on specific food security issues, such as data and methods; contributing to online technical fora with moderated discussions; consultation with third partners for the prioritisation of thematic areas to be covered by the programme.

2) Development/fine-tuning and dissemination of food security analysis methods

This is the main thrust of the scientific and technical partnership between the FAO and JRC. The FAO and JRC will also collaborate with other partners — including projects — to develop new tools and methods to address gaps identified and agreed by programme stakeholders. The areas of analytical work will be determined through a demand-driven consultation process and will tentatively include the following, to be defined more precisely in the MoU or agreement mentioned above:

- acquisition, processing and dissemination of satellite, meteorological and agro-meteorological data,
- strengthening of the collaboration started more than one year ago on data sharing for well-defined products derived from satellite-based data and meteorological models (e.g. precipitation, temperature, evapotranspiration, etc., regularly uploaded to the GIEWS Workstation),
- implementation of the workstation at the JRC as discussed with FOOD-SEC (Agriculture Unit) to facilitate data sharing between the FAO and JRC, encourage the development of analytical tools based on a common platform and link JRC applications such as EMM for the collection of news,
- methods and tools for crop and rangeland/livestock monitoring and forecasting, including crop acreage estimation and crop report preparation,

- crop situation report production,
- participation in food security assessments as EC observers,
- specific studies and/or development of methodologies/systems to support food security assessments and analyses, including on food prices
- food security situation analysis, as one technical agency within the IPC initiative.

3) Global learning facility and 4) Communication

The technical contribution of the JRC to the FSTP will also be better disseminated and communicated through close collaboration with the FAO global programme, which will establish a global learning facility and put in place an articulated communication strategy. On these two aspects of partnership, more work is needed to define the precise form of activities. However, the following directions can tentatively be indicated (to be refined in the MoU/agreement):

- dissemination of jointly developed tools and methods, e.g. CPSZ, post-harvest loss database, etc.,
- scientific and technical contribution to the content of didactic material,
- delivery/organisation of training events, workshop in partnership,
- contribution to scientific networks/community on practice with universities and research centres,
- dissemination of key information on crop situation in selected countries,
- regular contribution to the multi-stakeholder website,
- joint peer-reviewed papers and other publications.

This collaboration will be further discussed and refined with the FAO and other actors within the Component in preparation of and during the international workshop in early 2009.

9.3. Risks and assumptions

Risks:

- Lack of capacity within the EU Delegation to the African Union or the African Union Commission itself to host a possible JRC expert. Consultation is needed within the JRC and with the Delegation and the African Union Commission to secure a more adequate posting arrangement.
- Deficient collaboration and coordination between the different partner institutions due to institutional tension in the FSTP Component.
- Weaknesses or gaps in national or regional food security information systems, security situation.

Mitigating measures:

- The first round of consultations with the EC Delegation to the African Union, the Africa Union and the JRC administrative service during the formulation period resulted in a positive signal for the seconding of a JRC expert to Addis-Ababa. Another option is secondment to Nairobi, where, in addition to operations for Kenya and Somalia, many regional activities for the Horn of Africa are coordinated.
- Two other main partners in FSTP Component 2, namely the FAO and CILSS, were consulted during the formulation phase, leading to i) confirmation of the schedule for preparation of the formal collaboration agreements (MoU or exchange of letters) and ii) orientations for the main themes of collaboration.

- All identified partners are already exchanging technical information on a regular basis, in particular as regards the IPC, the food security assessments and the crop monitoring activity.
- Flexibility of the programme to adapt to changing contexts and new requests.

Sustainability:

- The commitment of the JRC in the external aid sector, including with its own budget, the strategic agreement between the JRC and the RELEX family on food security, and the fact that the JRC is a service of the Commission ensure a high degree of sustainability of the initiative.

9.4. Cross-cutting issues

Development/cross-cutting objectives	Directly targeted objective	Significant indirect impact
Poverty reduction		X
Good governance	X	
Democracy, human rights		
Integration in world economy		
Environmental sustainability		X
Gender equality		
Conflict resolution/peace building		X

Gender: Particular attention will be given to vulnerable groups such as children under 5, pregnant women and lactating mothers in the following activities: IPC, food security assessments.

9.5. Stakeholders

At global level, key partners are first the other actors within FSTP Component 2, as indicated above. Other key stakeholders are the EC services involved in food security, i.e. AIDCO, DEV, ECHO and RELEX, with which constant exchanges are envisaged, to ensure full information as well as programme coherence and possibly to build more internal synergy. EC Delegations are essential partners and will be the point of reference for links with local governments and other partners. Permanent interaction with the Delegations is essential in order to define the programme details, monitor activities and keep them on track. Contacts with EU Member State representatives should be developed.

Key partners are also the other technical agencies involved in the development and/or use of food security information systems, for example the FAO, WFP, UNICEF, FEWS-NET, Save the Children UK & US, CARE, OXFAM and other NGOs. Links and exchanges should continue and be reinforced with FEWS-NET and related organisations in the USA, with increased joint actions, such as joint crop assessments for example. EU Member State services will become increasingly important partners, particularly in the light of the European Consensus on Development, the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action. Stronger ties should be developed with them.

In West Africa, the CILSS is the regional point of reference for food security, with its specialised AGRHYMET Centre in the field of satellite information and crop monitoring and forecasting.

In Southern Africa, a similar role is played by SADC and its regional Remote Sensing Unit. The regional Vulnerability Assessment Committee is also a key partner. In both regions, national structures, such as the VACs in the SADC region, already exist for the monitoring and assessment of the national food security situation. The African Union is a prominent stakeholder at continental level, because of both the food security aspect of the CAADP and the AU-EU partnership and the specific existing JRC cooperation with the AUC. The programme presented envisages the secondment of one JRC expert either to the AUC or to the EC Delegation to the AU.

In the Horn and Central Africa, key stakeholders are the national ministries or entities in charge of, or contributing to, national food security information systems, such as Food Security or Early Warning Units, Ministries of Agriculture, Meteorological Departments or Statistical Agencies, to name but a few. National research institutions as well as universities may also be involved in food security matters. IGAD, in spite of its structural weaknesses and ineffectiveness in accomplishing its mandate for food security, is still an important point of reference in the region. IGAD or the specialised regional technical institutions, such as ICPAC, will be involved where appropriate in joint actions and invited to any workshops and training sessions organised. Other key partners in the region are the food security information system projects such as SIFSIA in Sudan, FSIS in Ethiopia, FSAU and SWALIM in Kenya (for Somalia). Cooperation with these projects is central to the programme. Local teams of the FAO, WFP, FEWS-NET, and NGOs active in food security are important partners.

10. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

10.1. Method of implementation

Direct Centralised Management: Under direct centralised management of the funds, in accordance with the MoU signed on 26 May 2005, and revised in May 2007, between the RELEX family³⁸ and the JRC, the JRC will implement the project through an Administrative Arrangement. The JRC has strong expertise in remote sensing, data processing and analysis, mapping information dealing with food security and rural development, food security analysis and classification, and food security assessments, vulnerability and indicators. The JRC's mission is to provide customer-driven scientific and technical support for the conception, development, implementation and monitoring of Community policies. As a service of the European Commission, the JRC functions as a science and technology reference centre for the Community. Close to the policy-making process, it serves the common interest of the Member States, while remaining independent of commercial or national interests. In accordance with the JRC mission statement, the JRC/MARS-FOOD (now FOOD-SEC) Action has been providing technical and scientific support for EC food security and food aid policy since 2001. This support was extended at the end of 2005 by the signature of a JRC-AIDCO Administrative Arrangement, 'Technical support for Horn of Africa food security information systems and assessments', due to end on 31 December 2009. This Administrative Arrangement is to be extended again.

³⁸

DG RELEX, DG DEV, EUROPAID, DG TRADE, DG ELARG, DG ECHO.

10.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

All contracts for implementing the action must be awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents laid down and published by the Commission for the implementation of external operations, in force at the time of the launch of the procedure in question.

10.3. Budget and timetable

The resources allocated to this programme are € million. The envisaged operational period of the programme is 60 months, with the tentative starting date being 1 October 2009. An indicative breakdown is given below:

Indicative budget breakdown	Amount in euros
Technical assistance (staff)	2 450 000
Studies, surveys	500 000
Data acquisition and pre-processing	550 000
Missions	700 000
Training, seminar and workshops (incl. invitation of experts)	300 000
Visibility and dissemination of information	90 000
Offices, small equipment and consumables for seconded expert	60 000
Evaluation	150 000
Audit	80 000
Contingencies	120 000
Total	5 000 000

10.4. Performance monitoring

Programme monitoring and reporting will be based on a logical framework. A draft logical framework is given in the annex. Reporting to AIDCO will consist of:

- Annual reports will be prepared by the JRC covering the activities under the programme and sent to relevant AIDCO services.
- Reports written by international consultants/contractors (inception report, final report) will be sent to relevant AIDCO services.
- Field mission reports will be prepared by the JRC and sent to relevant AIDCO services and European Commission Delegations.

During the Identification Phase, no EuropeAid Standard Indicators were found to be suitable as key indicators for measuring progress. Specific key indicators were therefore identified: see the draft logical framework in the annex. There will be coordination and planning with the other actors within FSTP Component 2 during annual stakeholder meetings. Annual work plans will be shared and discussed. In addition, yearly steering meetings will be held with the AIDCO services in charge of the project and other EC services concerned.

10.5. Evaluation and audit

A mid-term review of the programme will be undertaken early in the third year of implementation to assess the implementation of activities and to determine whether any adaptations are needed. External assistance can be requested. Provision is made for final evaluation and audit. The Commission will undertake any technical or financial evaluations, controls, and audits it may consider necessary.

10.6. Communication and visibility

Communication and visibility activities will be carried out in accordance with the Communication and Visibility Manual for External Actions of April 2008. Programme communication will contribute to the overall communication strategy coordinated by the FAO global component, such as regular contributions to the multi-stakeholder website, production of joint peer-reviewed papers and other publications, and contributions to other communication and visibility material. The JRC will also improve and expand the FOODSEC website. The site will give more visible access to the crop situation reports and the scientific and technical material developed. Other activities will be carried out according to needs, including EC press releases when relevant.

ACTION FICHE FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
STRATEGIC PRIORITY 2: LINKING INFORMATION AND DECISION-MAKING TO IMPROVE FOOD
SECURITY RESPONSE STRATEGIES
‘INFORMATION SYSTEMS TO IMPROVE FOOD SECURITY
DECISION-MAKING IN THE ENP-EAST AREA’

1. IDENTIFICATION

Title/Number	Information systems to improve food security decision making in the ENP-East region <i>CRIS: DCI-FOOD 2009/021-061</i>		
Total cost	€3.0 million EC Contribution: €3.0 million		
Aid method	Project approach – Joint Management		
DAC-code	52010	Sector	Food Security

2. RATIONALE**2.1. Sector context**

Although economic conditions and population welfare in the ENP East countries have generally improved over the past decade, poverty remains a persistent phenomenon. The progress with the transition in the rural economy has also been uneven, and the statistical information systems are still adjusting. Various types of crisis have plagued countries in the region over the past few years (droughts, conflicts, political instability, etc.), which have exposed the inability of existing information systems not only to respond to such crises but also to address structural problems that jeopardise food security.

In Moldova, problems have been compounded by a severe drought requiring emergency assistance. In Azerbaijan, internally displaced persons (IDPs) are a group whose food security (FS) situation is particularly worrisome. In Armenia, the need to consolidate agricultural information systems and improve their ability to inform policymakers is a priority. In Georgia, events such as the August war and increased food prices have highlighted the need for specific intervention.

In all countries, food security information (FSI) needs to be significantly improved while the links between the production and use of statistical information are often weak. Although the exact mechanisms and solutions may differ, there is wide consensus among stakeholders that addressing food security issues in an effective manner requires that:

- the capacity of local institutions in agricultural and FSI statistics is developed;
- the tools and information systems required to quantify and characterise the food security situation are reinforced (surveys, agricultural censuses, early warning systems, etc.);
- the determinants and drivers of food insecurity are better understood;
- the link between users and producers of information is strengthened.

2.2. Lessons learned

The present Programme builds upon the ongoing partnership between the European Commission and FAO, in particular the European Commission/FAO Food Security Information for Action Programme (FSIA), which was reviewed in September 2007. The mid-term review (MTR) recommended continuation of the Programme, noting that some of

the tools developed were breaking new ground and that the Programme was ready to be expanded beyond its current coverage.

On the other hand, the MTR stressed that results were mixed because of poor country commitment and ownership due to the approach of the Programme, which tended to be supply-driven. The present Programme largely builds on the recommendations of the MTR and on lessons learnt from previous EC-funded FSI programmes. Also, it acknowledges the need to (a) focus on the specific FSI needs of ENP-East countries and (b) take into account the need for coordination and the great potential for synergy with the global component. In particular, the Programme proposes to:

- Foster a more result-oriented approach to serve countries on the basis of a **demand-driven approach**;
- **Develop food security analytical methods** in partnership with national stakeholders on the basis of a joint definition of priorities;
- **Strengthen the focus on the policy process**, starting from an analysis of the decision-making process, its institutional setup and information needs;

2.3. Complementary actions

The present Programme has been designed to achieve the objectives of Component 2 of the Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP) in the ENP-East group of countries. It has been developed in close coordination with the global component (financed under FSTP 2008), which aims to **improve and harmonise methods of analysis to support decision-making leading to comparable and compatible information**. The Programme will benefit from technical synergies with the global component, with which it will share administrative support, technical tools, communication strategies and any aspect where synergy opportunities are identified.

Synergies will also be fostered with current EC-funded programmes. For example, food security programmes (FSPs) in Georgia and Armenia have contributed to establishing Food Security Observatories, which could constitute one of the main targets for training activities in order to enhance FSI.

In Azerbaijan, the EC is now launching a three-year *Agricultural and Rural Development Support Programme*. An identification exercise was carried out to sketch the outlines of this programme, and the introduction of an early warning system (EWS), crop monitoring tools and/or GIS for land tenure has been envisaged with a view to stabilising food availability and supply in the country.

Moreover, DG ECHO has earmarked €2m (in the budget for 2009) for an EWS Programme in the Caucasus and is now launching a feasibility study. This Programme (DIPECHO) will help reduce the risks associated with natural disasters in the Caucasus, given the frequency with which they occur and the extent to which they hamper the development of these countries.

2.4. Donor coordination

The Programme will contribute to the rationalisation and harmonisation of FS initiatives in the participating ENP-East countries, including those implemented by other international organisations. In accordance with the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action on Aid Effectiveness, the Programme will remain open to multi-donor support as well as to multi-partner implementation and governance mechanisms.

3. DESCRIPTION

The Programme's activities will be of both a **normative and operational nature, with a strong emphasis on capacity development among individuals and institutions in participating countries**. While the programme will help participating countries to produce the information, tools and analyses they demand, it will also strive to make sure these are applied to actual policies and programmes that are being implemented.

The following institutions have been identified as the main national partners in each country:

- § Armenia: Ministry of Agriculture (with the Department of Statistics and others);
- § Azerbaijan: An official reply has not been received but the likely candidate is the Ministry of Agriculture;
- § Georgia: Department of Statistics (with the Ministry of Agriculture);
- § Moldova: Ministry of Agriculture and Department of Statistics.

While much ground has been covered in terms of coordinated formulation and consultation in the development of the present 'fiche', the **process of selecting specific country activities and thematic prioritisation** will continue during the programme inception phase, based on joint analyses of gaps and opportunities. This will include:

- An in-depth tripartite (participating countries, European Commission, FAO) identification of country priorities, detailing specific activities and country work programmes;
- Finalisation of an annual results-oriented work plan on the basis of national and steering committee (SC) recommendations;
- Preparation of MoUs with partners for implementing activities, when appropriate.

The technical assistance (TA) envisaged for the project include: (a) an international expert based at FAO Headquarters, who will ensure programme coordination, coordination of FAO inputs, technical backstopping of country activities, technical secretariat work for the SC (the programme will only contribute two-thirds of the cost of this expert); and (b) four regional experts (one per country) to ensure continuity in the provision of TA and training.

Long-term technical assistance will have a major role in the implementation of the programme. A careful combination of local expertise, international consultancies and the FAO's own experts will be used so as to maximise impact in the most cost-effective way.

Accordingly, a final job description for all the TA personnel to be recruited will have to be developed during the inception phase by the partner governments (PGs), with the assistance of the European Commission Delegation and FAO, but draft Terms of Reference are attached to this document. Building on its experience in the field of FSIS, the FAO will guarantee an optimal length, quality and organisation of training activities.

At country level, a small Coordination Team (CT) will be established. The CTs will include a representative of each participating country, the EC Delegation and the long-term TA expert selected by the FAO. The role of the CT will be to (a) ensure the coordination of actions at ENP-East level, (b) ensure smooth implementation of the programme, and (c) contribute to the selection of the best available TA personnel.

The global coordination of the programme, coherence of actions and streamlining of policies will be ensured by a Steering Committee (SC), which will meet twice a year (see section 4.1).

3.1. Objectives

The overall objective is to **improve the food security of the poorest and most vulnerable populations through improved decision-making and better targeted policy choices**.

Different specific objectives apply to each country. Nevertheless, the following objectives will apply across all countries:

1. Quality, timeliness, analysis and dissemination of agricultural and FSI statistics to be improved.
2. The capacity of local institutions to produce good quality, timely and relevant FSI and information products to be reinforced.
3. Links between the production and use of FSI for policy-making to be strengthened.

These objectives will be achieved through country-based activities to be jointly identified with partner institutions. After close consultation with partner governments and European Commission Delegations, the following action areas have been chosen (subject to final endorsement from PGs during the inception phase, see section 4.1):

Armenia

1. *GIEWS Workstation*: Consolidation and follow-up upon successful implementation of the GIEWS workstation

Expected result: GIEWS workstation increasingly used by government and other stakeholders for analysis and decision-making; Capacity of local staff developed so that they are able to use the tools without further external assistance.

2. *Technical assistance in the preparation of the Agricultural Census*

Expected result: Census successfully completed. Analysis of census data started.

3. *Technical assistance for the establishment of an animal registration system*

Expected result: Institutional capacity of the animal registration system developed to ensure a reliable database with the numbering and certification of all farm livestock.

Azerbaijan (the Azerbaijan government has not yet selected activities to be implemented, so the following activity could be subject to change during the inception phase)

Improvement in the collection, analysis and dissemination of agricultural, crop and food security information for policy-making and early warning.

Expected results: Improved quality and analysis of the agricultural and cropping information collected; production of regular crop monitoring and/or early warning information/bulletins; institutional and individual capacity strengthened in performing the above tasks.

Georgia

Technical assistance in the preparation of the Agricultural Census and Agricultural Survey

Expected result: Census successfully completed. Analysis of census data started. Progress made during previous period with agricultural survey consolidated, survey further improved.

Moldova

1. *Technical assistance in the preparation of the Agricultural Census*

Expected result: Census successfully completed. Analysis of census data started.

2. *TA in the collection, analysis and dissemination of data for a study of migration and food security in rural areas.*

Expected results: Dataset collected and analysed. Policy recommendations made.

3. *TA for the collection, analysis and dissemination of agricultural, crop and food security information for policy-making and early warning.*

Expected results: Improved quality and analysis of the agricultural and cropping information collected; production of regular crop monitoring and/or early warning information/bulletins; institutional and individual capacity for performing the above tasks strengthened.

3.2. Risks and assumptions

The programme is designed assuming an existing political commitment to tackle food insecurity and improve the policy environment. The main risk is that this commitment could be weakened by other priorities. To avoid this, the Programme will invest in advocacy initiatives on the importance of prioritising FS for poverty reduction.

An additional risk is that the Agricultural Census preparation activities, where planned, will be conditional on the Agricultural Census being formally approved by countries and the funding becoming available. Should the prospects of actually holding the Census become less certain, the funds will be swiftly reallocated to other priorities to be identified with the countries.

3.3. Cross-cutting issues

The present Programme addresses gender issues through the development of FS analysis methods providing a disaggregation by gender. Moreover, the Programme will incorporate analyses addressing climate change and environmental management.

3.4. Stakeholders

The principal stakeholders are national organisations that will use FSI and policy assistance provided by this Programme, and those that will benefit directly from its capacity development efforts. With few exceptions, most of these stakeholders have also been partners of the FSIA and traditional partners for previous EC-funded FS programmes at country level.

Nevertheless, the final beneficiaries of this Programme are those populations in the participating countries suffering from temporary or chronic food insecurity.

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Method of implementation

The action will be implemented in joint management with the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), through the signing of a Contribution Agreement.

The existing familiarity of FAO with three of the four countries identified for actions under this programme (reinforced under the FSIA) will allow start-up costs to be contained. The identification of capacity development needs and operational approaches will also be simplified thanks to continuity with the FSIA.

The final list of activities will be selected by Coordination Teams (CTs). At the outset of the programme, each CT will be composed of the representative of the partner government (PG) and a staff member from the EC European Commission Delegation. They will be assisted by the Programme coordinator based at FAO Headquarters to select the long-term technical assistant.

The long-term expert will sit on the CT, so it is fundamental that the choice of expert corresponds to local needs. Accordingly, PGs will always retain the possibility to ask for replacement of the expert if deemed necessary. This is in line with the new *EuropeAid Guidance on Technical Cooperation* and will ensure flexibility, better quality of technical assistance and enhanced ownership and participation by PGs.

Once the Coordination Team is formed, it will assist FAO in producing an inception report, to include an institutional capacity assessment, planned activities and expected results (including objectively verifiable indicators).

The coordination of the ENP-East Programme will rely on FAO, which will establish appropriate links with other relevant offices or activities of international organisations.

The Steering Committee will be chaired by the European Commission and will be the main oversight mechanism for the Programme. It will meet twice a year, at different locations so as to facilitate stakeholder participation. Its composition will be as follows:

- a) the international expert based at FAO Headquarters
- b) one representative of the European Commission
- c) one member for each Coordination Team

Three reports will be issued by FAO in close consultation with PGs, CTs and the SC: an inception report, a mid-term report (MTR) and a final report. The MTR will present an evaluation of major programme results, shortcomings and lessons learnt, and will be used to adjust subsequent programme activities.

4.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

All contracts for implementing activities under the programme will be awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents provided by the international organisation concerned.

4.3. Budget and timetable

The Programme has an implementation period of 3 years. The indicative budget is as follows:

No	Activities	Budget in €	% of total
1	Armenia	670 000	24
2	Azerbaijan	350 000	12
3	Georgia	670 000	24
4	Moldova	670 000	24
5	Technical and admin support	370 000	13
6	Communication	43 739	2
7	Evaluation	30 000	1
	Sub-total, costs of project activities	2 803 739	
	Indirect support costs (7 %)	196 261	7
TOTAL		3 000 000	100

The administration of this Programme will rely on synergies with the Global Programme, so no specific secretarial and budget administrative post will be created.

4.4. Performance monitoring

The Programme will be closely monitored on the basis of key indicators listed in the log-frame matrix. A performance assessment matrix will also be prepared on a yearly basis to allow the SC to assess the progress of the Programme, with emphasis on the results achieved.

External monitoring missions from both European Commission HQs and EC Delegations with a regional mandate will be considered as complementary actions.

4.5. Evaluation and audit

The programme will undergo a mid-term review as well as a final evaluation. Audits will be carried out by the international organisation implementing the Programme. The European Commission shall be invited to participate in the main monitoring exercise and in the evaluation missions relating to the performance of the action. This is without prejudice to any evaluation mission that the European Commission as donor may wish to perform.

4.6. Communication and visibility

A communication and visibility strategy aimed at selected audiences will be developed as a component of the Global Programme. The same will be done for the present Programme, adapted as necessary to the specific needs of the countries and regions so as to ensure the visibility of EC funding. This will generate additional cost and efficiency savings.

**FICHE D'ACTION POUR LE PROGRAMME THEMATIQUE DE SECURITE ALIMENTAIRE –
PRIORITE STRATEGIQUE N°3: EXPLOITATION DU POTENTIEL DES APPROCHES
CONTINENTALES ET REGIONALES POUR AMELIORER LA SECURITE ALIMENTAIRE: «PLATE-
FORME POUR LE DEVELOPPEMENT RURAL ET LA SECURITE ALIMENTAIRE EN AFRIQUE DE
L'OUEST ET DU CENTRE»**

1 IDENTIFICATION

Intitulé/Numéro	Plate-forme pour le développement rural et la sécurité alimentaire en Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre – Le HUB. <i>CRIS DCI-FOOD 2009/199-927</i>		
Coût total	<i>Contribution de la CE: 3 500 000 euros</i> <i>Cofinancements (parallèle):</i> FIDA1 014 000 euros MAEE1 500 000 euros BM410 000 euros Total2 924 000 euros		
Méthode d'assistance / Mode de gestion	Approche projet / gestion conjointe à travers la signature d'un accord de contribution avec une organisation internationale (UNOPS)		
Code CAD	52010	Secteur	Sécurité alimentaire

11. MOTIF**11.1. Contexte sectoriel**

Faute de politiques et de stratégies définies et mises en œuvre de façon cohérente et concertée, les actions en faveur du secteur rural et de la lutte contre l'insécurité alimentaire en Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre sont souvent menées en ordre dispersé. L'application pratique des principes directeurs de la déclaration de Paris et le programme d'action d'Accra n'est pas «chose évidente». L'instrument que constituent les stratégies de réduction de la pauvreté (SRP) contribue à atténuer «théoriquement» ce diagnostic mais, dans la pratique, les allocations de ressources à ce secteur sont encore faibles et loin des 10% fixés par l'Union africaine à son sommet de Maputo. Par ailleurs, les probables trop faibles augmentations de l'APD à venir influenceront sur une plus grande efficacité de l'aide. Les gains d'efficacité ne sont pas mécaniques et requièrent des institutions novatrices appropriées.

Relever le défi du développement rural implique que des réformes politiques, économiques et sociales profondes doivent être formulées et mises en œuvre par ces pays avec la participation active de tous les acteurs locaux. L'échange d'informations, la concertation et l'instauration de partenariats entre les administrations nationales, les organisations d'intégration régionale, les organisations professionnelles et les partenaires extérieurs constituent de plus en plus un passage obligé pour l'élaboration et l'application des réformes à venir.

Les capacités techniques et l'expertise qualifiée disponibles en Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre restent limitées et insuffisamment structurées pour être en mesure d'accompagner et d'appuyer les processus de réforme et les très nombreuses étapes qu'ils nécessitent.

Ainsi, au début des années 2000, pour répondre à la demande d'acteurs régionaux, le FIDA, l'Union européenne, la Coopération française et l'UNIFEM ont-ils créé un instrument stratégique régional, la «Plate-forme pour le développement rural et la sécurité alimentaire en Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre» ou Hub rural, qu'ils ont doté d'une expertise de haut niveau pour, d'une part, faciliter un dialogue politique, coordonné et durable entre les bailleurs, les États membres, les organisations intergouvernementales (OIG) et les organisations de la société civile (OSC) en Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre et, d'autre part, aider ces différents acteurs à améliorer leurs processus de décision.

11.2. Enseignements tirés

L'évaluation réalisée en 2007 de la première phase de mise en œuvre du Hub rural a conclu que cette structure légère est en train de combler en partie et de façon progressive les déficits conceptuels dans l'élaboration (conception, mise en œuvre, suivi) des politiques, la coordination des acteurs, l'information et les liens entre recherche et développement.

Elle a également démontré que le Hub rural a su se positionner dans un environnement complexe et caractériser sa valeur ajoutée, qui provient principalement de sa connaissance fine, aux échelles régionale et nationale, des problématiques, des processus, des expériences et des acteurs. Elle se traduit par (i) une capacité à conseiller et proposer: de par la qualité de ses experts, le Hub délivre une assistance technique et méthodologique de haut niveau et dotée de méthodes d'intervention originales; (ii) une capacité à informer: le Hub rural est un centre de convergence de l'information qui lui permet de répondre aux demandes exprimées, de comparer et valoriser les expériences entre pays, voire de produire l'information qui manque aux acteurs nationaux ou régionaux; (iii) une capacité à mettre en synergie les interventions et faciliter le dialogue: le positionnement équidistant vis-à-vis des différents partenaires et la crédibilité du Hub rural se sont révélées des atouts indéniables pour promouvoir et appuyer les interrelations fonctionnelles entre les acteurs.

Par ailleurs, l'évaluation externe a mis en exergue que les actions du Hub rural sont appréciées et reconnues par ses différents bénéficiaires et partenaires. Au niveau régional, l'expertise du Hub rural a été sollicitée pour appuyer plusieurs processus. Par exemple, la CEDEAO a mandaté le Hub rural pour être son bras technique dans l'élaboration de la composante institutionnelle de son programme régional d'investissements agricoles (PRIA). La CEDEAO a également mandaté le Hub rural pour la mise en œuvre des deux activités «Renforcement de la compétitivité et diversité de l'offre des filières agricoles» et «Renforcement des capacités de préparation et de conduite des négociations internationales agricoles», qui relèvent de l'ECOWAP. Le Hub rural a en outre fourni, sur la base de demandes formelles, de l'expertise pour concevoir des projets régionaux: le projet d'appui à l'AAFEX (Association Afrique Agro Export) sur financement AFD; le projet CoP Horti (financement Banque mondiale, voir point 2.3). Il développe enfin, en partenariat, de nombreuses initiatives de portée régionale en mobilisant des financements spécifiques: élaboration de fiches pédagogiques sur le foncier, ateliers de simulation prospective collective sur les politiques foncières au Sahel, ateliers régionaux sur la préparation des négociations APE, élaboration du guide méthodologique pour les leaders du ROPPA en faveur de politiques réductrices d'inégalités.

Au niveau national, plusieurs pays ont adressé des demandes formelles au Hub rural pour qu'il les aide à développer des politiques d'une manière participative: au Mali, par exemple, le Hub rural a conduit les processus d'élaboration de deux feuilles de route pour la mise en œuvre des volets «foncier» et «développement du capital humain» de la loi d'orientation agricole. Au Burkina, le Hub rural appuie le ministère en charge de l'agriculture pour la mise en œuvre de la réforme foncière rurale et appuie la mise en œuvre du volet «formation» d'un programme financé par la Banque mondiale (mobilisation d'approches novatrices). Il accompagne le ministère sénégalais en charge de l'agriculture pour la conception de la

réforme foncière rurale, pour la capitalisation des actions conduites dans le cadre de sa stratégie nationale de formation agricole et rurale et pour sa contribution aux débats régionaux sur la négociation APE.

La valeur ajoutée spécifique du Hub rural est qu'il a su apporter, sur demande, une expertise intégrée permettant d'impliquer les parties prenantes dès le début des processus d'élaboration des politiques jusqu'à la mise en œuvre et au suivi (et non d'appeler, comme d'habitude, à un simple atelier de validation d'études et propositions formulées dans des logiques déconnectées des vraies contraintes socio-économiques).

11.3. Actions complémentaires

Les thèmes actuellement couverts par le Hub rural et validés par son comité directeur portent sur 1) l'analyse des processus de définition et de mise en œuvre des politiques agricoles, 2) le développement du capital humain pour le développement agricole et rural, 3) les politiques de sécurisation foncière, 4) les marchés, la compétitivité et les négociations commerciales internationales. La sécurité alimentaire est directement abordée dans le thème 1 et indirectement dans les thèmes 2 et 3.

Des liens étroits de coopération se sont tissés avec les OIG, particulièrement la CEDEAO, l'UEMOA et la CEMAC. Les deux premières contribuent désormais au financement du Hub rural, preuve de l'intérêt essentiel que ces deux structures lui portent. Le Hub rural et la CEDEAO ont établi une forte collaboration (cf. les exemples cités au point 2.2) dans le cadre du processus de mise en œuvre de la politique régionale ECOWAP-PDDAA (NEPAD).

Le Hub rural bénéficie aussi d'une subvention (2008) de la Banque mondiale de 410 000 euros pour le développement d'une plate-forme web régionale visant à promouvoir une communauté d'échanges de bonnes pratiques pour les producteurs et les exportateurs de produits horticoles (CoP Horti).

La Fondation des Nations Unies a octroyé au Hub rural une subvention (2008) d'un montant de 101 000 euros pour la réalisation d'une étude sur les conditions qui permettraient de définir des politiques publiques pour les biocarburants dans les pays membres de la zone UEMOA.

Le Hub rural et 3 partenaires dont le ROPPA ont également obtenu de l'AFD en 2008 une subvention de 150 000 euros pour la conception de fiches pédagogiques sur les questions clés de la problématique foncière en Afrique de l'Ouest.

Le Hub rural vient de bénéficier d'un «Small grant» de 137 000 euros dans le cadre de son partenariat avec le FIDA pour la réalisation de ses activités prévues durant la période transitoire. La contribution du FIDA pour la phase II du Hub rural se chiffre ainsi à 1 014 000 euros.

L'Union européenne, l'UNIFEM, le FIDA ont contribué au financement de la phase pilote pour des montants respectifs de 1 950 000, 102 000 et 820 000 euros. Le ministère français des affaires étrangères et européennes (MAEE) a pris en charge la rémunération de deux experts pour une durée de 4 ans. Le Hub rural a par ailleurs bénéficié d'une subvention du MAEE de 678 000 euros pour ses frais de fonctionnement et la réalisation de ses activités au cours de la première phase.

11.4. Coordination des bailleurs de fonds

En tant que membres de son comité directeur, une grande diversité de partenaires sont impliqués dans l'appui à la maîtrise d'ouvrage fourni par le Hub rural, notamment des centres de recherche (CIRDES, CORAF, IFPRI), OIG (CMA/AOC, CEDEAO, CEMAC, CEEAC, UEMOA, CILSS), OSC (ROPPA, RECAO, PROPAC) et des donateurs (FIDA, UE, Coopération française, UNIFEM). Le comité directeur joue un rôle essentiel d'orientation des

activités du Hub rural: choix des thématiques à développer, validation des méthodes de travail, etc. Ce mode de gouvernance assure avec efficacité une coordination globale des interventions du Hub rural.

En outre, sur chacun des thèmes qu'il traite, et grâce à l'ensemble des connexions qu'il établit avec de nombreux partenaires, le Hub rural se positionne comme un maillon essentiel du réseau des acteurs des politiques de développement rural de la région. Cette position lui permet de jouer un rôle actif dans la mise en synergie des programmes de ses partenaires. Le Hub rural a ainsi été déterminant dans le «rapprochement» de nombreuses structures ou programmes. Ceci se manifeste aujourd'hui par les sollicitations fréquentes du Hub rural pour contribuer à la préparation de rencontres techniques au niveau régional.

Le Hub rural phase II aura également pour objectif l'élargissement de ses partenariats et le développement d'une coopération étroite avec la Plate-forme des partenaires au développement rural (GDPRD). Le Hub réalise déjà pour le compte de la GDPRD et sur incitation de l'Union européenne une étude régionale sur le rôle des OSC dans la gestion de l'aide affectée au développement rural. Le Hub rural a défini un cadre de coopération avec cette institution. Ce mode de coordination est essentiel pour l'avenir, notamment dans le cadre d'initiatives telles que celles du GISA. Des modes de coordination performants et novateurs doivent rapidement se mettre en place à tous les niveaux, notamment aux niveaux sous-régionaux. Le Hub rural y contribuera conformément à son mandat.

12. DESCRIPTION

12.1. Objectifs

Conformément aux objectifs régionaux de réduction de la pauvreté en milieu rural et de réalisation de la sécurité alimentaire, le Hub rural vise à améliorer la cohérence et l'efficacité des politiques et programmes menés en direction du monde rural.

Les objectifs spécifiques, que le Hub rural s'efforcera d'atteindre au terme de la phase II, sont les suivants:

- 1) améliorer les conditions et capacités de dialogue et de coordination des acteurs régionaux et nationaux sur les thèmes d'intervention du Hub rural, en renforçant et élargissant son expertise pour permettre la prise en charge des défis et thèmes suivants: (i) impact du changement climatique sur la pauvreté rurale et la sécurité alimentaire; (ii) bioénergies et développement rural; (iii) financement du développement agricole et rural;
- 2) promouvoir une demande pertinente et structurée de la part des différents acteurs et partenaires et améliorer la couverture géographique du Hub rural;
- 3) répondre de façon efficace et efficiente aux demandes d'appui en information, en expertise méthodologique et en construction du dialogue entre acteurs sur les thématiques et dans les pays couverts;
- 4) pérennisation institutionnelle du Hub rural par la réalisation d'un ancrage institutionnel au sein des institutions régionales compétentes. Pour atteindre cet objectif spécifique, dès la première année du projet proposé, le Hub rural engagera une étude concernant le renforcement de sa structure organisationnelle, ainsi que la mise en œuvre de mesures pour améliorer l'efficacité de sa gestion. L'étude identifiera une stratégie et des démarches appropriées visant l'institutionnalisation et pérennisation du Hub rural. Cette étude, y compris son programme de mise en œuvre, sera soumise au comité directeur (CD) pour approbation. La mise en œuvre de ce programme sera entamée dès son

approbation et constituera un élément essentiel du programme global de travail du Hub rural.

La prise en compte de la dimension du genre constituera un thème transversal du champ d'activités du Hub rural.

12.2. Résultats escomptés et principales activités

Les **principaux résultats** attendus découlant des objectifs déterminés se résument comme suit:

- a) les capacités des acteurs à développer et influencer les politiques et programmes sont renforcées;
- b) des synergies entre acteurs travaillant sur les mêmes thèmes sont créées;
- c) tous les acteurs bénéficient d'un accès facilité à une information pertinente, structurée et d'actualité sur chacun des thèmes;
- d) les différentes catégories d'acteurs reçoivent une information pertinente et interagissent grâce aux outils mis en place par le Hub rural;
- e) les différentes catégories d'acteurs sollicitent l'expertise du Hub rural en appui à la maîtrise d'ouvrage de leurs politiques et programmes;
- f) la zone géographique d'intervention du Hub rural est étendue;
- g) les conseils et appuis fournis pour la définition, la mise en œuvre et l'évaluation des politiques et programmes sont pris en compte: élaboration participative de politiques et programmes révisés favorables aux acteurs ruraux pauvres, adaptation des méthodologies de mise en œuvre et d'évaluation des politiques et programmes;
- h) les synergies et complémentarités entre les politiques et programmes formulés et mis en œuvre aux niveaux national et régional sont renforcées;
- i) la structure d'organisation du Hub est renforcée et l'efficacité de sa gestion améliorée. Une stratégie de pérennisation institutionnelle du Hub rural est identifiée, approuvée et mise en œuvre.

Les activités déployées se fondent sur les demandes formulées par les partenaires nationaux et régionaux (dans le cadre des objectifs poursuivis). Elles peuvent également provenir d'initiatives du Hub rural sur la base de son analyse des besoins des acteurs. Les **principales activités** qui seront menées pour atteindre les résultats escomptés sont:

- recrutement de 3 experts de haut niveau sur les 3 nouvelles thématiques
- collecte, traitement et diffusion d'informations pertinentes, structurées et accessibles aux acteurs
- production d'informations pertinentes répondant à des besoins préalablement identifiés
- collaboration avec des centres de formation et de recherche pour la coproduction d'outils pédagogiques et méthodologiques
- organisation de séminaires d'échanges et d'espaces de dialogue politiques
- mise en place et animation de communautés de pratiques (plates-formes web)
- actions en faveur d'une meilleure valorisation des résultats de la recherche dans les pratiques de développement
- mise à disposition d'acteurs de l'information et de documents pertinents
- capitalisation continue des activités du Hub rural et promotion, auprès des catégories d'acteurs bénéficiaires, de l'existence et des activités du Hub rural

- repérage des acteurs bénéficiaires
- analyse des besoins d'appui à la maîtrise d'ouvrage des institutions ayant formulé une demande
- élaboration des cadres d'intervention thématiques du Hub rural validés par le comité directeur
- fourniture d'appuis à la maîtrise d'ouvrage, sur demande, aux pays, OIG, OSC, et aux partenaires extérieurs, en matière de formulation, de mise en œuvre ou d'évaluation des politiques et programmes
- co-organisation, sur demande, de dialogues inclusifs (promotion de la participation des acteurs de la société civile), informés et équilibrés sur les politiques et programmes
- réalisation d'une étude concernant le renforcement de la structure d'organisation du Hub rural. Mise en œuvre des mesures pour améliorer l'efficacité de sa gestion. Identification et mise en œuvre d'un programme de travail pour la pérennisation institutionnelle du Hub rural.

12.3. Risques et hypothèses

Dans la mesure où le Hub rural vise à améliorer la coordination des acteurs et à renforcer la cohérence des politiques et actions de développement, son impact dépendra de la volonté des parties prenantes, à savoir les bailleurs de fonds, les OIG, les gouvernements et les OSC, de partager l'information, d'apprendre à partir d'autres expériences et de collaborer entre elles.

La bonne exécution de la phase II sera également tributaire de la capacité du Hub rural à élargir le cercle de ses partenaires financiers bilatéraux et multilatéraux. La pérennité du Hub rural s'inscrit dans une prise en charge à moyen terme par les OIG de la région. Dans ce contexte, la rémunération des prestations de services effectuées par la structure sera un mode de financement à expérimenter au cours de la phase II. La CEDEAO et l'UEMOA, par les lettres d'appui au Hub qu'elles ont adressées à la CE, ont manifesté leur niveau d'appropriation de la structure du Hub rural. L'UEMOA a apporté une subvention de 80 000 euros pour la phase transitoire (fin de la phase I) du Hub rural en août 2008 et la CEDEAO y a contribué aussi en décembre 2008.

12.4. Questions transversales

La mise en œuvre des activités (information, conseil, espaces de dialogue) permet d'appliquer les principes de la déclaration de Paris et du programme d'action d'Accra relatifs à la responsabilité partagée et à l'appropriation. La fonction d'expertise-conseil assumée par le Hub rural vient généralement en appui à la maîtrise d'ouvrage assurée par l'institution demandeuse. Ceci est illustré par l'exemple d'une demande du gouvernement malien visant à «mettre en œuvre le volet foncier de la LOA (loi d'orientation agricole)». Le Hub rural a fait valoir deux types de compétences en vue de suppléer à une faiblesse institutionnelle:

- la mise en œuvre de la dimension foncière de la LOA est par essence le fruit d'une concertation entre acteurs. Le Hub rural, en retravaillant avec le gouvernement malien sa demande, lui a permis de s'engager vers un processus de nature différente: il a aidé le gouvernement malien et les autres acteurs concernés (organisations paysannes notamment) à élaborer une méthodologie participative et globale du volet foncier de la LOA. Cette méthodologie, validée par l'ensemble des acteurs, englobe différents recours à de l'expertise privée pour réaliser les tâches initialement confiées au Hub rural;
- la dynamique institutionnelle enclenchée a été facilitée par l'originalité du positionnement du Hub rural qui repose sur trois caractéristiques: une expertise avérée accompagnée

d'une connaissance des différentes situations nationales de la région, une position équidistante et un regard considéré comme externe.

Les principes de bonne gouvernance sont intégrés dans les activités du Hub rural, notamment à travers l'implication des OSC dans les exercices de définition des programmes de travail et d'évaluation des activités menées.

La prise en compte de la dimension du genre sera faite par un effort de dissémination des analyses portant sur les questions de genre et d'équité en milieu rural au niveau régional, ainsi que sur une évaluation de l'intégration de ces questions dans les programmes de développement rural. Le Hub rural vient de finaliser (novembre 2008) avec l'UNIFEM un accord en vue de définir et de mettre en œuvre une stratégie de protection des productrices rurales face à la hausse des prix des produits alimentaires.

Le Hub rural intégrera la dimension environnementale par la prise en charge de la thématique «Impact du changement climatique sur la pauvreté rurale et la sécurité alimentaire». Cette thématique sera fortement promue par l'organisation d'un dialogue politique approprié.

12.5. Parties prenantes

Les groupes bénéficiaires des actions du Hub rural se situent à trois niveaux: au niveau national, ce sont les gouvernements et les organisations de la société civile des pays de la région; au niveau régional, les organisations intergouvernementales et les organisations de la société civile régionales; au plan international, ce sont les partenaires bilatéraux et multilatéraux associés ou non au Hub rural. Pour atteindre ses objectifs, le Hub rural développe de nombreux liens fonctionnels avec une grande diversité d'institutions spécialisés dans la recherche et le développement: regroupements internationaux d'organisations de la société civile, structures de recherche, organismes spécialisés des Nations-Unies.

Une grande diversité de partenaires est impliquée dans le pilotage du Hub rural à travers le comité directeur (cf. point 2.4).

13. QUESTIONS DE MISE EN ŒUVRE

13.1. Mode de gestion

Gestion conjointe via la signature d'un accord de contribution avec une organisation internationale [UNOPS – United Nations Office for Project services]. L'UNOPS a été reconduit de la phase pilote en tant qu'institution gestionnaire du projet. Un manuel d'opérations a été préparé pour mettre en place les règles et réglementations administratives et financières. En vue d'améliorer les mécanismes de gestion et de pilotage, conformément aux recommandations du rapport d'évaluation, il sera commandité une étude (sur une partie des ressources allouées) dont les conclusions seront présentées au comité directeur pour approbation.

UNOPS adheres as a UN organisation to the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) of 29 April 2003, between the European Community and the United Nations, which governs all contribution-specific agreements signed between the parties after the date hereof, unless otherwise agreed in exceptional circumstances. The "General Conditions applicable to European Community contribution agreements with international organisations" apply.

Le cadre juridique sous lequel cet accord de contribution sera signé est régi par le règlement (CE) n° 1905/2006 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 18 décembre 2006 portant établissement d'un instrument de financement de la coopération au développement.

13.2. Procédures de passation de marchés et d'octroi de subventions

Tous les contrats mettant en œuvre l'action doivent être attribués et exécutés conformément aux procédures et aux documents standard établis et publiés par l'organisation internationale concernée.

13.3. Budget et calendrier

Libellé	Années 1 à 5
INVESTISSEMENTS (véhicules et équipement)	130 000
COUTS OPERATIONNELS	820 000
Personnel local	240 000
Fonctionnement du bureau (véhicules, location bureaux, consommables, appui administratif, autres services)	335 000
Gestion de l'information, développement et maintenance de plates-formes web	150 000
Voyages et frais de mission	75 000
Comité directeur	20 000
ASSISTANCE TECHNIQUE	2 240 000
Honoraires professionnels et AT long terme ³⁹	1 896 000
Appui aux programmes régionaux (études, enquêtes, formations, ateliers)	344 000
SUIVI, ÉVALUATION, AUDIT	50 000
IMPRÉVUS	60 000
Sous-total	3 300 000
Frais de gestion UNOPS	200 000
GRAND TOTAL	3 500 000

Le niveau de contribution des autres partenaires pour la phase II du Hub rural s'élève à environ 2,9 millions d'euros. Des négociations sont en cours avec la CEDEAO et l'UEMOA afin d'obtenir des contributions budgétaires régulières.

La durée opérationnelle de l'action prévue est de 60 mois à compter de la date de signature de l'accord de contribution.

13.4. Suivi de l'exécution

Le Hub rural est géré par 3 entités administratives différentes et complémentaires.

³⁹ Cette rubrique comprend la prise en charge du directeur exécutif et de trois experts sur cinq ans, étant entendu que les cinq autres experts seront pris en charge par les autres contributeurs. Cette rubrique, compte tenu du rôle du Hub, est en réalité un investissement.

La première est le comité directeur (CD) où sont représentés sur une base égale l'ensemble des partenaires. Il approuve les statuts, les procédures et réglementations, le plan de travail et le budget annuel du Hub rural, la supervision générale, les rapports d'évaluation et d'audit. Il est dirigé par un président élu. Le CD du Hub rural se réunit au moins 2 fois par an. Le directeur exécutif du Hub rural agit en tant que secrétaire du CD.

La deuxième entité est l'unité technique (UT) qui est responsable de la conduite des activités. Elle est composée de 4 à 7 experts de haut niveau (responsable chacun d'un thème de développement précis) et dirigée par le directeur exécutif (DE).

La troisième entité est l'UNOPS qui joue un double rôle au niveau du Hub rural en tant qu'agence d'exécution du Hub et fournisseur de services. Le Hub rural est un projet exécuté par l'UNOPS depuis 2004. Un accord a été établi avec l'UNOPS pour les tâches administratives.

Le Hub rural applique le principe de la gestion par objectifs, ce qui permet d'évaluer à intervalles réguliers, sur la base d'indicateurs prédéfinis, sa performance et la pérennité de ses résultats. Les indicateurs choisis peuvent être mesurés de façon fiable pour un coût acceptable. Ils sont présentés dans le cadre logique en annexe. Ils seront détaillés, puis validés par le comité directeur, pour la phase de mise en œuvre.

13.5. Évaluation et audit

Un audit interne des comptes sera fait chaque année par le fournisseur des services administratifs et financiers. À ces audits annuels seront couplés: (i) l'analyse et les débats du CD qui se réunira deux fois par an et (ii) une évaluation à mi-parcours externe entreprise en début de troisième année sous l'égide du CD, ayant pour but d'analyser les performances du Hub rural et de recommander les réaménagements nécessaires devant lui permettre d'atteindre ses objectifs à la date de sa clôture; (iii) une évaluation terminale prévue au cours de l'année 5 du projet sous l'égide du CD. Elle portera sur les performances du Hub rural durant la phase, sur la qualité des résultats obtenus ainsi que sur l'impact du projet. Elle aura également pour objet d'émettre des recommandations sur la poursuite ou non de cette initiative.

13.6. Communication et visibilité

Le Hub rural prendra toutes les mesures nécessaires pour assurer la visibilité du financement fourni par l'Union européenne. Ces mesures doivent suivre les règles applicables en matière de visibilité pour les actions extérieures, telles que définies et publiées par la Commission européenne.⁴⁰

Le Hub rural est doté d'un site internet qui offre aux internautes, entre autres, une des bases de données documentaires les plus fournies du web sur le développement rural et la sécurité alimentaire en Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre. Ce site qui offre une visibilité à l'Union européenne, fait l'objet d'un nombre croissant de visites, ces dernières dépassant 4 000 par mois en fin de phase pilote. Des partenariats ont été mis en place en vue de collaborer avec les sites web d'institutions partenaires. Pourtant, le budget alloué au Hub rural en phase pilote ne prévoyait pas un tel outil. Le site sera grandement perfectionné au cours de la phase II de manière qu'il devienne incontournable pour les acteurs du développement rural. Le Hub rural utilise et développera l'utilisation d'autres outils, comme les bulletins d'information électroniques.

⁴⁰ http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/documents/communication_and_visibility_manual_en.pdf

ANNEXE 1: Cadre Logique

Objectif global: Conformément aux objectifs régionaux de réduction de la pauvreté en milieu rural et de réalisation de la sécurité alimentaire, le Hub rural a pour objet d'améliorer la cohérence et l'efficacité des politiques et programmes menés en direction du monde rural.				
Objectif spécifique n°1: Améliorer les conditions et capacités de dialogue et de coordination des acteurs régionaux et nationaux sur les thèmes d'intervention du Hub rural, en renforçant et élargissant son expertise				
Résultats attendus	Activités	Indicateurs objectivement vérifiables (valeur ciblée)	Moyens de vérification	Hypothèses, risques
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Les capacités des acteurs à développer et influencer les politiques et programmes sont renforcées * Des synergies entre acteurs travaillant sur les mêmes thèmes sont créées * Tous les acteurs bénéficient d'un accès facilité à une information pertinente, structurée et d'actualité sur chacun des thèmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Recrutement de 3 experts de haut niveau sur les 3 nouvelles thématiques * Collecte, traitement et diffusion d'informations pertinentes, structurées et accessibles aux acteurs * Production d'informations pertinentes répondant à des besoins préalablement identifiés * Collaborations avec des centres de formation et de recherche pour la coproduction d'outils pédagogiques et méthodologiques * Organisation de séminaires d'échanges et d'espaces de dialogue politiques * Mise en place et animation de communautés de pratiques (plates-formes web) * Actions en faveur d'une meilleure valorisation des résultats de la recherche dans les pratiques de développement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Informations structurées et mises à jour sur le site internet du Hub rural: nombre d'articles mis en ligne (500 par an), nombre de bulletins d'information électroniques produits (60 par an), nombre de personnes abonnées à chaque type de bulletin (600 en moyenne), nombre de visiteurs mensuels du site (8000) * Nombre de thèmes effectivement pris en charge (7) * Nombre de programmes développés en partenariat sur chaque thème (2) * Nombre de produits méthodologiques et pédagogiques développés (15) * Nombre d'évènements co-organisés (20 par an) * Pour chaque communauté de pratique en activité: nombre d'abonnés (600), statistiques de fréquentation (1000 par mois) et taux de satisfaction des membres (80% d'opinions positives) * Nombre de communautés de pratiques (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Rapports d'activité * Actes des évènements co-organisés * Produits édités (édition papier ou électronique) * Analyses statistiques des produits web * Rapport d'évaluation finale de la phase de mise en œuvre * Enquête de satisfaction des membres des communautés de pratique 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Ressources financières adéquates * Volonté des acteurs de partager l'information, d'apprendre des expériences des autres et de collaborer entre eux
Objectif spécifique n°2: Promouvoir une demande pertinente et structurée de la part des différents acteurs et partenaires et améliorer la couverture géographique du Hub rural				

Résultats attendus	Activités	Indicateurs objectivement vérifiables	Moyens de vérification	Hypothèses, risques
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Les différentes catégories d'acteurs reçoivent une information pertinente et interagissent grâce aux outils mis en place par le Hub rural * Les différentes catégories d'acteurs sollicitent l'expertise du Hub rural en appui à la maîtrise d'ouvrage de leurs politiques et programmes * La zone géographique d'intervention du Hub rural est étendue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Mise à disposition des acteurs de l'information et des documents pertinents * Capitalisation continue des activités du Hub rural et promotion, vers les catégories d'acteurs bénéficiaires, de l'existence et des activités du Hub rural * Repérage des acteurs bénéficiaires * Analyse des besoins d'appui à la maîtrise d'ouvrage des institutions ayant formulé une demande * Élaboration des cadres d'intervention thématiques du Hub rural validés par le comité directeur 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Nombre de documents et d'informations mis à disposition des acteurs bénéficiaires (1000 par an) * Existence d'une base de données de capitalisation des expériences du Hub rural * Nombre d'activités de communication réalisées sur le Hub rural (15) * Nombre (30 par an), pertinence et portée des demandes d'appui adressées au Hub rural * Nombre de pays où des demandes ont été formulées (12) * Nombre des demandes formulées par chacune des catégories de bénéficiaires et pour chacun des thèmes couverts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Rapport d'évaluation finale de la phase de mise en œuvre * Rapports d'activité * Base de données * Supports de communication * Demandes formulées * Cadres d'intervention thématiques 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Ressources financières adéquates * Volonté des acteurs de partager l'information, d'apprendre des expériences des autres et de collaborer entre eux * Croissance des demandes dépassant les capacités de traitement du Hub rural
Objectif spécifique n° 3: Répondre de façon efficace et efficiente aux demandes d'appui entre acteurs sur les thématiques et dans les pays couverts				
Résultats attendus	Activités	Indicateurs objectivement vérifiables	Moyens de vérification	Hypothèses, risques
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Les conseils et appuis fournis pour la définition, la mise en œuvre et l'évaluation des politiques et programmes sont pris en compte: élaborations participatives de politiques et programmes révisés favorables aux acteurs ruraux pauvres, adaptations des méthodologies de mise en œuvre et d'évaluation des politiques et programmes * Les synergies et 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Fourniture d'appuis à la maîtrise d'ouvrage, sur demande, aux pays, OIG, OSC, et aux partenaires extérieurs, en matière de formulation, de mise en œuvre ou d'évaluation des politiques et programmes * Co-organisation, à la demande, de dialogues inclusifs (promotion de la participation des acteurs de la société civile), informés et équilibrés sur les politiques et programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Nombre d'appuis à la maîtrise d'ouvrage apportés par thème, par type de bénéficiaire et par pays * Nombre de processus et de méthodologies d'élaboration, de mise en œuvre et d'évaluation de politiques et programmes ayant bénéficié d'un appui du Hub rural (15 par an) * Degré de satisfaction des bénéficiaires sur l'efficacité des appuis apportés (valeur ajoutée méthodologique, mise à disposition d'informations, construction de 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Rapport d'évaluation finale de la phase de mise en œuvre * Rapports d'activité * Enquête de satisfaction des bénéficiaires sur l'efficacité des appuis apportés * Base de données de capitalisation des expériences du Hub rural 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Les activités réalisées en amont (cf. objectifs spécifiques 1 et 2) portent leurs fruits * Accord politique des gouvernements impliqués dans les activités du Hub rural visant à associer les OSC dans le processus de décision * Attitude pro-active de la direction du HUB rural,

complémentarités entre les politiques et programmes formulés et mis en œuvre aux niveaux national et régional sont renforcées		dialogues politiques) (80% d'opinions favorables) * Qualité des documents et supports produits		ainsi que des partenaires
Objectif spécifique n° 4: Pérennisation institutionnelle du Hub rural par la réalisation d'un ancrage institutionnel au sein des institutions régionales compétentes.				
Résultats attendus	Activités	Indicateurs objectivement vérifiables	Moyens de vérification	Hypothèses, risques
* La structure d'organisation du HUB rural est renforcée et l'efficacité de sa gestion améliorée. Une stratégie de pérennisation institutionnelle du Hub rural est identifiée, approuvée et mise en œuvre.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Réalisation d'une étude concernant le renforcement de la structure organisationnelle du Hub rural. * Approbation de l'étude et de son programme de travail par le comité directeur (CD). * Mise en œuvre des mesures pour améliorer l'efficacité de sa gestion. * Identification et mise en œuvre du programme de travail pour la pérennisation institutionnelle du Hub rural. 	* Nouvelle structure d'organisation mise en œuvre et évaluée suivant les critères d'efficacité et d'efficacité (performance organisationnelle en général et pérennité de son ancrage institutionnel en particulier)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Rapport d'évaluation finale de la phase de mise en œuvre * Rapports d'activité * Rapports d'expertise et PV des réunions du comité directeur 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attitude pro-active de la direction du Hub rural. Disponibilité et volonté d'appropriation des partenaires régionaux Soutien des partenaires et disponibilité d'un ancrage institutionnel approprié.

**ACTION FICHE FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME –
STRATEGIC PRIORITY 3: EXPLOITING THE POTENTIAL OF CONTINENTAL AND REGIONAL
APPROACHES TO IMPROVE FOOD SECURITY –
“PUTTING A PRO-POOR AGENDA INTO PRACTICE – SUPPORT FOR THE INTERNATIONAL LAND
COALITION”**

1. IDENTIFICATION

Title/Number	Putting a Pro-poor Land Agenda into Practice: Ensuring Access to and Control over Natural Resources Helps Achieve Food Security <i>CRIS DCI-FOOD 2009/199-932</i>		
Total cost	EC contribution: €2 950 000 Joint co-financing totalling USD 2.266m (approximately €1.6m) has been secured from the following donors: IFAD: 702 000 USD Belgian Survival Fund: 692 000 USD The Kingdom of the Netherlands: 455 000 USD IDRC: 354 000 USD CIDA – Canada: 63 000 USD		
Aid method/ Method of implementation	Project approach/Joint management by means of signature of a contribution agreement with an international organisation (IFAD)		
DAC code	52010	Sector	Food security

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

Rural people around the world depend on land-based livelihoods for their food security and well-being. Recent global trends have prompted a massive increase in global commercial interest in land and natural resources. Rising food and commodity prices, accelerating agro-fuel production and carbon-trading mechanisms to value standing forests have combined to generate steep increases in demand and prices for land. The resulting unprecedented pressure on current land tenure systems has resulted in widespread loss of access to land and weakening of livelihoods among the poorest. Those most vulnerable to losing access to land are small-scale producers (1.5 billion households live on less than 2 hectares), indigenous peoples, pastoralists, common property users and households affected by HIV/AIDS. Land-poor rural groups are hardest hit by rising food prices, which primarily affect net consumers of food, those who produce insufficient food and must purchase it. Rising prices make it more difficult for land-poor or landless people – the poorest of the rural poor – to gain access to land and thereby strengthen their livelihoods. Pro-poor land policies have the potential to counter these pressures and improve food security by strengthening the security of tenure for the most vulnerable land users and by making land more accessible to rural people lacking other livelihood opportunities. Several African countries, including Malawi, Uganda and Benin, will be finalising reforms to their land policies in the period 2009-11 and therefore offer particular opportunities for positive change. Other African countries, including Madagascar and Niger, are in the process of implementing tenure reform.

Development and implementation of new land policy presents great opportunities, but also risks, for pro-poor land reform. ILC's experience shows that pro-poor land policies are more likely to emerge from multi-stakeholder processes with strong civil society involvement. However, many land policy development processes fail to create such platforms. In many countries, the weak capacity of civil society organisations limits their effective influence on such processes. Strengthening this capacity is one of the aims of the action proposed.

2.2. Lessons learned

Lessons learned during the 2007-08 partnership with the European Commission have been taken into account in the design of this project. For example, past experience with multi-stakeholder platforms for land policy formulation has demonstrated that governments are often receptive to recommendations from civil society – on condition that sufficient evidence is demonstrated. This observation has led to a sharper focus in this phase on strengthening civil society organisations (CSO) research and analysis for evidence-based advocacy. ILC, as a knowledge-based organisation, regularly promotes reviews of past activities to learn lessons for the next phase of activity. One example is the forthcoming meeting of ILC members who have undertaken land policy monitoring at national level with ILC's support, under the last EC grant, to discuss how ILC can best build on their experience in the next phase of activity.

Institutional learning was already an important part of the previous grant. As a result of regionalisation and membership expansion processes partly supported by the European Commission, ILC has become a more member-led coalition. The process of collaboratively creating new regional structures and processes was a source of rich collective learning, resulting in more effective instruments for coordination and leadership in future activities.

Concerning the previous EC grant, a ROM mission is taking place in January/February 2009. Results and recommendations in the final report will be taken into account in the project document before any new agreement will be signed.

2.3. Complementary action

This project is part of a larger programme developed by ILC members in regional consultation processes and approved by the ILC Council, on which a number of donors are also represented. The activities in this project are co-financed by other donors in concert with their larger programmes on land. These include: IDRC on women's access to land in eastern and southern Africa; the Belgian Survival Fund on pro-poor land policy in Niger and Uganda; the Swiss Development Cooperation on pro-poor land policy in Madagascar and Benin; IFAD on support for the AU/UNECA/AfDB land policy guidelines for Africa; and CIDA on land tenure security for smallholders in the face of new commercial pressures on land. ILC will continue its cooperation with the NEPAD-driven Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), the Comité Permanent Inter-Etats de Lutte Contre la Sécheresse au Sahel (CILSS) and the African Centre for Food Security (ACFS) under the AU/NEPAD Framework for African Food Security (FAFS).

2.4. Donor coordination

As a coalition of IGOs and CSOs for promoting dialogue and joint action, ILC actively supports the Paris Declaration's guiding principles of ownership, coordination and alignment as well as the Accra Agenda for Action. ILC regularly promotes information-sharing and coordination between stakeholders working on land issues. For example, it recently facilitated a joint mission of six UN organisations to Madagascar to share lessons from the national land reform. ILC plans activities in consultation with its members, identifying local and regional activities on the basis of member demand (at national level) and collective regional analysis. Stakeholder consultation is a key

component of both planning and implementation. ILC seeks to complement the efforts of others working on the thematic area of land, many of whom are among its members. Typically, ILC seeks input from both members and relevant non-member organisations, including donors, in its global work. In country-level initiatives, it promotes broad stakeholder participation, including by government ministries and donors active in the country.

3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectives

The overall objective of this project is to ensure that **natural resources, especially land, are accessed and used equitably and managed sustainably, thus reducing vulnerable households' food insecurity.**

The purpose is to enhance the capacity of ILC members and partners and their opportunities, at all levels, for pro-poor policy dialogue and influence to promote secure and equitable access to and control over land and other natural resources that are vital to the livelihoods of poor women and men.

3.2. Expected results and main activities

Expected result 1: ILC members provide coordinated support for ILC global initiatives on priority issues.

Activities:

- Launching a global initiative to monitor equitable access to land. ILC members have already initiated collaborative efforts to monitor land trends at regional level; these efforts will be built upon to improve use of the results and promote informed decision-making;
- Producing a set of case studies and synthesis reports on the impact of, and possible responses to, increased commercial demand for land as a result of increased food and commodity prices, agro-fuel production and carbon sequestration, providing an evidence base for collaborative action by ILC members;
- Supporting advocacy activities on women's access to land, drawing upon the work of members at community level to support targeted advocacy (impact of CEDAW⁴¹) at national and global levels;
- Building collaboration between ILC members and partners to document and support successful efforts to defend the rights of common property resource users, indigenous people and pastoralists (including at the level of global initiatives such as UNPFII and CSD 17⁴²). This will include strengthening the communication capacity and role of organisations representing pastoralist and indigenous peoples within the ILC network and support for advocacy at national and global levels.

Expected result 2: CSOs in Africa exercise greater influence over and participate more actively in the decision-making processes that affect the access of poor women and men to natural resources, especially land.

Activities:

- Facilitating CSO engagement with the AUC/UNECA/AfDB-led process of formulating Africa-wide land policy guidelines, including input from African farmers' organisations

⁴¹ Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women – CEDAW.

⁴² United Nations Permanent Forum for Indigenous Issues (UNPFII) and Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD 17).

and other civil society organisations into final draft guidelines, civil society participation at the summit of Heads of State, at which the guidelines will be adopted, and work with members to promote uptake and implementation of the guidelines once they are adopted;

- Supporting pro-poor policy reform and implementation in Uganda, Benin, Niger, Malawi and Madagascar by strengthening civil society engagement in the reform processes. This will include building the organisational and advocacy capacity of civil society organisations, facilitating collaboration with inter-governmental members of ILC and promoting exchanges of experience.

Expected result 3: CSOs, IGOs and governments identify, share and adopt lessons and good practice that improve access of poor women and men to natural resources, especially land.

Activities:

- Developing policy documents and tools on a range of topics, from pastoralist land rights to women's land rights advocacy, based on action-oriented research with community-based organisations. Learning components will be developed, based on an assessment of capacity-strengthening needs, and exchanges of knowledge will contribute to sharing and uptake of knowledge among the ILC membership.

Expected result 4: ILC members in Africa have increased capacity for networking, knowledge-sharing, dialogue and joint action.

Activities:

- Supporting development of tools and strategies to influence land policies. ILC will facilitate sharing of experience and expertise between organisations working on land policy reform in Africa and globally, including in the form of internships and of organising study tours by experts within the region;
- Sharing knowledge/building capacity within the ILC membership by building networks of and for women, indigenous people and pastoralists and enhancing their participation in decision-making within ILC and beyond. Supporting development of sub-regional networks on land in southern, eastern, western and central Africa as a mechanism for sharing experience and developing collaboration on issues of regional importance, such as engagement with the Africa-wide land policy guidelines;
- Supporting members from within the region to collaborate and support each other in specific advocacy efforts such as for finalisation of national land policies;
- Developing "learning paths", a mechanism for knowledge exchange between peers (referred to as South-South exchange/dissemination in the EC's strategy paper).

Expected result 5: ILC becomes an autonomous, decentralised, globally representative, member-led and financially sustainable coalition.

Activities:

- Implementing ILC's new operating framework and monitoring and evaluation framework and strengthening members' involvement in planning, implementation and monitoring;
- Developing institutional objectives for mainstreaming gender in ILC's engagement on women's access;
- Strengthening the capacity of ILC's regional nodes to function effectively as part of a global network;

- Facilitating sharing of information between Africa and other regions.

3.3. Risks and assumptions

Some of the risks entailed in the proposed action could be:

- Lack of political commitment to deal with land issues;
- Powerful interests may block dialogue and negotiation processes;
- Lack of donor coordination and harmonisation;
- Lack of attention to land issues in the global development agenda.

The proposed action is based on ILC's assessment that a sufficient critical mass of institutions and of individuals within State and non-State institutions consider a participatory land policy process necessary for economic growth, national stability and poverty reduction. In other words, it has to be assumed that land issues retain, or gain a higher level of, interest from decision-makers, researchers and donors and in the global development agenda. For details of the assumptions by objective, see the annexed logframe.

Mitigating measures

Lack of political commitment and powerful interests as obstacles to national dialogue: ILC has developed a set of criteria for selection of priority countries (see Appendix 2 to the Strategic Framework 2007-11, http://www.landcoalition.org/pdf/07_SF_2009_11.pdf). The main mitigating measure to address the risk of lack of political commitment and powerful interests acting as an obstacle will be an increasing focus on evidence-based advocacy.

Lack of donor harmonisation/land issues in donor priorities: ILC has a diverse membership, including international organisations, making it a major forum for debate on land issues. ILC also approaches other donors and key stakeholders and links land issues to key development debates to stress the cross-cutting nature of access to and use of natural resources.

3.4. Cross-cutting issues

The proposed action is part of a broad-based food security strategy based on promoting secure and equitable access to land and other natural resources. This fits neatly into a sustainable development approach linking social development and environmental sustainability.

One of ILC's core values is a rights-based approach, to go beyond conceptions of poverty as a merely economic phenomenon and to strengthen the participation of poor women and men in decision-making processes that affect their livelihoods.

The proposed action also has a bearing on environmental sustainability, as secure and equitable land tenure rights for poor women and men encourage sustainable management of natural resources to safeguard their continued productivity. Large-scale commercial interests, able to move on to new areas after exhausting local resources, are less likely to protect resources than local people, who depend on them for their livelihoods and those of future generations.

Secure and equitable land tenure rights play an important role in rural and urban poverty reduction, peace and security. Many conflicts are based on land disputes. Much rural-to-urban migration occurs due to a lack of livelihoods in rural areas for want of access to land.

Women face gender-specific challenges and are the group most vulnerable to lacking or losing the access they need to land, although they are the guarantors of food security in most households. ILC has a dedicated programme linking research and action on women's access to land in eastern and southern Africa, to which activities under this project will be linked in order to share lessons, build relationships between project partners and replicate parts of the project in other countries. ILC is developing a global approach to promote activities that empower women

to exercise their land rights and push for recognition of the importance of women's land rights in gender equality.

3.5. Stakeholders

This project will involve a wide range of stakeholders. ILC has a diverse membership. Working together in the context of this project, and as a wider alliance, will encourage transfers of experience and capacity between organisations. The following broad groups of stakeholders can be identified:

Local-level civil society organisations: These include: grassroots women's organisations working on women's access to land in eastern and southern Africa, members of national land networks and organisations representing rural women, pastoralists and indigenous peoples in all regions. These organisations enjoy strong relationships with the ultimate project beneficiaries, but often have limited research, documentation and advocacy capacity.

National-level organisations: These include networks on land, such as Platform SIF (Madagascar), the Uganda Land Alliance and Landnet Malawi, which have strong links with diverse organisations in their country and, in several cases, are officially recognised by their governments as partners in land policy processes. Nonetheless, they often lack effective advocacy experience, which will be built in the course of ILC activities such as "learning paths", development of tools and exchanges. Other national partner organisations have strong research and advocacy capacity, such as CEBEDES (Benin) and the University of Makerere (Uganda). This project will support these organisations' work to build capacity in local-level organisations.

Regional-level organisations: Regional civil society organisations and networks such as ANGO (Asia) and LandNets (in four sub-regions of Africa) draw on the collective capacity of their members to engage with regional processes, such as those driven by regional development banks. LandNets is addressing the challenge of building sustainable networks in regions with diverse national languages, poor communication infrastructure and weak civil society institutions. Inter-governmental stakeholders in this project include the African Development Bank, African Union, UNECA, Terrafrica, CILSS and NEPAD's CAADP. Despite their financial and institutional capacity, these organisations' ability to engage civil society organisations adequately in regional policy processes and land-based programmes is limited.

Global and northern-based organisations: This project will link civil society organisations such as the IIED, AGTER, RRI and WISP, which have strong research and/or advocacy capacity, with southern-based organisations for common research, monitoring and advocacy activities. It will link intergovernmental organisations such as IFAD, CAPRI and CIFOR and the Inter-Agency Support Group on Indigenous Issues with civil society organisations, which can increase the capacity of intergovernmental organisations to give greater consideration to the needs of people with insecure access to land in national and local contexts.

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Method of implementation

The method of implementation is joint management by means of signature of an agreement with an international organisation [IFAD – the International Fund for Agricultural Development]. The ILC Secretariat is hosted by, and therefore falls under the administrative rules and regulations, of

IFAD. As for the previous grant, the grant agreement will be signed by IFAD on behalf of ILC, with the ILC Secretariat managing the funds in accordance with IFAD procedures.

IFAD and the European Union signed a Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement on 27 September 2004, under which, as a UN organisation, IFAD adheres to the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement of 29 April 2003 between the European Community and the United Nations, which governs all contribution-specific agreements signed between the parties after that date, unless otherwise agreed in exceptional circumstances. The “General Conditions applicable to European Community contribution agreements with international organisations” apply.

The legal framework under which grant agreements are signed is Regulation (EC) No 1905/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 establishing a financing instrument for development cooperation (the “DCI Regulation”).

4.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

All contracts implementing the action must be awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents laid down and published by the international organisation concerned.

4.3. Budget and time-table

Proposed EC contribution					Total non-EC contributions* (in USD)
ILC strategic objectives	Proposed contribution year 1 (euro)	Proposed contribution year 2 (euro)	Proposed contribution year 3 (euro)	Total over the period	
Objective 1: Global policy advocacy on land issues	170 000	180 000	190 000	540 000	1 026 000
Objective 2: African CSOs participate more actively in policymaking on land	100 000	100 000	100 000	300 000	150 000
Objective 3: Civil society, IGOs and governments identify, share and adopt good practice	110 000	130 000	140 000	380 000	180 000
Objective 4: Support ILC Africa Platform on policy dialogue, knowledge and capacity-building	150 000	140 000	100 000	390 000	500 000
Objective 5: Strengthen ILC as an institution	190 000	170 000	150 000	510 000	410 000
SUB-TOTAL 1	720 000	720 000	680 000	2 120 000	2 266 000

Programme coordination and management	<i>171 151</i>	<i>171 151</i>	<i>171 151</i>	<i>513 452</i>	
<i>Regional programme manager (60%)</i>	<i>91 115</i>	<i>91 115</i>	<i>91 115</i>		
<i>Programme officer – women’s access (20%)</i>	<i>25 325</i>	<i>25 325</i>	<i>25 325</i>		NB: staff costs are based on standard professional cost plus 5% p/a increase
<i>Programme officer – M&E/Africa (40%)</i>	<i>54 711</i>	<i>54 711</i>	<i>54 711</i>		
SUB-TOTAL 2	<i>891 151</i>	<i>891 151</i>	<i>851 151</i>	<i>2 633 452</i>	
Monitoring and evaluation (approx. 5%)	<i>45 000</i>	<i>45 000</i>	<i>42 000</i>	<i>132 000</i>	
Overheads (7%)	<i>62 381</i>	<i>62 381</i>	<i>59 787</i>	<i>184 548</i>	
TOTAL	<i>998 531</i>	<i>998 531</i>	<i>952 938</i>	<i>2 950 000</i>	
* The Netherlands, IDRC, CIDA-Canada, IFAD and BSF; contributions calculated at 1 euro = approximately 1.4 USD.					
The EC contribution is financing around 64% of this action.					

Implementation period: This action will be implemented over a period of 36 months, starting from the date of signature of the contribution agreement.

4.4. Performance monitoring

The M&E strategy recently endorsed by the ILC Council⁴³ seeks to strengthen ILC’s systems for accountability and learning. Implementation of the strategy is a major ILC priority. This includes:

Key activities – monitoring

- Regional networks, members, partners and the Secretariat prepare **physical and financial progress reports** on the activities they manage;
- Regional networks, members, partners and the Secretariat organise **annual audits or financial statements** for the activities they manage;
- Regional networks and the Secretariat facilitate **peer-to-peer learning**.

Key activities – evaluation

Annual survey of members and partners

- The Secretariat designs and administers the annual survey questionnaire using a web-based survey tool;
- The Secretariat analyses the preliminary findings, secures members’ and partners’ feedback on them and compiles the annual survey report.

⁴³ Coalition Council meeting, April 2008.

Joint reviews and participatory evaluation studies (part of the planning and budget cycle)

- Regional networks consult members to identify their requirements for joint reviews and evaluation studies;
- The Secretariat consults regional networks to identify the programme of joint reviews and evaluation studies to be conducted.

Annual progress report against the Strategic Framework

- The Secretariat compiles and analyses monitoring and evaluation findings across the network and over the year and prepares the annual report to the Coalition Council;
- The Coalition Council reviews and approves the report and draws lessons.

The ILC has made a conscious decision to use indicators tailored to the objectives, expected results and activities of this project and consistent with its M&E framework, rather than the standard DAC indicators. The DAC indicators are a set of measurable impacts at local level most appropriate to direct action, such as food distribution, and ill-suited to the type of action proposed by ILC, which seeks to improve poor people's access to land by indirect means, including policy dialogue and advocacy, strengthening the voice of civil society and coalition-building. Projects like this, which aim to address the root causes of food insecurity rather than its symptoms, are crucial to achieving sustainable solutions. However, complex causal linkages and the involvement of numerous stakeholders make it impossible to attribute ultimate measurable impacts on food security to any single measure.

More broadly, the lack of widely accepted standard indicators of secure and equitable land access poses a challenge to monitoring and evaluating work on land issues. ILC seeks to address this gap by its work on monitoring land access globally (one of the activities for which continued support is proposed under strategic objective 1).

4.5. Evaluation and audit

For details of the evaluation arrangements, see section 4.4.

With the aim of transparent management of funds, separate accounts, subject to the financial procedures of IFAD, will be applied. The EC contribution will be itemised in the annual statements of ILC prepared by the IFAD external auditor. Each sub-agreement between ILC and its implementing partners will be subject to activity-based financial reporting and provide for independent field auditing, as and when considered necessary.

4.6. Communication and visibility

Appropriate tools and platforms for communication are pivotal to ILC's functioning as a global alliance. ILC has developed a strategy that broadens the scope of communication to make it an integral part of the way the Coalition works, rather than simply a tool for sharing information. The strategy involves engaging members at local level to identify the most effective ways to create public spaces for dialogue and empowering communities to participate in decision-making and exchange knowledge and information.

The ILC Secretariat supports and facilitates communication, liaising with regional platforms (and communication focal points) and sharing information by disseminating publications, via the website, and organising electronic forums.

Visibility: All reports and other material produced, together with events organised under this grant, will acknowledge the European Commission as a donor, in compliance with the EU visibility guidelines. Information on events and outputs to be disseminated will be shared with the EC on a continuous basis. In addition to acknowledgement of EC support, the ILC network offers an opportunity for the European Commission (via its in-country delegations) to gain access to forums for policy dialogue in conjunction with other ILC members at national and regional levels. The visibility of the EU land policy guidelines will also be enhanced by the proposed action.

Annex – LOGFRAME MATRIX

Project description	Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions
Overall objective			
Natural resources, especially land, are accessed and used equitably and managed sustainably, thus reducing vulnerable households' food insecurity.			
Purpose			
To enhance the capacity of ILC members and partners and their opportunities, at all levels, for pro-poor policy dialogue and influence to promote secure and equitable access to and control over land and other natural resources that are vital to the livelihoods of poor women and men.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Number of instances in which key stakeholders perceive that ILC has been instrumental to policy change. § Ratings by members of their own improved capacity and opportunities for advocacy, policy dialogue and sharing knowledge. § Members' perceptions of the benefits of being part of the ILC network. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § External/independent evaluation studies. § ILC reports. § Survey of members. § Key stakeholder interviews. 	A sufficient critical mass of institutions and of individuals within State and non-State institutions consider land policy change a priority.
Expected results			
1. ILC members provide coordinated support for ILC global initiatives on priority issues.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § ILC members' ratings of the relevance and value for their work of information received via ILC on land, women's access to land and indigenous and pastoralist land rights. § ILC communication products, including publications, websites and media releases, reach key stakeholders, including policy-makers, donors and the public. § At least three member partnerships established to develop and oversee global initiatives. § Advocacy products on at least three thematic areas developed by ILC. § Number of members participating in ILC thematic groups. § Number of non-members participating in ILC thematic groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § ILC annual reports. § Members' and partners' activity reports. § Evaluation studies. § List of groups' participants. § ILC advocacy and policy documents/publications. § Members' advocacy and policy documents/publications. § ILC database. § List of land tenure indicators. § Reports by ILC observatories and land 	Land issues retain, or gain a higher level of, interest from decision-makers, researchers and donors and in the global development agenda.

Project description	Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions
	§ Use of, or reference to, tenure security monitoring indicators developed by ILC by target audience (governments, IGOs, etc.).	watch. § Distribution lists and media clippings.	
2. CSOs in Africa exercise greater influence over and participate more actively in the decision-making processes that affect the access of poor women and men to natural resources, especially land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § At least five national multi-stakeholder policy dialogue processes supported in Africa. § Ratings by CSO members of their opportunities to participate in and influence the process of formulation of AUC land policy guidelines. § Ratings by CSO members of their opportunities to participate in and influence the process of formulation of national land policy. § Member CSOs perceive ILC as instrumental in improving opportunities to participate in and influence national and regional processes. § Key CSO recommendations are taken up in the AUC land policy guidelines. § Key CSO recommendations are used in at least two national land policies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § ILC annual reports. § Members' and partners' activity reports. § Evaluation studies. § AUC land policy guidelines. § National land policies. 	<p>Political commitment to deal with land issues.</p> <p>Existing conditions for synergies with other poverty reduction and environmental strategies/programmes.</p> <p>Donor and technical harmonisation in development operations affecting land issues.</p>

Project description	Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions
3. CSOs, IGOs and governments identify, share and adopt lessons and good practice that improve the access of poor women and men to natural resources, especially land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Number of tools/methods tested (by type). § At least nine knowledge products (technical reports, policy briefs, syntheses of lessons learned) developed. § At least three manuals/guidelines/toolkits for building capacity of organisations on land-related issues produced. § Number of pro-poor approaches and good practices adopted by key audiences (breakdown by ILC members, partners, governments, IGOs and other 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § ILC annual reports. § Members' and partners' activity reports. § Evaluation studies. § Members' documents/publications. § ILC website and communication products. 	High-quality learning opportunities and products can support advocacy and policy development along with replication and scaling-up.

Project description	Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions
	<p>groupings).</p> <p>§ Contextual review shows that ILC action/research will contribute new knowledge to the context.</p>		
4. ILC members in Africa have increased capacity for networking, knowledge-sharing, dialogue and joint action.	<p>§ Four sub-regional land networks and/or ILC-supported networks are active and fulfilling intended purpose.</p> <p>§ At least three networks attract non-ILC funding.</p>	<p>§ ILC annual reports.</p> <p>§ Members' and partners' activity reports.</p> <p>§ Evaluation studies.</p>	Members and partners wish to collaborate. Collaboration on the sub-regional network allows stakeholders to achieve influence they could not otherwise wield. Benefits of collaboration outweigh the costs.
5. ILC becomes an autonomous, decentralised, globally representative, member-led and financially sustainable coalition.	<p>§ Members' satisfaction with ILC's legitimacy, its fairness to members and the role and influence of members within ILC.</p> <p>§ Number of ILC members by type of organisation, thematic focus, region and country.</p> <p>§ Required volume of funding support mobilised.</p> <p>§ Number of decision-making processes managed or coordinated by regional networks.</p> <p>§ Good governance principles upheld by ILC and regional networks.</p> <p>§ Coherent and functioning planning and monitoring systems.</p>	<p>§ Annual survey of members.</p> <p>§ Annual workplan and budget.</p> <p>§ Annual report.</p> <p>§ Website newsletter and other communication products.</p>	<p>Sufficient resources available.</p> <p>ILC governing bodies, members and Secretariat are willing to accept fundamental changes. Members are able to commit their organisations and some of their human resources in order to have a real member-led and member-based coalition.</p>

**ACTION FICHE FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME –
STRATEGIC PRIORITY 3: EXPLOITING THE POTENTIAL OF CONTINENTAL AND REGIONAL
APPROACHES TO IMPROVE FOOD SECURITY –
“REGIONAL CASSAVA INITIATIVE IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN AFRICA”**

1. IDENTIFICATION

Title/Number	Regional Cassava Initiative in support of vulnerable smallholders in Central and Eastern Africa		
Total cost	€ 761 000 <i>EC contribution: 100%</i>		
Aid method/ Method of implementation	Project approach/Joint management by means of signature of an agreement with the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO)		
DAC code	52010	Sector	Food security

2. RATIONALE**2.1. Sector context****Policy for the sector concerned**

The reference document for cassava policy – *“The global cassava development strategy and implementation plan”*⁴⁴ – envisages that cassava will spur rural industrial development and raise incomes for producers, processors and traders. Cassava will contribute to the food security of households producing and consuming it. The project is consistent with:

- *EC policies*: The proposed action covers elements of the “EC Food Security Thematic Programme, Thematic Strategy Paper and Multiannual Indicative Programme 2007–2010” and contributes to achieving MDG 1. The proposal is also fully in line with the food security objectives of the “Africa-EU Strategic Partnership” on the Millennium Development Goals and with “Advancing African Agriculture”, the EC proposal for continental- and regional-level cooperation on agricultural development in Africa.
- *NEPAD and CAADP*: The project is consistent with the declared strategic thrusts, i.e. pillar 3, *“Increasing Food Supply and Reducing Hunger; Combat Africa’s Food and Agriculture Emergencies”*, as specified in the Framework for African Food Security (FAFS). It is also consistent with national agricultural development and poverty reduction strategies in all the countries where it is operating.
- *ASARECA*: The ASARECA mega-project entitled *“Unlocking the potential of cassava for development in the Eastern and Central African sub-region”* aims to address:
 - (i) cassava mosaic disease (CMD) and cassava brown streak disease (CBSD); and
 - (ii) the lack of appropriate frameworks for enhancing the value chains for cassava and for catalysing its transformation into a commercial crop in an integrated manner and based on a regional collaborative approach.

At regional level, the global cassava development strategy promotes regional and sub-continental strategies, especially where regional entities such as ASARECA in Eastern and Central Africa are actively involved in agricultural development and could act as champions or catalysts for cassava.

⁴⁴ FAO and IFAD proceedings of the validation forum on the global cassava development strategy, Rome, 26-28 April 2000.

Finally, the document encourages efforts on tissue culture and rapid multiplication of planting material, crop protection and integrated pest management where cassava has been seriously affected by pest and disease attack.

Main problems which the project is intended to address

Overall food insecurity problem caused by CMD and CBSD propagation

Cassava is produced mostly by smallholders on marginal and sub-marginal lands in the humid and sub-humid tropics. It is efficient in carbohydrate production, adapted to a wide range of environments and tolerant to drought and acidic soils. In Africa, an estimated 70 million people obtain more than 500 kcal per day from cassava (Kawano, 2003). Its ability to grow on poor soils and under difficult climatic conditions, combined with the advantage of flexible root harvesting whenever there is a need, make cassava a key crop to bridge the hunger gap, the “crop of last resort” for African farmers’ families, particularly in areas where subsistence agriculture is dominant, such as Central and Eastern Africa.

The continuing spread of CMD⁴⁵ and EACMV-Ug and the recent spread of CBSD⁴⁶ have had devastating effects on the resilience of vulnerable households who have few other coping mechanisms. The socio-economic impact of these diseases in the region over the last five to ten years has not been fully examined. Nevertheless, in the areas hardest hit by the diseases, hardly any cassava fields can be seen, except in the early stages of growth, with little hope for the plants to survive to maturity. As a consequence, there is a shortage of cassava products (tuberous roots, chips, flour, etc.) in the local markets.

Environment conducive to disease propagation at both regional and national levels

⁴⁵ *Cassava mosaic disease (CMD)* is caused by a complex of viruses and transmitted by a whitefly (*Bemisia tabaci*). In severe cases, root yield losses are near to 100%. Over the past decade, an unusually severe pandemic of the Ugandan variant of the East African cassava mosaic virus (EACMV-Ug) has been spreading from Uganda and devastating cassava production in the region. Globally, these diseases have had a significant impact on cassava production (15 to 25% reduction or more in the entire Great Lakes Region), reducing local cassava yields from the farms affected by up to 80%.

⁴⁶ *Cassava brown streak disease (CBSD)* is a viral disease. It is spread mainly through infected planting material. CBSD is already present in Tanzania, Kenya and Uganda.

- Uncontrolled movements of vegetative material: The Great Lakes Region has been particularly affected by civil insecurity since the mid-90s. This has led to significant population movements throughout the region and disrupted collaboration between countries in the region, including on matters related to trans-boundary sanitary regulations. The survival mode into which millions of people have been plunged, accompanied by transport of vegetative material, has contributed to speeding up dissemination of diseases.
- Reactive rather than preventive attitude: Some areas are not yet covered by the existing plans for multiplication of planting material under either of the two largest programmes.
- In the case of CBSD, the current geographical range of the disease already extends beyond the scope of the FAO-ECHO and GLCI projects. However, there is no evidence so far that CBSD is spreading in a regular, predictable manner nor is reliably resistant material available for large-scale multiplication. Efforts have focused mainly on replacing affected plants rather than taking measures to prevent them becoming infected or to mitigate the eventual impact of infection.
- Potential multiplication of wrong varieties: The lack of a harmonised system for certification of vegetative planting material and for surveillance of diseases in the region has been a major handicap limiting all stakeholders. The vacuum left in terms of certification adds to the risk of organisations multiplying wrong varieties and therefore contributing to the spread of diseases. Furthermore, the low level of interaction between researchers and extension agents has also contributed to the farmers' lack of improved varieties.

2.2. Lessons learned

In an effort to link relief, rehabilitation and development, the action proposed is a continuation of two previous projects funded by ECHO. The FAO-ECHO Regional Cassava Initiative (phase I from June 2006 to November 2007 and phase II from March 2008 to February 2009), with a budget totalling EUR 1 946 498, involved:

- (i) multiplication and distribution of planting material resistant to cassava mosaic disease in the five worst affected countries;
- (ii) support for national and regional data and information management; and
- (iii) establishment of the basis for improved consensus and coordination mechanisms.

By the end of the two phases, some 20 000 households will have received improved vegetative material by 2009. Factoring in the farmer-to-farmer redistribution under the FAO-ECHO initiatives and the additional cassava projects implemented by the FAO since 2001, it is estimated that at least 500 000 households in the region have received improved vegetative material under the FAO projects. Some of the major achievements and impact of the two ECHO projects up to now (the second ECHO project is still running) were observed in Burundi, which managed to develop an annual target plan for cassava, to map all stakeholders and to compile an inventory of cassava nurseries, all of which contributed to restoring cassava production systems to the pre-crisis levels. The other countries involved in the ECHO projects (Uganda, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Tanzania and Rwanda) have also made some progress on setting up a national cassava coordination mechanism and government representatives agreed to lead the process, with support from the FAO in the initial stage, thus securing a smooth transfer of responsibilities. However, a fully fledged coordination structure is yet to become a reality.

Despite this success, the spread of CMD and the recent outbreak of cassava brown streak disease (CBSD) in Eastern Africa, coupled with the enormous number of rural households which are relying on cassava for their daily food intake and are still affected or threatened by

cassava-related diseases, call for a significant scaling-up of the cassava initiatives in order to prevent a major food security disaster.

While the FAO is currently fine-tuning an **overall strategic programme framework** for cassava-related diseases in Eastern, Central and Southern Africa (14 countries), this project (covering seven of the 14 countries) is already integrating key elements of this framework, focusing on:

- (i) countries under current disease pressure, i.e. Uganda, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, Burundi and Tanzania; and
- (ii) countries which have requested assistance as a result of a CMD outbreak, i.e. the Central African Republic and Gabon.

In addition, preliminary contacts with all other countries where cassava production is threatened will be initiated, i.e. Kenya, Malawi, Zambia, Angola, Mozambique and the Republic of the Congo.

The project builds on existing successfully implemented approaches and systems. It draws on the **lessons learned** from regional coordination workshops and joint evaluations on the previous FAO/ECHO grants. Building on what already exists allows a rapid start-up of activities and is an important asset in designing a transboundary response to crop disease and coordination, particularly when the agricultural calendar is considered. Key lessons learned over the last two years include:

Multiplication and production issues

- (i) Shortening the distance between cassava multiplication sites and final beneficiaries reduces losses of vegetative material during transport and increases the rate of adoption of healthy planting material.
- (ii) Preparing planting material as cuttings in bags is preferable for short times before planting, whereas preparing as stems is appropriate for longer times before planting.
- (iii) Quality control of each nursery rather than random checks is imperative in order to maintain high-quality vegetative material.

Coordination issues

- (i) A national commission or committee is essential in each country in order to prevent counter-productive action. Where such bodies exist, the quality of action is much higher and synergies are created better (as in the case of Burundi).
- (ii) In each country, the government is requested to develop a coordination platform and the FAO is well placed to support that process.
- (iii) A national commission regulates the choice of varieties that are multiplied.

Surveillance and early detection issues

- (i) The magnitude of the spread of cassava disease and its impact on the livelihood of already vulnerable communities has been such that, in some cases, control programmes have been overwhelmed. Efforts have focused mainly on replacing affected plants rather than taking measures to prevent them becoming infected or to mitigate the eventual impact of infection. Accurate and timely surveillance data might make it possible to design more active prevention measures or mitigation strategies, particularly for CMD.
- (ii) A formal surveillance system is hard to establish and maintain. However, use of proxies or sentinel sites for early detection of cassava-related diseases would be important. FFS or other forms of farmers' groups are considered the most cost-effective approach.
- (iii) Surveillance is not the mandate of any single institution and synergies between programmes are essential (e.g. the ASARECA mega-project and CRS GLCI).

Awareness issues

The proportion of farmers aware of the cassava-related diseases and how they are propagated is extremely limited. As a result, farmers are the main contributors to the spread of the disease at the moment. Simple awareness material can drastically change farmers' behaviour.

2.3. Complementary action

As mentioned above, this project is the continuation of the ECHO-sponsored projects with the FAO since 2006 which themselves capitalised on the country-by-country experience built up since 2001 on cassava multiplication and redistribution. Given the increasing number of stakeholders addressing cassava-related issues, this project has been designed to build synergies and complement existing initiatives aiming at reducing food insecurity in the region by combating cassava-related diseases, in particular (see also section 3.5 – “Stakeholders”):

§ *ASARECA cassava mega-project*: To improve cassava productivity and utilisation in Eastern and Central Africa (2008–2012 sponsored by USAID).

§ *CRS/IITA Great Lakes Cassava Initiative*: To strengthen, within four years, the capacity of 60 local African partners and approximately 1.15 million farmers to address cassava mosaic disease and the emerging cassava brown streak disease pandemic that threaten food security and incomes of cassava-dependant farming families in Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda (2008–2012 sponsored by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation).

§ *IITA – Integrated protection of cassava from emerging pests and diseases that threaten rural livelihoods*: To increase and sustain cassava productivity and improve livelihoods of farmers by reducing crop losses due to pests and diseases in sub-Saharan Africa (2007–2010 sponsored by IFAD).

2.4. Donor coordination

The action proposed integrates the main principles of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action, as well as EU commitments regarding ownership, harmonisation, alignment, results-based management and mutual accountability. This is particularly reflected in result C of the project where the FAO will directly support Ministries of Agriculture in setting up national coordination platforms for cassava disease and pest-related measures. To that end, the project envisages signing Letters of Agreement (LoA) with relevant authorities in order to provide incentives to initiate new or reinforce existing coordination activities. A total of EUR 172 435 has been pre-positioned for that purpose, equivalent to some EUR 8 200 per country per year. This amount is clearly intended to cover essential operational implementation costs and not hiring of personnel or procurement of inputs or equipment. Finally, the project will support national and regional capacity-building, particularly in relation to information management by training under results B and C of the project. Some EUR 89 700 is positioned under result B to help to train extension staff and central government on disease surveillance. Under result C, EUR 462 051 (or approximately EUR 22 000 per country per year) will contribute to training partners at regional and national levels on issues that will emerge at inception and throughout the project.

3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectives

Overall objective: To contribute to protecting and improving the food security status of vulnerable subsistence farmers in Central and Eastern Africa.

Purpose of the project: To restore cassava yields by reinforcing the capacity of the subsistence farmers most prone to food insecurity to prevent, mitigate, prepare for and respond to cassava-related diseases in the region.

EC standard indicator No 1: Cropping area supported by the project (the agricultural area supported by the project);

EC standard indicator No 2: Technology adoption by farmers, i.e. proportion of farmers who have planted improved cassava varieties as a percentage of those who have attended awareness-raising/training sessions.

Other project outcome indicator: Cassava yields restored to pre-CMD and pre-CBSD level at household level by 2010. (NB.: Country-wide pre-disease yield levels will not be achievable by 2010.)

3.2. Expected results⁴⁷ and main activities

Result A: Improved cassava varieties are widely available to vulnerable subsistence farmers in the region.

Activities related to result A

A.1: Community awareness-raising on project activities and the need for farmers' involvement in multiplication activities, including the gender perspective of the project.

A.2: Promotion of a Farmer Field School approach with farmers' groups or, alternatively, conclusion of contracts with farmers or farm associations with a particular focus on gender equality.

A.3: Promotion of participatory variety selection.

A.4: Support for national agricultural research institutes to initiate or complete germplasm collection.

A.5: Setting-up of multiplication plots.

A.6: Farmers' training on multiplication techniques, pest/disease identification and nurseries maintenance.

A.7: Quality control of vegetative material produced.

A.8: Identification of final beneficiaries.

A.9: Redistribution of cassava vegetative material.

Result B: Preventive capacity and measures are enhanced by the availability of cassava-disease surveillance information to government authorities, NGOs and donors.

⁴⁷ See Logical Framework Matrix in Annex 1 for the indicators to measure the results.

Activities related to result B

- B.1: Training of field focal points on early disease detection.
- B.2: Advanced training of research and MoA staff on disease and pest surveillance.
- B.3: Comprehensive cassava-related disease surveys.

Result C: *Movements of cassava vegetative material are better regulated with the aid of operational cassava commissions in each country and a regional information and coordination network.*

Activities related to result C

- C.1: Review of country coordination mechanisms for cassava-related issues.
- C.2: “Who does what and where” exercise with mapping conducted at the beginning of the project with bi-yearly update.
- C.3: Setting-up of a national commission on cassava where necessary (Central African Republic, Gabon and the Democratic Republic of the Congo).
- C.4: Training needs identification for commission members (coordination skills, database management, GIS, dynamic maps, etc.).
- C.5: FAO support for the national commission (secretariat, venue, national surveys, travel allowances, development of dynamic maps tool, etc.).
- C.6: Update of dynamic maps data-warehouse and annual release.
- C.7: Preparation and holding of bi-yearly regional cassava coordination and best practice workshops.

3.3. Risks and assumptions

The major risks consist of:

- (i) Lack of commitment of stakeholders at regional level to a needs-based approach;
- (ii) National local stakeholders not cooperating;
- (iii) Collection and dissemination of information hampered; and
- (iv) Security.

The FAO has developed contingency measures against:

- § Security deterioration: partnerships with national partners (farmers’ groups) and indigenous NGOs will be established so that if access by UN staff were limited the project could still be implemented to an acceptable level.
- § Disease outbreak: the FAO has developed a strong partnership with research institutes so that access to new varieties could be secured on time.
- § Theft from cassava nurseries: the strong involvement of communities should prevent theft. However, if theft were to occur, some security night guards should be hired. If theft were nevertheless to materialise, the FAO would decide to reduce the number of beneficiaries or the quantity of planting material per beneficiary at redistribution time.
- § Reduced availability of planting material: if there were insufficient planting material, the FAO would first initiate a rapid multiplication phase using mini-stem cuttings on nursery beds or, alternatively, plant mini-stem cuttings in strong, perforated polythene

bags. Mini-stem cuttings would be kept in nurseries for four to six weeks before transplanting into the field.

- § Unfavourable climatic conditions: a reduction of planting material, as a result of particularly unfavourable conditions, would trigger a revision of beneficiary figures or cuttings per beneficiary. In that case, the FAO would provide training to beneficiaries on a technique known as “mini-stem cuttings sprouted in perforated polythene bags without soil”. Sprouted cuttings can be planted directly in the field after seven to ten days.

3.4. Cross-cutting issues

Gender issues are a key component of food security assessment, analysis and response. Men and women have different needs in terms of food security. They also contribute differently to the sustainability of their households. Furthermore, their coping mechanisms evolve over time to adapt to the emergency they are facing. In addition to this, pervasive violence in the region is resulting in increasing gender-based violence.

The breakdown of family structures, social values and networks, the increase in rape cases, the presence of military and aid workers, poor camp facilities, poor health services, lower disposable income, sexual abuse and exploitation have all contributed to increasing vulnerability to HIV/AIDS. Ultimately, food insecurity is both a cause and a consequence of HIV. In practice, the nutritional and financial needs of affected and infected households increase but their labour force decreases. In this situation, resort to risky coping strategies, such as engagement in sexual relationships in exchange for goods or money, amplifies the risk of infection. Furthermore, the poor nutritional status of people living with HIV/AIDS favours the progression from HIV to AIDS.

The HIV and Gender Officer of the REOA will ensure that the project addresses the particular needs of women and men and integrates the **HIV/AIDS** issue. The officer will ensure dissemination and application of the Interagency Standing Committee (IASC) guidelines on HIV/AIDS interventions in emergency settings, the IASC guidelines on gender-based violence interventions in humanitarian settings and the IASC Gender Handbook plus the Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA) material developed by the FAO and the World Food Programme (WFP). With the aid of the active role played by the REOA in the Regional Interagency Working Group on HIV in Emergencies and in the Gender-Based Violence Task Force, the project will be linked, where appropriate, with other activities and training in the region.

With regard to **environmental sustainability**, the project is also considering helping research institutes to initiate or complete local cassava germplasm collection. This will contribute to biodiversity preservation. This is particularly important in the context of reduced availability of cassava-disease-tolerant varieties.

3.5. Stakeholders

- § **FAO – Regional Emergency Office for Africa (REOA)** has been coordinating regional cassava initiatives in Rwanda, Burundi, Tanzania, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda since 2006 (under two successive ECHO agreements). In particular, the FAO has contributed to better organisation of multiplication of planting material and distribution systems for improved cassava varieties.
- § **Catholic Relief Services (CRS)** has become the FAO’s main partner in the Crop Crisis Control Programme (C3P) and the Great Lakes Cassava Initiative (GLCI) since 2006. In particular, efforts have been made to avoid geographic overlaps at country level and entry

points. In addition, the two programmes have different but complementary emphases: the GLCI stresses support for research, whereas the FAO is aiming at strengthening coordination and information-sharing. Its dioceses network gives the CRS considerable capacity to reach farmers and makes it definitely the closest project partner.

- § **IITA** has played a leading role in development of improved cassava varieties which are disease- and pest-resistant, have a low cyanide content and are drought-resistant, early maturing and high yielding. The improved varieties have been introduced throughout Africa's cassava belt. While the technical capacity of the IITA is unquestionable, the capacity to organise speedy dissemination of newly released varieties might be a problem that will require NGO and FAO support.
- § **ASARECA** is increasingly involved in cassava-related activities and will be a key partner at regional level to institutionalise the operations and ensure sustainability. However, empowerment of ASARECA will need to be phased, since its existing capacity remains limited.
- § **Ministries of Agriculture:** their role and efforts in mitigating the impact of cassava-related diseases in countries covered by ECHO agreements have been reinforced since 2006. This was achieved by facilitating national and regional workshops and joint field assessments and setting up dedicated national commissions. However, the latest regional cassava workshop, held in Bukavu in September 2008, highlighted that there is still a need to improve governmental capacity, both financial and technical.
- § **Farmers:** particular attention needs to be paid to displaced farming populations in the process of resettlement, especially in Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda, whether former refugees or internally displaced people (IDP). These groups have been less aware of the risks posed by transporting contaminated cassava cuttings from the place where they were displaced to their place of return. They are also less aware of the existence of improved cassava varieties tolerant to CMD. In all the countries concerned, the project will also target settled communities who have been directly affected by the spread of cassava-related diseases and, as a consequence, have seen their food security status declining.

Ownership and appropriate technology

- § **Regional institutional ownership:** At regional level, the natural counterpart of the FAO for the Cassava Initiative is ASARECA. Contacts have been established (since July 2008) and this project is already reflecting some of the discussions that have taken place since then. Furthermore, the FAO is currently developing a strategic framework for cassava and a more systematic and formalised partnership will be developed by early 2009, contributing to increasing ASARECA's ownership of the regional cassava programme.
- § **Government ownership:** Throughout the two initial phases of the Cassava Initiative sponsored by ECHO, the FAO has encouraged governments to lead the process of country coordination for cassava-related operations. This became reality in Burundi in 2006. The set-up proposed there has set an example, and all the countries concerned are now committed to establishing a national coordination platform to be led by the Ministry of Agriculture. To that end, a significant part of the project will be designed to support the individual governments with setting up the coordination mechanism and obtaining the appropriate technical expertise to own it. Training activities initiated under phase 2 of the ECHO project will be continued, particularly on information and data management. Besides participation in training and capacity-building activities for the governments, the FAO has earmarked a substantial amount (EUR 1 161 538) under the budget line for Letters of Agreement to support institutional strengthening and ownership by the

governments, in particular for setting up and leading the national commissions and for conducting surveys and field verifications.

- § Farmers' ownership: Use of the Farmer Field School (FFS) approach as a mechanism to multiply cassava vegetative material. The Farmer Field School offers farmers the opportunity to learn by doing, by being involved in experimentation, discussion and decision-making. This strengthens the role of farmers in the researcher/extension worker/farmer chain. The private sector and the local authorities are strongly involved in the multiplication and redistribution process. The FAO does not own the nurseries. In some countries, the FAO reinforces the capacity of the national research centres to conduct multiplication and redistribution. In others, the FAO works with private farmers specialising in cassava production, taking the Farmer Field Schools approach.

Institutional and management structures

The fight against EACMV-Ug and CBSD requires a multiannual approach, linking donors, research institutions, NGOs and beneficiaries in order to define the best strategies. Therefore, besides assisting beneficiary households to gain access to vegetative material, the project builds a bridge to partner regional institutions, in particular ASARECA. In order to ensure sustainability, government authorities will play a key role in project validation and implementation. They will provide human resources to lead national coordination activities and the establishment of national commissions. They will also host regional workshops as appropriate and facilitate access to beneficiaries.

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Method of implementation

The method of implementation will be joint management by means of signature of a Standard Contribution Agreement with an international organisation (the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations – FAO).

The choice of the “Joint management with an international organisation” option for implementation of the project is based on considerations about the areas where the FAO has a clear comparative advantage, which can be summarised as:

- (i) access to influence national and regional policies, by virtue of its privileged position as a neutral specialised agency with power to convene and to support coordination;
- (ii) an implementing role related to the main relevant intergovernmental agreements (notably the International Plant Protection Convention and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture);
- (iii) long experience of work at community level, using participatory approaches in assisting farmer education and decision-making, with the aid of Farmer Field Schools and other approaches which help ensure local sustainability of programmes; and
- (iv) a regional network of emergency coordinators and on-the-ground project experience working with cassava diseases over the last seven years.

Via its **Regional Emergency Office for Africa (REOA) based in Kenya** and its country-based Emergency Coordination Units, the FAO will be responsible for overall implementation of the project. In addition, some activities will be carried out with the aid of **implementing partners**, under Letters of Agreement with key partners, such as the:

- § *Association for the Development of Agricultural Research in Central and Eastern Africa (ASARECA)* to develop awareness-raising material on cassava diseases and to assist

ASARECA with implementation of the EU-funded Regional Support Programme (RSP). This partnership will be essential for liaising between research networks and practitioners;

- § *Ministries of Agriculture*, which will take the lead for all coordination activities and the establishment of national commissions on cassava;
- § *International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)* for the research component, for developing and testing improved and disease-resistant varieties and for disease surveillance;
- § *CRS* for the multiplication component.

4.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

All contracts implementing the action must be awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents laid down and published by the international organisation concerned. As a UN organisation, the FAO adheres to the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement of 29 April 2003 between the European Community and the United Nations.

For signing Letters of Agreement with implementing partners or commercial contracts with suppliers for inputs, FAO standard procedures will apply.

4.3. Budget and time-table

Indicative budget breakdown

Description	Total (EUR)
Staff salaries (professional, general services, consultants, etc.)	1 062 308
Letters of Agreement with implementing partners	1 161 538
Training	641 538
Travel ⁴⁸	365 385
Expendable procurement – inputs (cassava vegetative material, fertilisers, tools, bags, etc.)	788 462
Non-expendable procurement (durable equipment)	60 769
Technical support services (technical backstopping to the project from FAO technical units)	73 077
Running costs (GOE) in the field, (office rent, vehicle and office maintenance, fuel, telephone bills, transportation costs for procured inputs, project visibility and communication, etc.) ⁴⁹	296 499
Sub-total	4 449 576
Indirect costs (7%)	311 424
Total budget	4 761 000

No co-financing is envisaged for this initiative.

The operational duration of the programme is 36 months from the date of signature of the Contribution Agreement.

⁴⁸ A major part of the travel budget line is to cover per diem payments for participants in training sessions and workshops (and is therefore not for FAO staff only). These costs are not included on the training budget line, in accordance with the FAO financial system, but on the travel budget line.

⁴⁹ The running costs (or “general operating expenses – GOE” in the FAO terminology) are different from the 7% overhead costs, as they are necessary to carry out the project activities and are therefore directly linked to the project, in particular to cover costs at field level, usually on a cost-sharing basis with other projects. On the other hand, the 7% indirect costs (overhead costs) are kept at FAO HQ to contribute to the functioning of the organisation (e.g. FAO procurement service, finance service, etc.).

4.4. Performance monitoring

Reporting

As stipulated in the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA), a technical and financial report will be submitted to the European Commission on an annual basis.

Monitoring

In addition to the standard reports, the FAO will produce quarterly progress and situation reports during implementation of the ECHO-funded project. The monitoring will be led by the FAO Regional Emergency Officer – Agriculture Sector in charge of the project with the support of national agronomists assigned to the project, following a process of data collection and analysis, reporting (quarterly flash report format) and use of information, based on the indicators identified in the logical framework matrix.

While the logical framework matrix in Annex 1 provides indicators (including EC standard indicators) for monitoring and evaluating the degree to which the project has achieved its purpose and results, a number of specific indicators related to cross-cutting issues are proposed below:

Gender-related indicators:

- (i) Number of women involved in multiplication scheme (individual or group/FFS) and training;
- (ii) Level of women's participation in defining target group and final beneficiary figures by gender;
- (iii) Number of women involved in the national coordination system.

Environmental sustainability-related indicators:

- (i) Number of local cassava varieties from which germplasm has been collected and inventoried.

4.5. Evaluation and audit

Evaluation: A mid-term review and a final evaluation of the project are envisaged.

Audit: The FAO's standard audit procedures will apply.

4.6. Communication and visibility

Visibility principle (in line with the FAFA): the FAO will take appropriate measures to publicise the fact that the action has received funding from the European Union using, whenever applicable, the EC visibility guidelines⁵⁰.

Visibility plan

- § *Objective of visibility and communication activities:* To raise awareness among the host countries, recipients and institutional partners of the European Union's role in delivering food security assistance to the population in the seven target countries.
- § *Target audience:* Ministry of Agriculture, research centres and NGOs in the seven targeted countries plus regional institutions, particularly the IITA and ASARECA.
- § *Communication instrument chosen:* A press release, primarily on the FAO website and Reliefweb. The FAO will also consult partners (the IITA and ASARECA) to have references to the project on their websites as well. All publicity material, such as T-shirts, caps, etc., will acknowledge that the action was carried out "with funding by the European Union" and will display the European logo in compliance with the EC guidelines. The same will also apply to all publications relating to the action (workshop proceedings, training material, posters, maps, etc.).

⁵⁰http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/index_en.htm

ANNEX 1 – Logical framework matrix

Title	Regional Cassava Initiative in Central and Eastern Africa.			
Overall objective of the project	To contribute to <i>protecting and improving the food security status of vulnerable subsistence farmers in Central and Eastern Africa.</i>			
	<i>Reasons for action</i>	<i>Objectively verifiable indicators</i>	<i>Sources of verification</i>	<i>Risks and assumptions</i>
Purpose of the project	To restore cassava yields by reinforcing the capacity of the subsistence farmers most prone to food insecurity to prevent, mitigate, prepare for and respond to cassava-related diseases in the region.	<p><u>Standard indicator No 1:</u> Cropping area supported by the project (the agricultural area supported by the project).</p> <p><u>Standard indicator No 2:</u> Technology adoption by farmers, i.e. proportion of farmers who have planted improved cassava varieties as a percentage of those who have attended awareness-raising/training sessions.</p> <p>Cassava yields are restored to pre-CMD and pre-CBSD level at household level by 2010.</p> <p>NB.: Country-wide pre-disease yield levels will not be achievable by 2010.</p>	Baseline survey.	<p>Assumption:</p> <p>Risk: Diseases progress faster than the dissemination of new varieties.</p>
Results	Result 1 – Improved cassava varieties are widely available to vulnerable subsistence farmers in the region.	<p>Number of certified cuttings redistributed and number of beneficiary households by 2010.</p> <p>Improved cassava varieties account for at least 30% of total cassava planted in targeted areas by 2010.</p> <p>100% of cassava multiplication sites have been surveyed, certified or declassified.</p> <p>100% of certified multiplication sites are in conformity with quality standards accepted by countries.</p>	<p>Beneficiary lists.</p> <p>Project evaluation.</p> <p>Dynamic maps data-warehouse.</p>	<p>Assumption: Farmers are willing to adopt improved cassava varieties. The FAO “quality standards for vegetatively propagated crops” manual is published in 2009.</p> <p>Risk: MoAs might refuse to accept the FAO quality standards, but fail to offer alternative standards.</p>

	<p>Result 2 – Preventive capacity and measures are enhanced by the availability of cassava-disease surveillance information to government authorities, NGOs and donors.</p>	<p>A minimum of 50 persons per country are able to report suspected cassava-related diseases to relevant authorities by 2011.</p> <p>A minimum network of 20 FFS is established in each country with capacity to report on CBSD and CMD.</p> <p>An indepth disease survey is conducted in 2009 and 2010.</p>	<p>Dynamic maps.</p> <p>Project evaluation.</p>	<p>Assumption: Funds are available to other partners, such as the CRS/IITA, under the GLCI to co-finance disease incidence surveys until 2011.</p> <p>Risk: Leading FFS members are not willing to act as field focal points for disease detection.</p>
	<p>Result 3 – Movements of cassava vegetative material are better regulated with the aid of operational cassava commissions in each country and a regional information and coordination network.</p>	<p>By 2010, seven national commissions are leading quarterly coordination workshops and managing a national database on cassava with the following indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 100% of training material is harmonised (all stakeholders are using the same material); - 100% of varieties multiplied are cleared by the national commission (no other varieties are multiplied); - 100% of multiplication sites are known, monitored and mapped; - one national dynamic maps CD is released per year. <p>70% of all stakeholders report that they know the regional information system posted on the ASARECA website and use it at least twice a year.</p>	<p>Workshop proceedings.</p> <p>Dynamic maps release.</p>	<p>Assumption: The MoAs concerned are willing to lead a coordination mechanism on cassava-related issues.</p> <p>ASARECA is interested in playing an active role in regional coordination and information related to cassava.</p> <p>Risk: ASARECA might become overstretched with increasing demand.</p> <hr/> <p>Precondition Security prevails in the areas targeted by the project.</p>

**ACTION FICHE FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME –
STRATEGIC PRIORITY 3: EXPLOITING THE POTENTIAL OF CONTINENTAL AND REGIONAL
APPROACHES TO IMPROVE FOOD SECURITY –
“LIVESTOCK FOR LIVELIHOODS”**

1 IDENTIFICATION

Title/Number	Livestock for Livelihoods: Strengthening Climate Change Adaptation Strategies through Improved Management at the Livestock-Wildlife-Environment Interface		
Total cost	<i>EC contribution:</i> €4 883 500		
Aid method/ Method of implementation	Project approach – Joint management by means of signature of a contribution agreement with an international organisation (AU-IBAR)		
DAC code	52010	Sector	Food security

14. RATIONALE

14.1. Sector context

Arid and semi-arid lands (ASALs) are widespread in Africa, covering between 60% and 80% of the land surface. They are home to a substantial portion of pastoralists (currently one of the population groups in sub-Saharan Africa most vulnerable to the impact of climate change) and, to a lesser extent, sedentary farming communities. Continued population growth has significantly increased the pressure on natural resources and leads to a range of conflicts. ASALs are fragile ecosystems where natural resources such as water, fertile soil and vegetation are scarce. Furthermore, the ecosystems are not easily restored once degraded. Currently, the ecological dynamics are complicated by the inevitable growing effects of climate change.

Hence, in these vulnerable and relatively resource-poor ASALs, there is fierce competition between pastoralists and their livestock, sedentary farmers and wildlife for water, fodder and land, leading to conflicts and further ecosystem degradation as the carrying capacity of this fragile natural environment continues to wane and is often over-stretched. Judicious management of these natural resources, including conflict management and adaptation/mitigation to climate change, has become imperative to avert severe ecological disasters.

Understandably, sustainable management of scarce natural resources becomes even more complex in cross-border (or across the Regional Economic Communities / RECs) land-use systems where different regulatory and institutional frameworks apply and where common transboundary mechanisms have to be set up to allow appropriate natural resource management.

Having built up experience (DLWEIP⁵¹) in two such zones, namely in Kenya (Samburu and Laikipia districts) and Burkina Faso (Arly National Park), the African Union Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU/IBAR) proposes a follow-on project to consolidate the

⁵¹ Dryland Livestock-Wildlife-Environment Interface Project funded by UNEP/GEF and implemented by AU/IBAR in Kenya and Burkina Faso.

ground gained in the above-mentioned hotspots and start up a similar process in four transboundary hotspots, namely:

- 1) *The W-Arly-Pendjari (WAP) Parks Complex (Benin, Burkina Faso and Niger);*
- 2) *The Karamajong Cluster (Kenya, Uganda and Sudan);*
- 3) *The area around Lake Chad (Nigeria, Cameroon and Chad);*
- 4) *The Fouta Djallon Foothills (Senegal, Guinea and Mali).*

The major problems in these areas go beyond food and feed insecurity. There are serious environmental concerns such as incursion of cattle into the protected park areas, heavy competition for water between cattle, wildlife and people (especially in the case of transhumance), environmental degradation, the presence of busy corridors for seasonal migration of livestock (transhumance) and the current changes in the seasonal nature of the migrations which have led to cattle sometimes passing prior to crop harvesting, resulting in significant crop damage for local farmers. These are all significant causes for concern.

The effect of climate change on the ecosystem is notorious and still growing. But even under increasingly unfavourable climatic conditions pastoralists are expected to do whatever they can to keep their cattle at present stocking rates. Their strategies to adapt to climate change will undoubtedly consist of a robust approach, including more intensive migration towards places where fodder is available (e.g. protected areas and cropping areas), resulting in increased competition for resources and associated conflicts. This project seeks to address these issues and develop ways to increase the adaptability of livestock-dependent communities, providing alternative livelihoods and less conflictive solutions.

14.2. Lessons learned

This proposal builds on lessons learned from DLWEIP and intends to scale up this experience. DLWEIP not only provides an ideal institutional and technical background to this proposal, but also systematically dovetails with the core elements and objectives presented in it in terms of geographical area and themes. As a pilot project, DLWEIP logically calls for an appropriate follow-on, scaled-up project. Documents providing details of achievements and progress and an interim evaluation of DLWEIP are available.

Assessments of natural resource dynamics, livelihoods, water resources, natural resources-based conflicts and markets have produced a rich base of information on the arid and semi-arid ecosystem. Land use and land policy issues that need to be addressed for this ecosystem have been documented and have the potential to influence governments. Among other issues and best practice, the project has documented the needs to examine the group representatives' action, to streamline legislation to accommodate conservancies and to discourage individual ownership and sub-division of ASALs in Kenya.

This project has been supporting community members and leaders of conservancies by means of a series of workshops and training sessions on the following subjects: community-based resource management plans with zoning of areas allocated to different purposes such as conservation, settlement and grazing; community-based by-laws; awareness-raising on sustainable rangelands management and proper grazing systems as a means to enhance community livelihoods; rehabilitation of degraded land; understanding the root causes of the existing conflicts in the area covered by the project and developing and implementing conflict resolution mechanisms (such as conflict resolution plans (CRP)); alternative means of livelihood; animal health and production (disease surveillance, breed and feed improvement); awareness-raising for transhumance livestock owners on national and sub-regional legislation in relation to cross-border livestock movements; establishment of transhumance routes and guidelines for management of grazing lands and transhumance routes.

Among the lessons learned from implementation of the DLWEIP:

1. Direct coordination between implementing partners (under the auspices of the national steering committee) created synergies and strong partnerships between relevant government departments and non-governmental organisations.
2. The nature of transboundary NRM-based conflicts and therefore the necessity to involve stakeholders from neighbouring communities within the country and even across international borders must be appreciated.
3. Sectoral conflict issues must be mainstreamed into a national peace-building process by enlisting the support of relevant policy-makers on appropriate approaches to conflict management.

14.3. Complementary action

One core component of TPN3⁵² is implementation of the “Dryland Livestock–Wildlife–Environment Interface Project (DLWEIP)”. This project therefore complements the UNCCD’s Regional Action Programme (RAP) and its Thematic Programme Networks in Africa. Moreover, the proposed project would operate within the framework of CAADP⁵³ pillars 1 and 3 on sustainable land management and food security respectively.

The work on the project will comply with the action guidelines contained in ALIVE⁵⁴ policy notes on pastoral mobility and community-based drought management initiatives. These strategy documents have been validated by major stakeholders involved in livestock development in Africa and contain consensus-based recommendations. In particular, the action will build on recommendations concerning participation of stakeholders and pastoral communities, support for livelihood diversification and preservation of pastoral resources.

At regional level, the proposed project will complement and synergise with ongoing initiatives and past programmes such as the Intergovernmental Authority for Development (IGAD) Regional Food Security and Risk Management Programme (REFORM) funded by the EU/EDF (€10 million) and implemented by the Inter-Governmental Authority for Development (IGAD) Secretariat in the Karamajong Cluster, the IUCN⁵⁵, CILSS⁵⁶ and TerrAfrica⁵⁷ programmes on natural resources and desertification in West Africa, the ECOPAS⁵⁸ programme funded by the EU/EDF between 2001 and 2005 in the W-Arly-Pendjari (WAP) Parks Complex and the projects funded by the Fonds Français pour l’Environnement Mondial (FFEM) on protected areas in Northern Cameroon among others. Further consultations will be held to identify areas of synergy and lessons learned.

⁵² In the Environment Initiatives of the NEPAD, the AU is responsible for facilitating establishment and implementation of the six thematic programme networks (TPNs) under the UNCCD and designated institutional focal points that include:

- TPN 1: Integrated management of water resources – SADC, Maseru, Lesotho;
- TPN2: Sustainable land use (agroforestry and soil conservation) – INSAH–CILSS, Bamako, Mali;
- TPN3: Rational use of rangelands and development of fodder crop – AU/IBAR, Nairobi, Kenya;
- TPN4: Ecological monitoring, natural resources mapping, remote sensing and early warning systems – African Organisation for Mapping and Remote Sensing, Algiers, Algeria;
- TPN5: Promotion of new and renewable energy sources – National Agency for Renewable Energy (ANER), Dakar, Senegal;
- TPN6: Development of sustainable agriculture – AU/SAFGRAD, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.

⁵³ CAADP is the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme that has been agreed as the blueprint for Africa’s agricultural development agenda.

⁵⁴ ALIVE is a partnership of organisations, regional and international institutions, civil society, donors, research and training institutes and all others involved in livestock development in sub-Saharan Africa.

⁵⁵ International Union for Conservation of Nature.

⁵⁶ Comité Permanent Inter-Etats de lutte contre la sécheresse dans le Sahel.

⁵⁷ TerrAfrica is a multipartner platform that seeks to provide an enabling framework for action to scale up the mainstreaming and financing of effective and efficient country-driven sustainable land management approaches (SLM).

⁵⁸ Ecosystème des Parcs en Zone Soudano-sahélienne.

The project will also build on the effectiveness of RECOPA⁵⁹ in Burkina Faso for changing attitudes among farmers, improving livestock production systems, establishing buffer zones and demarcating, developing and protecting transhumance corridors.

14.4. Donor coordination

Two levels of donor coordination are envisaged in the project proposed:

Overall implementation: The programme will be presented to the harmonisation, alignment and coordination (HAC) donor forum in Kenya. The principle of presenting IBAR and its programmes to this forum has been discussed previously with the local European Commission Delegation. IBAR will make implementation reports available to the donor forum after approval by the EC.

Regional implementation: IBAR will ensure that donors active in the regions where the project is being implemented will be informed about the objectives and set-up of the project with a view to harnessing synergies. They will be invited to regional meetings and will receive copies of implementation reports after approval by the EC.

15. DESCRIPTION

15.1. Objectives

Overall objective: To strengthen livestock-based livelihoods and improve food and environmental security in arid and semi-arid lands.

Purpose of the project: To improve natural resources and livestock management practices in designated sites in response to the increasing risks from and vulnerability to climate change.

15.2. Expected results and main activities

The proposed strategy is designed to improve natural resources and livestock management practices in arid and semi-arid ecosystems in Africa as a pro-active response to the increasing risks from and vulnerability to climate change. Building up the capacity of communities that are responsible for management of the resources at the interface is therefore critical to environmental security. The capacity-building activities will ensure community participation, enhance community negotiating skills and empower communities to manage resources at the interface. Training for women in alternative means of making a livelihood and support for women's groups will broaden their economic base and increase their active participation in management of natural resources by ensuring equitable benefit-sharing, resource distribution and utilisation and enhancing livelihood security.

Management of community lands, including the buffer zones, requires the good will of the sedentary livestock farmers. Land-use planning and management will be developed in consultation with and with the participation of all stakeholders and with supportive policy structures. Dynamic land-use planning is needed to appraise access to buffer zones for livestock and to determine accessible and non-accessible areas for livestock. The community needs to be empowered, by means of training, to seize income-generating opportunities, especially in an improved livestock marketing system.

Also, these activities will ensure, in collaboration with all other partners, effective control of diseases and of other ecological consequences of climate change and management at the interface. The project will also ensure that the community-based organisations (CBOs) and local social organisations are well trained and equipped with knowledge and skills to educate others.

⁵⁹ Réseau de Communication sur le Pastoralisme.

Result area 1: Appropriate natural resource management systems established at the livestock-wildlife-agriculture interface.

- Activity 1: Identifying policy entry points for supporting implementation of priority options for adaptation in pastoral and agro-pastoral systems;*
Activity 2: Developing natural resources management plans;
Activity 3: Establishing a functional peace-building and conflict resolution committee;
Activity 4: Developing community-based Monitoring and Evaluation systems.

Result area 2: Degraded lands restored and rehabilitated by participatory community-based action (establishment of demonstration zones).

- Activity 1: Establishing grazing committees;*
Activity 2: Developing zoning, including grazing management plans;
Activity 3: Demonstrating rehabilitation of degraded land.

Result area 3: “Climate-proofed” livestock production systems and alternative means of livelihood provided to pastoral and agro-pastoral production systems in ASALs.

- Activity 1: Providing training and support for alternative livelihoods and action on livestock production (feed resources, breeding, etc.);*
Activity 2: Strengthening Community disease surveillance (training community animal health workers (CAHWs) and wardens) on emerging diseases;
Activity 3: Strengthening local/grassroots livestock market associations (training, institutional support and infrastructure);
Activity 4: Strengthening women’s groups to develop basic entrepreneurial capacity.

Result area 4: Enhanced awareness of and information-sharing on best practice on sustainable natural resource management in response to the increasing risks from and vulnerability to climate change at the livestock-wildlife interface (regional comparative learning).

- Activity 1: Identifying the target groups and facilitating exchange visits for dissemination of success stories and lessons learned;*
Activity 2: Documenting the success stories and lessons learned and sharing information;
Activity 3: Disseminating information and holding progress assessment workshops.

(See the annexed logical framework matrix for further details.)

15.3. Risks and assumptions

The main risks that could jeopardise achievement of the envisaged outputs and results include:

- (1) political instability in the transboundary areas covered;
- (2) inadequate participation by the countries involved and ownership of the action; and
- (3) lack of enabling policy frameworks at national levels for community-based initiatives on livestock-wildlife-environment interactions (e.g. negotiations on resource ownership in Burkina Faso have caused a one-year delay in implementation of the DLWEIP pilot project in Burkina Faso).

15.4. Cross-cutting issues

Gender equality: In African drylands, women’s traditional roles in and knowledge of natural resource management and food security are critical for livelihoods. They are thus severely affected when erosion and diminishing soil fertility lower crop and livestock productivity and

lessen the sources of household incomes derived from these products. Yet, despite their roles and extensive knowledge, women living in drylands (who tend to rank among the poorest of the poor) often face constraints in their efforts to care for their families and for the lands on which they depend. Because ownership and decision-making over land and livestock have remained predominantly the domain of men, women are often excluded from participation in land conservation and development projects, from agricultural extension work and from the overall policymaking process. Promotion of alternative livelihoods – which is central to the proposed project – will mainly focus on small enterprises, targeting pastoralist women, as in the case of the women’s poultry group established and supported by the DLWEIP.

Environmental sustainability: The core components of the proposed project hinge on understanding environmental dynamics, reducing threats and improving environmental sustainability in the areas where the project will be implemented. In this context, DLWEIP’s ecosystem health framework piloted in East and West Africa will be replicated and scaled up.

Good governance: Introduction of an ecosystem framework complements and contributes directly to national action plans (NAPs) by promoting dialogue and quantifying advances on the ecosystem health framework.

Human rights: Provision of a livestock-based livelihood to improve food and environmental security is a fundamental right for every individual, particularly the most vulnerable groups of women and children. Access to basic information on livestock-based livelihoods is critical for an informed decision to exercise basic rights to a sustainable livelihood.

15.5. Stakeholders

The ultimate beneficiaries of the project are pastoral, agricultural and agro-pastoral communities, particularly women whose livelihoods depend mostly on sustainable management of land and other natural resources conflicting with wildlife.

The *Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (IBAR)* is the African Union’s technical body for livestock issues. IBAR is active in the following domains: control of major transboundary animal diseases; improvement of genetic and feed resources; development of livestock information, communication and technology; enhancement of trade and marketing of livestock and livestock products; quality assurance for livestock and animal products; and harmonisation of livestock-related policies and legal frameworks. IBAR will be the contracting authority in charge of overall coordination of the project with the aid of regular internal monitoring and evaluation.

The *RECs*, as building blocks of the African Union, form the regional level for planning, coordinating and monitoring the integration process. To this end, the RECs’ technical units will coordinate and facilitate implementation of the project and reporting. The RECs will also bear the primary responsibility for seeking the full participation of all regional stakeholders in the planning and implementation stages of the project. Three RECs will be involved in the project: the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)⁶⁰, the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) and the Economic Community of Western African States (ECOWAS).

⁶⁰ IGAD has replaced the East African Community (EAC) because of its compelling comparative advantage as the current implementing agency for the REFORM Programme in the Karamajong Cluster – one of the designated sites for action.

The *Permanent Inter-State Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel* (Comité Permanent Inter-Etats de lutte contre la sécheresse dans le Sahel – CILSS), as the technical body of ECOWAS for natural resource management, will contribute shared experience and lessons learned from its previous and ongoing initiatives in the region. The project will also use its rich database to build baseline data to be set against the logframe.

The *African Union Office for the Promotion of Semi-Arid Food Grain Research and Development* (AU/SAFGRAD) is the designated focal point of the network for the promotion of sustainable agricultural farming systems in the context of the UNCCD in Africa. It is also the specialised technical arm of the Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture of the AUC with a mandate to enhance coordination and cooperation in agricultural research, technology transfer and commercialisation plus management of natural resources in semi-arid ecosystems to improve food security. The focal point of the UNCCD TPN6 will use its network for disseminating best practice and identifying target groups for the regional comparative learning process.

The *African Wildlife Foundation* (AWF), a leading international conservation organisation focusing solely on Africa and active for over forty-five years, will contribute its strong expertise on wildlife and community conservation initiatives.

The *World Initiative for Sustainable Pastoralism* (WISP) is a global initiative that supports empowerment of pastoralists to manage dryland resources sustainably. WISP will advocate an enabling environment for sustainable rangeland management, improved pastoral livelihoods and pastoral empowerment.

Line ministries in different countries are the partners in the field who will be responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the project.

International and local groups and associations representing pastoralists.

Other stakeholders (e.g. national and regional NGOs) will be identified during the inception phase of the project.

16. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

16.1. Method of implementation

The proposed method of implementation is joint management by means of signature of a contribution agreement with an international organisation (the Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources of the African Union Commission – AU-IBAR).

The principles of the 2005 EU strategy for Africa and the institutional reform programme between the African Union Commission (AUC), of which AU-IBAR is part, and the European Commission are further reasons for financing the project under a contribution agreement.

The project will be implemented under the auspices of the Animal Production Unit (APU) of AU-IBAR, which will be responsible for the technical management and day-to-day coordination and implementation. The APU will be supported by a project officer, recruited by AU-IBAR and paid for by the project. In line with the Paris Declaration and the Accra

Agenda for Action on aid effectiveness, specially with the aim of strengthening institutional capacity and avoiding parallel implementing structures, AU-IBAR has put in place a permanent institutional project management mechanism – the Project Support Unit (PSU) – which is responsible for financial and administrative management of the proposed project, including procurement, logistics, protocol, monitoring and evaluation. The PSU is accountable to the AU-IBAR Finance and Administration Unit and to the AU-IBAR Director, thus guaranteeing full institutional alignment where project implementation is concerned.

Because of the transboundary nature of the approach and in line with its mandate to strengthen regional institutions and integration policies, AU-IBAR will involve three RECs in implementation of the project. Each REC will appoint a project focal point which will act as the regional project coordinator. The regional coordinator will oversee the activities in his or her region, provide technical assistance and coordination, conduct the necessary monitoring and report to the project officer in the APU. The project will provide an operating budget to each regional coordinator on a monthly basis.

In the participating States, focal contact points (staff members) in the relevant line Ministries will be designated to ensure that the project is monitored closely by the national authorities. Staff of the line Ministries in the countries concerned will be in charge of the field work and implementation of the national components. They will perform their tasks together with other key stakeholders like the pastoralist organisation WISP and the AWF. This approach will greatly enhance ownership of the project and uptake of the outcomes as a direct contribution to the relevant national action plans and ensure the sustainability of the project.

A Project Steering Committee (PSC) representing all key stakeholders will provide overall policy guidance and oversee implementation of the project. The composition and terms of reference of the PSC will be decided during the inception phase of the project.

16.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

All contracts implementing the action must be awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents laid down and published by the international organisation concerned (the African Union Commission – AUC). Financial, procurement and recruitment regulations and policies and relevant AUC management systems will be used to implement the project. All systems are being upgraded as part of the AUC/EC cooperation programme on institutional reform. Formal recognition of the policies and systems is expected in early 2009.

16.3. Budget and time-table

The operational duration of the programme is 42 months from the date of signature of the contribution agreement.

Budget	Euro
Inception/preparatory phase	120 000
Activities	2 950 000
Result 1:	700 000
Result 2:	850 000
Result 3:	1 100 000
Result 4:	300 000
Investment	
Equipment and supplies	71 100

Operating and management costs	
Staff, vehicles and office	1 052 400
Outsourced expertise	40 000
Administrative costs	250 000
Evaluation (mid-term and final)	150 000
Audit	50 000
Contingencies	200 000
TOTAL	4 883 500

16.4. Performance monitoring

Monitoring will be performed by AU-IBAR in the form of meetings to assess progress towards the objectives and outcomes of the project. Specific outputs and indicators shown in the logical framework matrix will be adhered to and feedback from communities and other participating institutions will also be incorporated in project implementation and management.

At the end of every year, an internal evaluation of project implementation will be carried out by AU-IBAR in collaboration with other stakeholders, including the community. During the project inception phase, consensus will be reached with other implementing partners and stakeholders on what data to collect and how to collect and process the data on performance indicators.

***Reporting schedule:** Monthly reports from the countries concerned to their RECs, quarterly reports from the RECs to IBAR and semi-annual report from IBAR to the European Commission.*

***Coordination meetings:** Quarterly meetings between RECs and their countries, semi-annual meetings between IBAR, RECs and other implementing partners and annual meetings of the Steering Committee.*

Monitoring: This will follow international good practice. More specifically, result-based M&E systems and approaches will be adhered to. In that respect, the AUC, together with the European Commission, has developed a new M&E instrument – the “Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting Tool (AMERT)”. AMERT will form the central system to ensure relevant and timely M&E results and information (before) the action and target values with and without the action (for the overall project).

16.5. Evaluation and audit

Audit: All original project documentation will be kept at the AU-IBAR offices in Nairobi. An annual audit by the AU-IBAR office of implementation of the project is envisaged and the auditors will be recruited via the local European Commission Delegation if the Delegation becomes the implementing body for the European Commission. In case the programme is implemented by AIDCO at European Commission headquarters, a certified auditor will be recruited after a competition procedure approved by the European Commission.

Evaluation: A mid-term evaluation, after about 18 months of implementation, and a final evaluation towards the end of the implementation period will be undertaken by an independent M&E team. The evaluation teams will be recruited under an EC framework

contract in order to ensure an independent and transparent process. The terms of reference for these activities will be jointly developed between the European Commission and AU-IBAR.

The results of the mid-term evaluation will serve to improve aspects of the approach and implementation during the first phase. The results of the final evaluation will be used to improve future project design in AU-IBAR and the European Commission. All evaluation results will be shared as widely as possible as part of the AU's knowledge management policies with the aim of enhancing the capacity of AU-IBAR partners and AU member states.

16.6. Communication and visibility

IBAR will ensure adequate visibility, using, whenever applicable, the standards of visibility described in the “Communication and Visibility Manual for EU External Actions” published in April 2008 and available at:

http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/documents/communication_and_visibility_manual_en.pdf

The project will include a detailed stakeholder analysis to establish the different information and communication needs. This includes the inside stakeholders along with the target groups/beneficiaries. A knowledge, attitude and practice (KAP) survey (baseline and tracking) will round off the picture of development of the target group throughout implementation of the project and provide the necessary basis for evaluating and reporting on the effectiveness of the means of communication applied.

Prime areas of communication and visibility

The programme will clarify the areas of communication. The following distinction between the different areas of communication activity might help to cast light on the approach:

1. Project visibility, public relations and media relations

The visibility of the project is governed by the EU guidelines on visibility and IBAR's corporate approach to and means of communication. Activities are aimed primarily at external stakeholders/target groups of the project, but will also entail publication of project reports and results, primarily in print and online.

2. Internal communication

“Internal” means all communication activity within the extended project team, i.e. within the project team itself, between the project team and the stakeholders and, to some degree, among the stakeholders themselves. In this sense, internal communication refers to the roll-out of the programme and can be viewed as a means to support stakeholder coordination.

3. Information, education and communication (IEC)

IEC is distinct from project visibility, as it aims to raise the profile of the issues at hand and position them as important to the target groups. Only two-way communication will be able to lend credibility to the process and, therefore, make a longer lasting impact.

Specific communication objectives and messages will be tailored at a later stage, in a separate session at an inception workshop dealing with communication aspects.

Annex: Logical framework matrix for the project

	Reasons for action	Objectively verifiable indicators	Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
Overall objective	To strengthen livestock-based livelihoods and improve food and environmental security.	Percentage increase in GDP of countries involved in implementation. Percentage of livestock-dependent persons whose income is less than US\$1 per day at the end of the project. Number of policies in implementing countries to enhance livestock as a source of income and protein.	National and local statistics. Impact analysis report (part of result 4). Areas set aside and effectively managed for multiple use of wildlife and restricted livestock grazing during critical seasons. Framework for long-term ecosystem health monitoring at pilot sites and in the neighbouring areas using ground transects and remote-sensing tools.	
Purpose	To improve natural resources and livestock management practices in arid and semi-arid ecosystems in Africa in response to the increasing risks from and vulnerability to climate change.	20% increase in the area under sustainable management by local communities. 12 countries develop and adopt natural resource management plans for the project sites by the end of the project. 10% increase in the livestock productivity index by the third year of the project in the project area.	Project reports. Natural resource management plans.	National policy framework enabling mitigation of, and community-based initiatives on, wildlife/livestock and environment interactions in place. Environmental conditions (e.g. severe drought or floods) do not prohibit development.

<p>Result area 1</p>	<p>Location-specific appropriate natural resource management systems established at the livestock-wildlife-agriculture interface in four identified areas. (Community-based management committees scaled up; ecosystem management plans developed; capacity built.)</p>	<p>At least two policy dialogues between policymakers and other local stakeholders about supporting policies to increase the adaptability of smallholders and pastoralists per project site by the end of the first year. Identified best practice for satisfactory co-habitation between people/livestock/wildlife documented by the end of the first year.</p> <p>All natural resource management plans for the targeted communities at the project sites developed and adopted by competent national authorities by the end of the project.</p> <p>50% reduction in incidence of natural resource-based conflicts in the areas covered by the end of the project.</p> <p>At least three negotiation/conflict prevention meetings held over access to shared resources and successful conflict resolution by local committees before, during and after transhumance.</p> <p>Community-based M&E systems in place at the end of the project.</p>	<p>Reports from policy dialogue workshops. Project reports. Policy briefs.</p> <p>Management plans showing the zoning for protected woodlands and limits for agricultural expansion.</p> <p>Conflict resolution and monitoring reports indicating areas secured for shared use by different groups (e.g. pastoralists and agropastoralists).</p> <p>Reports on community peace-building meetings.</p> <p>Community-driven M&E reports.</p>	<p>Environmental conditions (e.g. severe drought or floods) do not prohibit development. Policymakers buy into the process. Security in the area is maintained. No transboundary or tribal conflicts.</p>
<p>Result area 2</p>	<p>Degraded lands restored and rehabilitated by participatory community-based action (establishment of</p>	<p>10 000 ha of community-rehabilitated land by the end of the project at all project sites (by conservation, reseeded or tree</p>	<p>Project reports. Grazing management plans.</p>	<p>Communities are willing to participate.</p>

	demonstration zones).	planting). Grazing management plans for all the communities on the project site developed by the end of the project. Grazing associations established around buffer zones by the end of the project.	Reports of consultation meetings with communities living at the interface.	
Result area 3	“Climate-proofed” livestock production systems and alternative means of livelihood provided to pastoral and agro-pastoral production systems in ASALs by diversifying and broadening the economic base.	At least two training sessions per project site per year held on disease monitoring, livestock marketing and breeding and grazing management and feed resources aspects. 20% increase in livestock production indexes by the end of the project in the area covered. Two livestock holding grounds rehabilitated by the end of the second year. Four training sessions per selected committee held per year on income-generating activities (beekeeping, dairy farming, tree nurseries, fodder resources, etc.). 20% increase in the income directly accruing to at least 50% of the women by the end of the project in the area covered.	Training reports. Impact assessment reports. Project reports.	
Result area 4	Enhanced awareness of and information-sharing on best practice on sustainable natural resource management in response to increasing risks	At least one exchange visit organised between selected hotspots by the end of the second year. Two exchange visits within each	Reports on exchange visits.	

	from and vulnerability to climate change at the livestock-wildlife interface (regional comparative learning).	hotspot by the end of the second year. At least three information-sharing networks established by the end of the project in each REC. Information and educational material on sustainable NR management developed at the end of the project in printed and electronic form.	List of focal institutions in member states accessing the information. Printed and electronic media reports.	
--	--	---	---	--

ACTION FICHE FOR FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
STRATEGIC PRIORITY 3: REGIONAL FOOD SECURITY PROGRAMMES FOR CENTRAL AND LATIN AMERICA

REGIONAL PROGRAMME FOR FOOD AND NUTRITIONAL SECURITY FOR CENTRAL AMERICA II — PRESANCA II

1. IDENTIFICATION

Title/Number	Regional Programme for Food and Nutritional Security for Central America II — PRESANCA II		
Total cost	Total contribution: €19 500 000 EC contribution: €3 000 000 United Nations Development Programme (UNDP): €5 000 000 Institute of Nutrition of Central America and Panama (INCAP) and other regional institutions linked with the sector: €1 000 000 Local institutions and authorities: €500 000		
Aid method/Method of implementation	Joint management		
DAC code	52010	Sector	Food security

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

Since 1993, the Central American Region has developed a Food and Nutrition Security Strategy, aimed at reducing poverty, hunger and malnutrition. In 2002, due to the coffee price crisis and climate changes that affected the Region, a strategic framework for food and nutrition security was developed by governments and regional institutions. The interest in these issues has grown significantly since the end of 2007, because of the impact that rising food prices have had on the livelihoods of the poorest and most vulnerable families in the region.

In the first half of 2008, seven high-level meetings took place in Central America, with the aim of agreeing and designing mechanisms to combat food and nutrition insecurity in the region. In several declarations the countries' presidents recognised the crucial work carried out by PRESANCA⁶¹ and INCAP⁶² and thanked the European Commission for its financial support.

From December 2007 to date, three major regional strategies have been completed and approved by the presidents of the region. The first, the Central American Agricultural Policy (PACA), drafted by the Council of Agriculture Ministers and ratified in December 2007 at presidential level, seeks to strengthen regional integration, improve the international competitiveness of the agricultural sector, improve food and nutritional security and foster the access of small and medium-sized producers to the benefits of regional integration.

The second important strategy is the Regional Strategy on Agro-environment and Health (ERAS), which was the product of meetings between three ministries of each country (agriculture, environment and health). It promotes consistency and convergence of sector policies in these areas and is closely related to the topics of Food and Nutritional Security (FNS).

The third strategy is related to different measures to minimise the effects on food and nutritional security of the fluctuation of international market prices of food products, fuel and agricultural inputs. This last strategy is based on a mandate given to the ministers of agriculture and health to

⁶¹ Regional Programme for Food and Nutritional Security for Central America.

⁶² Institute of Nutrition for Central America and Panama.

intensify the production of basic seeds, as well as to provide the technology and the inputs necessary for agricultural production.

The accomplishment of these strategies will require significant efforts to transcend from regional to national and local levels. PRESANCA II has been identified as a programme which should facilitate the establishment of links between the various levels and the trickling down of the regional initiatives mentioned to national and local layers of policy-making in Central America.

2.2. Lessons learnt

Within the implementation framework of the Regional Programme for Food and Nutritional Security for Central America (PRESANCA)⁶³ the following are some of the reflections that emerged from external evaluation and monitoring activities, as well as internal analyses — envisioning future actions — undertaken by the European Commission's Regional Delegation:

- The operational time span must be carefully assessed because regional programmes have longer consultation and consensus-reaching processes and therefore also longer implementation cycles as compared to national and local programmes.
- The implementation of FNS regional policies requires that the whole Region be considered; otherwise, dialogue potential and impact will decrease.
- The national and regional levels need to reinforce their links and improve their current channels of communication and coordination. A different and innovative type of approach has to be adopted in order to have more impact at the national level.
- With a view to improving and strengthening regional integration at local level, activities should be carried out in bi-national or tri-national areas. Generally national food security programmes, based on a Country Strategy Paper, only focus on activities within the borders of one country, so that activities of a “cross-border” nature are only possible within the remit of regional programmes and are geared to reinforcing the real integration process.
- FNS-specialised human resources training activities, combined with local activities related to decision making, are highly recommended. Actions of this kind contribute directly to capacity building and FNS policy development at the local level. This model should be promoted and replicated at national and regional levels as well, in order to step up information and communication between the regional and national levels. Continuation of the FNS-specialised scholarship/work programme is key for having an impact on the integration of FNS policies at the different levels of action.
- There is a need to reform national FNS strategies in order to better define the linkages between regional and local levels of FNS strategy implementation. The national authorities have to be strengthened, using their own structures. This means that an innovative scheme of interaction between the Programme and national/regional/local authorities has to be developed.
- In the Central American Integration System, INCAP is the organisation officially mandated to deal with food and nutritional security, in particular when related to FNS aspects of (health and nutrition) public policies in the region. INCAP also coordinates with other specialised regional institutions related to the sector (e.g. agriculture, environment, water). Furthermore, the competence of INCAP is widely recognised at regional and international levels. The General Secretariat of the Central American Integration System has the mandate for regional interinstitutional coordination.
- The participation of specialised regional institutions in actions related to FNS has been crucial for developing intersectoral approaches for public policies, plans, programmes and projects at regional and local levels. The model of CCR-SAN⁶⁴ has been very successful and is one of the factors that contributed to PRESANCA's success in its first phase.

⁶³ PRESANCA emerged out of the interest expressed by political and technical, national and regional bodies, and out of the experiences gathered by these organisations and institutions in their struggle against food and nutrition insecurity among the socially excluded sectors of the programme's recipient countries (see: <http://www.sica.int/presanca>).

⁶⁴ CCR-SAN (Regional FNS Consultative Committee) is a regional interinstitutional/multisectoral coordinating mechanism for Central American integration. It has an Inter-Agency Forum and a Coordination Committee, currently bringing together the Secretariat for Central American Social Integration SISCA Coordination Center for Disaster Prevention in Central America CEPREDENAC Regional Committee on Water Resources CRRH, the General Secretary of the Agricultural Central American Council (SCAC), the Central American Bank for Economic Integration (BCIE), INCAP, the Secretariat of the Central American Higher University Council (SCSUCA), the General Secretariat of the Central American Education and Culture Council (SG CECC), the Central American Environment and Development Council (SE CCAD), the Organisation of the Central American Isthmus Fishing and Aquiculture Sectors (OSPESCA), the Secretariat for Central American Economic Integration (SIECA) and the Federation of Central American Isthmus Municipalities (FEMICA); it is open to other regional organisations working in the same field.

2.3. Complementary actions

The present Programme is in addition to the many initiatives and projects concerning FNS and related issues currently financed by the European Commission, the EU Member States (EU MS) and other donors in a large number of countries.

In particular, there are various FNS initiatives in Central American countries which attempt to improve FNS from different perspectives. The European Commission is supporting, among other things, the following initiatives. In Guatemala the EC has five ongoing operations funded by the Food Security Thematic Programme (€2.5m) and a geographic programme (rural and local development, €25m) in the western highlands of the country, actions which are basically designed to institutionalise the policy in FNS municipal management, and invest resources in activities that improve the conditions for income generation. Additionally, and in line with the CSP 2007-2013, a sector budget support programme (€33.8m) has been designed for implementing the FNS policy and its Strategic Plan 2006-2016. In Honduras, the Food Security Budget Support Programme (PASAH, €14m) and in Nicaragua, the Programme for Local Development and Food Security (PRODELSA, €6.5m) are ongoing. New food security projects, one for Nicaragua (€7m) and another for Honduras (€2m) are at present being designed.

Other existing regional initiatives which are ongoing and related to the development and strengthening of FNS are:

- i. Food aid programmes in emergency situations (WFP, USAID, NGOs);
- ii. Humanitarian aid programmes managed by ECHO and DIPECHO;
- iii. Programme supporting regional integration in Central America (EC — PAIRCA II);
- iv. Regional Programme of Information Systems in Food Security and Nutrition in Central America (PRESISAN).

An FNS Central American Regional Programme (PRESANCA) is currently being successfully implemented with a special emphasis on four Central American countries, namely El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua. At the regional level, this programme is linked to the General Secretariat for the Central American Integration System (SG-SICA), the Secretariat for Social Integration (SISCA), the Institute of Nutrition for Central America and Panama (INCAP) and the CCR-SAN institutions, which also represent regional institutions and technical secretariats. The programme pursues the goal of helping to improve food and nutritional security among the most vulnerable populations of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua. It also envisions contributing to the Central American regional integration process and to the establishment of a coordinated regional agenda on food and nutritional security. PRESANCA's period of implementation will end in September 2009.

2.4. Donor coordination

The European Commission's cooperation with the Region currently overlaps between the Regional Strategy Paper (RSP) 2002-2006 and the RSP 2007-2013. It encompasses various topics which allow continuous dialogue with the integration bodies that make up SICA. Timely communications facilitate the efficient and effective management of different thematic priorities.

The Programme is expected to contribute to the rationalisation and harmonisation of food security initiatives at global, regional and national levels. With a view to enhancing coordination and on the basis of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action on aid effectiveness, the programme will be open to multi-donor support and financing, as well as multi-partner implementation and governance mechanisms.

The European Commission maintains regular contact with some Member States that are working in the FSN area at regional level, with the aim of establishing close coordination and inviting them to participate in the implementation of this programme. Concrete interest in direct participation has been expressed by some of them.

3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectives

Overall objective: To contribute to the reduction of food and nutritional insecurity among the most vulnerable populations in Central America, while strengthening the Central American integration system.

Specific objective: To improve the food and nutritional security of the most marginalised people by consolidating a regional and national political and legal framework, making policies at different levels more consistent, improving the generation and management of knowledge in matters related to FNS, and supporting local and supra-municipal development, with special emphasis on the development of marginal and border zones in the Region.

3.2. Expected results and main activities

These objectives should be reached through three project results, each with its subsequent activities and indicators:

- Result No 1: FNS policies and strategies have been strengthened at the regional, national and local levels.

Main activities

- 1.1. Support regional mechanisms and processes relevant to the policies and strategies in FNS.
- 1.2. Promote consistency among regional and national policies and support the analysis and implementation of sector policies at national level.
- 1.3. Help regional and national organisations of municipalities to integrate FNS into their policies.
- 1.4. Develop facilitator mechanisms and strategies of communication to achieve political impact.

Indicators

- 1.1. At least one procedure has been developed to formalise proposals from regional organisations linked to FNS, to be discussed in preparatory meetings before high-level presidential encounters.
- 1.2. At least two regional strategies have been harmonised at national level in at least three countries.
- 1.3. At least three regional/national organisations related to municipal development have a strategy to include FNS in their plans for support to their member municipalities.
- 1.4. One communication mechanism to achieve political impact has been developed.

- Result No 2: The generation and management of knowledge have been improved and institutional and professional capacities have been strengthened.

Main activities

- 1.1. Support the management of knowledge.
- 1.2. Strengthen human resources linked with FNS policies, plans and projects developed at different levels.
- 1.3. Develop mechanisms for dissemination of knowledge on food and nutrition security.

Indicators

- 1.1. During the third year of programme implementation, at least 50% of the investigations anticipated in the global plan are ongoing or concluded.
- 1.2. At mid-term of the implementation period, 40% of the staff involved in the programme have received specialised training in FNS.
- 1.3. A communication strategy has been developed and implemented.

- Result No 3: Local development with an emphasis on FNS has been strengthened.

Main activities

- 1.1. Improve capabilities of local associations of municipalities (bi- or tri-national) participating in the programme in forecasting and management with emphasis on FNS.

1.2. Manage a development fund to implement FNS projects (FONSAN) in border areas.

Indicators

1.1. At least 60% of the participating local associations of municipalities have developed and implemented a plan for strengthening FNS actions in their territories.

1.2.1. At the end of the first year, operational procedures have been adopted for FONSAN which are accessible to local/municipal associations. The functioning and regulation of FONSAN will be inspired by the set of rules adopted for a similar fund under PRESANCA I.

1.2.2. At the end of the second year of the programme, at least 10 FNS projects have been approved by FONSAN and are implemented by local/municipal associations. Current strategies and procedures used by PRESANCA's first phase will be taken into account.

4. RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS

- Existing risks that may affect the participation and commitment of regional, national and municipal institutions will be countered through participative processes at different work levels.
- The Region and its national governments take up the challenge of improving FNS as an instrument to combat poverty.
- Advances are made in Central American regional integration at sector level.

4.1. Cross-cutting issues

Important global trends such as climate change, globalisation of agricultural commodity markets, environmental degradation, rapid urbanisation and pandemics, migration and immigration, gender and indigenous issues need to be incorporated into the analytical process and activities responding to the needs of primary beneficiaries.

4.2. Stakeholders

The following beneficiaries have been identified: Central American organisations linked to this sector (SG-SICA, INCAP, and CCR-SAN⁶⁵ members), national and municipal institutions responsible for designing and implementing FNS action plans in prioritised countries of the Central American Region, as well as civil society organisations structured around this topic. A similar model of interinstitutional participation to the one used in PRESANCA is going to be applied in this new phase.

5. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

5.1. Method of implementation

The project will be implemented over a period of six years as from signature of the Financing Agreement. The option of joint management through the signature of an agreement with an international organisation is being proposed. A Contribution Agreement between the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the European Commission will be signed.

The UNDP will have the role of project administrator and will be responsible for the implementation unit, as in the case of the previous project. Furthermore, it will administer the regional FONSAN fund, contribute funds to it and disburse funds via the four national FONSAN committees⁶⁶ that approve proposals submitted by the associations of municipalities. The UNDP will sign a Delegation Agreement with INCAP, which will be the principal partner institution⁶⁷, and with SG-SICA, as the body with political responsibility. Alliances will be sought with other

⁶⁵ CCR-SAN (Regional FNS Consultative Committee) is a regional interinstitutional/multisectoral coordinating mechanism for Central American integration. It has an Inter-Agency Forum and a Coordination Committee, currently bringing together SISCA, CEPREDENAC, CRRH, S-CAC, BCIE, INCAP, S-CSUCA, SG-CECC, SE-CCAD, OSPESCA, SIECA and FEMICA; it is open to other regional organisations working in the same field.

⁶⁶ FONSAN will only be operative in Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador and Nicaragua.

⁶⁷ With PAHO in the event that the formal separation of PAHO and INCAP has not yet taken place; in that case PAHO will completely delegate to INCAP. After completing the reorganisation, the agreement should be signed with INCAP without PAHO involvement.

UN specialised agencies and so-called “joint programmes”⁶⁸ could be agreed upon. As this is a multi-donor effort, a simple and user-friendly monitoring system will be agreed upon during the first half-year.

The headquarters of PRESANCA II will be established within the institutional framework of INCAP and, as such, will be located within the SICA structure. Although it will have a project structure with its own management staff, it can also be seen as contributing to the institutional strengthening of INCAP and, indirectly, of SICA.

5.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

All contracts implementing the action must be awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents laid down and published by the international organisation concerned.

5.3. Budget and timetable

INDICATIVE					
Outcome / Activities	CE	Regional Institutions contribution	Local Inst. & authorities	UNDP and other Donors	TOTAL
Outcome 1: FNS policies and strategies have been strengthened at the regional, national and local levels.	€ 3,700,000	€ 600,000	€ -	€ -	€ 4,300,000
1.1. Support regional mechanisms and processes relevant to the policies and strategies in FNS	€ 420,000	€ 50,000	€ -		€ 470,000
1.2. Promote consistency among regional and national policies and support analysis and implementation of sectorial policies at national level.	€ 2,000,000	€ 550,000	€ -		€ 2,550,000
1.3. Support regional and national organizations of municipalities to insert the FNS in their policies.	€ 1,130,000	€ -	€ -		€ 1,130,000
1.4. Develop facilitator mechanisms and strategies of communication to achieve political impact	€ 150,000	€ -	€ -		€ 150,000
Outcome 2: The generation and management of knowledge have been improved and institutional and professional abilities have been strengthened.	€ 2,800,000	€ 50,000	€ -	€ -	€ 2,850,000
2.1. Support the management of knowledge.	€ 600,000		€ -		€ 600,000
2.2. Strengthen human resources linked with FNS at different levels.	€ 1,750,000	€ 50,000	€ -		€ 1,800,000
2.3. Dissemination of knowledge.	€ 450,000		€ -		€ 450,000
Outcome 3: Local development with an emphasis on FNS has been strengthened.	€ 3,260,000	€ 50,000	€ 500,000	€ 5,000,000	€ 8,810,000
3.1. Improve capabilities of local associations of municipalities (bi or tri national) participating in the program in forecasting and management with emphasis in FNS.	€ 660,000	€ -	€ -		€ 660,000
3.2. Managing a developing fund –FONSAN- to implement FNS projects	€ 2,600,000	€ 50,000	€ 500,000	€ 5,000,000	€ 8,150,000
4. Technical Assistance	€ -	€ -	€ -	€ -	€ -
5. Technical Coordination Unit	€ 1,698,318	€ 300,000	€ -	€ -	€ 1,998,318
6. Audits	€ 70,000	€ -	€ -	€ -	€ 70,000
7. Visibility and Communication *	€ 210,000	€ -	€ -	€ -	€ 210,000
SUB-TOTAL	€ 11,738,318	€ 1,000,000	€ 500,000	€ 5,000,000	€ 18,238,318
8. Indirect Costs UNDP (7%)	€ 821,682	€ -	€ -	€ -	€ 821,682
9. Evaluations and Audit UE **	€ 240,000	€ -	€ -	€ -	€ 240,000
10. Contingencies ***	€ 200,000	€ -	€ -	€ -	€ 200,000
TOTAL	€ 13,000,000	€ 1,000,000	€ 500,000	€ 5,000,000	€ 19,500,000

* To be used previous authorization of the strategy by CE

** Committed directly by CE

*** Needs official pre authorization by CE

The project will be implemented over a period of 72 months (including 12 to close), starting from the date of signature of the Financing Agreement.

The contribution of the EC and UNDP (including that of possible other donors) will be managed as joint co-financing under a contribution agreement. Other contributions (INCAP and local institutions) will be brought to the project as parallel co-financing.

5.4. Performance monitoring

The project will be closely monitored by the Nicaragua staff of the European Commission Delegation, via field trips and participation in different events. The key indicators will be

⁶⁸ Name for programmes in which more than one UN organisation is involved.

established in the Annual Work Plans mentioned above and will be monitored through an internal programme. External monitoring missions will be considered as complementary actions. The UNDP will implement additional monitoring systems to assess progress in implementation.

5.5. Evaluation and audit

The programme will undergo a mid-term evaluation after three years of implementation and a final evaluation. Audits will be carried out by the UNDP. Verification missions may also be performed by the European Commission.

5.6. Communication and visibility

A communication and visibility strategy aimed at selected audiences, including the constituencies of all partner organisations and those of the European Commission, will be developed. Communication support at regional and local level will aim to (i) identify and bridge communication gaps; (ii) raise awareness of key FNS issues and of the desirability of FNS-related actions in overall development and poverty reduction strategies; (iii) maximise media coverage of key FNS issues and emerging crises; (iv) disseminate information and analysis produced by the programme in formats that are most appropriate for linking them to actionable responses; (v) highlight donors' contributions and related policy priorities.

Standards regarding visibility will be derived from the “EU visibility guidelines for external actions” (http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/visibility/index_en.htm).

ACTION FICHE FOR FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
STRATEGIC PRIORITY 4: ADDRESSING FOOD SECURITY IN EXCEPTIONAL SITUATIONS OF TRANSITION
AND IN FRAGILE SITUATIONS
“LINKING RELIEF TO REHABILITATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN FRAGILE SITUATIONS”

1. IDENTIFICATION

Title	Linking relief to rehabilitation and development (LRRD) in exceptional situations of transition and in fragile situations		
Total cost	<i>EC contribution:</i> €4,185,000		
Method/Management mode	Call for proposals		
DAC code, if applicable	52010	Sector	Food security

2. RATIONALE**2.1 Sector context**

This programme aims to support food security projects implemented by non-governmental organisations (NGOs), international organisations and UN agencies in favour of vulnerable populations in countries where people are exposed to food insecurity, in particular in the context of the LRRD process and in countries in transition.

The programme addresses food insecurity at national and sub-national level, where European Commission geographic instruments cannot be used or cannot operate fully. The targets are the most marginalised and discriminated groups, which are very often the ultra-poor and, hence, food insecure. This component helps in tackling the underlying causes of food insecurity, therefore also contributing to providing a response to the consequences of recent increases in food prices on livelihood conditions.

Actions financed under the present priority area are coherent with past Commission operations under the Food Security Programme and complementary with ECHO's mandate and activities. The aim is to link relief to rehabilitation and development (LRRD) operations, supporting rural economies, through income generating activities increasing food security and resilience of poor rural households.

2.2 Donor coordination

Donor coordination takes place at country level involving consultation with stakeholders at all levels.

In **Guinea Conakry**, coordination with other donors takes place during regular thematic donors' meetings on rural development. Recently, the Government took the initiative to organise and lead a coordination framework with the technical and financial partners. The first meeting is programmed for January 2009. Concerning other EC instruments, ECHO is implementing a nutrition programme in rural areas via the WFP and UNICEF, due to end on 31.12.2008.

In **Burundi**, coordination between the different programmes and stakeholders is not yet optimal. This task should be managed by the Government but is still to be fully assumed. A National Committee for Assistance Coordination (Comité National des Coordinations des Aides — CNCA) was created in December 2005 but is still not totally operational. Sector groups have been created recently, among which one group is dealing with agriculture and rural development, but this group is just starting its coordination activities (first meeting on 25.11.2008). Another group is focusing on reintegration and reinsertion of vulnerable groups (ECHO is part of it). Coordination has so far chiefly been ensured on a case-by-case basis between donors and projects. Within the scope of this Food Security Thematic Programme, the relevant stakeholders (Ministries concerned, other donors) are involved in the preparation of the call for proposals and in the evaluation process, together with ECHO to ensure the link between relief, rehabilitation and development.

In the **Democratic Republic of the Congo**, a thematic group with the main donors and administration is periodically convened by the Agriculture Ministry. In this framework, the EC delegation European Commission Delegation can organise its operations in full knowledge of other donors' actions. At provincial level, local structures called “agriculture advisory boards” will be implemented under the new agriculture code. This body will lead to enhanced coordination for all stakeholders and projects.

In **Sudan**, the main countries and related aid agencies involved in aid cooperation are the UK/DFID (mainly humanitarian assistance but with a progressive switch to recovery and development planned for 2007/2008/2009), the Netherlands (mainly development support through the MTDF), Sweden (LRRD support through multilateral channels), Denmark (half funds for humanitarian assistance and half for development), France and Germany (as major contributors to the EDF), the US/USAID (humanitarian support for Darfur and recovery/development for the south), Norway (development activities through the MTDF), Canada (mainly humanitarian activities and support for UNMIS/AMIS) and Japan (support for UN agencies). There are regular UN-led coordination meetings in place in which the above-mentioned stakeholders participate. In addition, specific coordination of recovery activities takes place for the three areas (three areas steering group led by DFID) and the east (led by the EC). In southern Sudan, the Government is particularly active in leading coordination efforts through the rural development and natural resources budget sector group in which the main donors participate. In addition the EC is lead donor for the rural development sector and organises regular specific donor meetings with USAID and the country members of the Joint Donor Team, which brings together the main stakeholders for the sector.

In **Somalia**, coordination is carried out through a body called *Coordination of International Support to Somalia (CISS)* and the *Somali Donor Group (SDG)*. The CISS is governed by an Executive Committee co-chaired by the UN and the World Bank and assisted by a permanent Somali Support Secretariat (SSS) and has a specific sector committee on food security. At field level, DG ECHO and the EC Delegation Somalia Operations Unit of the European Commission Delegation in Somalia (ECSOU) regularly meet to discuss strategy, programmes and approaches within the LRRD framework in order to ensure synergies and complementarities and avoid potential overlapping, duplications and differences in approach between projects supported by the different EC instruments.

In **Haiti**, the programme rests on a wide consultation process, which has involved operators, Member States and other donors. Without exception, the link between food security and improved management of natural resources has been recognised as the unifying theme of all actions in the domain. The complementarities in terms of actions and in terms of geographic concentration are currently being discussed with multilateral and bilateral donors active in Haiti. In addition, coordination with other EC instruments, e.g. ECHO (the Instability Instrument is not significantly active in Haiti), is ingrained in the working culture of the Delegation and has provided the basis for the joint monitoring of past operations.

This has confirmed that the most appropriate responses are actions tackling situations of severe food insecurity and intense depletion of natural resources through the mobilisation of collective responses to the rehabilitation of assets vital for production.

The actions proposed offer scope for moving from specific emergency operations towards post-emergency assistance and development.

In **North Korea (DPRK)**, since the 2002 Council conclusions, EC actions are limited to humanitarian aid, with which food security is equated. There is no development aid with the DPRK, CSP, or MIP. Our actions are constantly coordinated with DG RELEX and DG ECHO. In mid-2006, DG ECHO decided to close their technical office in Pyongyang in May 2008. Whenever possible, DG AIDCO has integrated some of their areas of action under the Food Security programme (mostly as a sub-component of FS-focused projects).

Annual programmes and scope are discussed with the DPRK authorities (i.e. all stakeholders and as many beneficiaries as possible, at all levels), EU Member States, other donors and international agencies, as well as with the resident European NGOs. These discussions feed into the Actions envisaged under the Annual Work Plans.

In **Afghanistan**, coordination efforts in the food security sector take place through the Food Security and Agriculture Cluster (FSAC). For the proposed action, the European Commission will also participate in the Nutrition Cluster. Donor-focused coordination efforts are generally made through consultative groups and through the newly formed Agriculture Task Force chaired by the Minister of Agriculture. There is close coordination between the European Commission Delegation and the DG ECHO Afghanistan office on food security matters, to ensure that both strategies are complementary.

With regard to **the Occupied Palestinian Territories**, the proposed action, by providing a long-term solution to adverse climate shocks, is complementary to ECHO operations that aim to have an immediate impact on the most vulnerable populations (“contiguous” approach of LRRD). Donor coordination will be addressed by existing sector working groups (agriculture and infrastructure) chaired by the Palestinian Authority.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE CALL FOR PROPOSAL(S)

3.1 Basic act and financing source

The legal basis is Regulation (EC) No 1905/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 establishing a financing instrument for development cooperation⁶⁹.

The budget line is 21 02 01 (food security).

3.2 Objectives of the programme, areas of action/priorities, geographic scope and expected results

The objective is to achieve a timely and sustainable reduction in the food insecurity of vulnerable groups in situations of transition, thus enabling them to recover from a crisis situation and to take advantage of development opportunities.

⁶⁹ http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/worldwide/food-security/documents/reglement_1905_2006_en.pdf

The main expected results are: (i) a participatory strategic framework to link relief to rehabilitation and development is in place; (ii) productive and social assets, in particular natural resources, vital for food security are protected and recovered; and (iii) vulnerability to shocks is reduced and people's resilience is strengthened at national and local levels.

In terms of approach, priority will be given to projects ensuring a continuum with/complementing current EC-funded projects (DG ECHO, EDF, DCI geographic instrument, Non-State Actors thematic programme, etc.) at country level and providing concrete impacts on the vulnerable population and its communities, where NSAs (Non State Actors) and LGAs (Local Government Agencies) play an active role throughout the project cycle and/or where there are potential synergies with development projects supported by European Commission or other donors.

Within the present AAP, the following countries will receive assistance:

WEST AFRICA

In a post-crisis context such as in **Guinea Conakry**, the needs in the area of food security in the medium term are the following: (i) increase agricultural productivity (whereas for the majority of Guineans, rice is the basis of their food intake, more than 1/3 of the rice consumed in Guinea is imported), (ii) improve post-harvest operations and commercialisation since a large part of the harvest in Guinea is lost due to the lack of adequate conservation techniques or of transformation units) and (iii) invest more in the long term in human capital through education and in agricultural research, since to ensure sustainability of agricultural production, it is necessary to improve the integration of young adults into jobs linked to agriculture and to ensure that farmers' concerns are taken into account by the agricultural research system. The final beneficiaries will be the rural populations.

The main areas of action will therefore address:

- Increasing/diversifying agricultural production with appropriate farming systems;
- Improving post-harvest storage, processing, transport and commercialisation of agricultural products;
- Enhancing technical education and skills (e.g. through vocational training, capacity building, know-how transfer, field training) and supporting research initiatives.

The logic for choosing these main areas of action was to point out the very general needs, which will be spelt out in detail following a dedicated study on the food security situation in Guinea, starting on 10.12.2008, that will constitute the basis for launching a specific call for proposals.

CENTRAL AFRICA

Since 2005, **Burundi** has been in a situation of post-conflict reconstruction after a civil war which lasted nearly 13 years. The progress of democratisation is promising but fragile. Burundi also remains vulnerable to regional instability. Therefore, and for further reasons described below, the LRRD component offers an appropriate approach to improve the food security situation in this country.

The population of Burundi is growing rapidly (2-2.5%), whilst its economy has been shrinking in net terms over the last decade (the gross domestic product of Burundi dropped by 20% in real terms between 1993 and 2002). Burundi continues to face huge structural deficiencies and challenges, which have made a reduction in vulnerability and risk difficult. Burundi is a low-income food-deficit country with food shortages averaging 350 000-400 000 MT annually. The north and north-eastern parts of the country are traditionally the most food insecure but for season 2008B, the food insecurity trend is now

shifting to the Moso region (eastern Burundi) and the western part bordering Lake Tanganyika (Imbo region) due to low rains. A secondary data analysis (SDA) on food security and vulnerability conducted in March 2008 reports that 43% of Burundians are extremely food insecure with a daily calorie intake lower than 1 400 kcal, 22% are food insecure surviving with between 1 400 and 1 900 kcal per day and a further 7% living on between 1 900 and 2 100 kcal. According to the SDA, only 18% of the population is likely to be food secure. The main source of food is from own production and markets. The causes of food insecurity are varied and interrelated, mostly attributed to limited access to land, plant disease, poor agricultural, soil, water and land management practices, climatic shocks — floods and droughts — and population pressure, with a population density of 300 people per km². The pressure on the land is also rising with the increasing number of returnees and refugees.

This Action will focus mainly on:

- Agricultural rehabilitation through improvement of factors of production (agriculture, livestock), support for management and producing higher-value added products;
- Nutrition: improvement of food and nutritional status of the population through warning, awareness-raising and information.

The beneficiaries targeted are the rural and peri-urban households, particularly the large number of households threatened by food insecurity. The area targeted is proposed to be the enlarged Imbo region (along the western border and Lake Tanganyika, extended to the areas of reintegration for the returnees), where a large part of the vulnerable population is located with limited support.

The areas of action/priorities retained for this Action Fiche are in line with the EC Strategies as well as with the priorities identified by the Government of Burundi, which has recently approved the National Strategy for Agriculture (July 2008). Simultaneously, the Government has launched the preparation of a National Programme for Food Security (Programme National de Sécurité Alimentaire — PNSA) specifically addressing food insecurity in Burundi and aimed at facilitating the implementation and ensuring the coordination of food security operations.

While the actions financed under the 9th and 10th EDF have also allowed the EC to accompany the country during the early phase of a crucial transition period, the call for proposals for the LRRD component can offer more flexibility to intervene in issues and areas in which other donors and the government are not active, for example at the community level.

After several years of conflict, smallholder farmers and urban consumers in the **Democratic Republic of the Congo** have not recovered sufficient community dynamics to compensate for the weakness of administrative capacity. While the eastern part of the country stands insecure and receives large amounts of humanitarian funds, the western part is in a transition process for which LRRD operations are most appropriate. Eligible areas for this Action will be limited to the production basin supplying the markets of Kinshasa. This support for agriculture will be complementary to the road rehabilitation projects funded by the EC in the same area.

The main problems in boosting agricultural production are shipping of outputs and the lack of improved techniques and factors (seeds multiplication, animal traction, etc.). The growth potential for local production is very large and is the action baseline to strengthen the local population's food security. Reinforcing local producers' associations will therefore be one of the important objectives of the call for proposals (through income-generating activities, produce transformation, storage, and transport).

In the **Central African Republic**, food security is central to the economic and social recovery of the country and constitutes the most important aspect of the overall national strategy of “development hubs” (pôles de développement). The European Commission’s overall strategy for the 10th National Indicative Programme, which is in fact an LRRD approach, supports the implementation of development hubs. In combination with the Microprojects Programme, the Rural Development Programme and all the actions implemented by ECHO in the food security field, the Food Security Thematic Programme will concentrate on agricultural rehabilitation to support farmer organisations and thus will contribute to building the capacity of these organisations through:

- Income-generating activities (produce transformation, storage, transport);
- Increased agricultural production (seeds multiplication, animal traction, fish farming, small cattle farming, etc.).

The final beneficiaries are in particular the rural population living around the development hub (31% of the CAR’s total population).

The main problem in the country is the weak capacity of the rural population and their disorganisation, linked to the political instability of the country. The Food Security programme will ensure the basic efficiency of the stability instrument funds by providing an initial stabilising impact on the population.

In addition, it has to be underlined that the development hub strategy is also an approach to reinforce the local authorities’ rule.

EASTERN AFRICA

Sudan

In addition to the long civil war between the north and south that ended recently, the Sudan has during the last 10 years suffered from a variety of regional crises and natural disasters, including a still ongoing conflict in Darfur and a low-intensity conflict in the east which ended only two years ago. As a result, the livelihoods of most of the Sudanese population living in war-affected areas (almost two thirds of the total territory) have been devastated and the overall capacity of the Government to provide services has been severely undermined. International aid is therefore required for relief operations (Darfur and flood/drought-affected areas), to support ongoing peace initiatives/processes (Darfur, consolidation of the CPA), to facilitate reconstruction, reconciliation and reintegration efforts and to underpin the overall economic recovery and development of southern and eastern Sudan.

The LRRD component of the FSTP is particularly appropriate to fund food security programmes in post-conflict areas of Sudan that benefited from substantial humanitarian aid before and immediately after the peace agreements were signed and in which the security situation has significantly improved, allowing for longer-term operations aimed at putting self-sufficiency in place. The war-affected areas in the south, the transitional areas (Blue Nile, South Kordofan and Abyei) and the east of the country meet these criteria. In addition, there are some specific areas in Darfur in which the situation is stable enough for early recovery actions. In these “pockets of stability” and where humanitarian actions have been successfully put in place in previous years, the LRRD approach could successfully be implemented.

In these areas, actions will mainly focus on agriculture and fishery production through sustainable and innovative practices, income-generating activities and market enhancement as well as natural resources management.

In addition to the environment and gender, projects will consider long-term reintegration of IDPs and returnees and capacity-building of local technical institutions as cross-cutting issues. In terms of operations, priority will be given to consolidation and continuation of current EC-funded projects (DG ECHO, FSBL, ONG-PVD and Sudan Post-Conflict Community-Based Recovery and Rehabilitation Programme — RRP) which were positively evaluated as well as links and synergies with other EC-funded programmes (i.e. Sudan Productive Capacity Recovery Programme — SPCR).

Although main themes are considered for the whole of Sudan, there are some specific priorities per geographic areas:

- In the south and transitional areas, support should have a specific focus on long-term reintegration of returnees through community-based operations;
- In the east, emphasis should be on stabilisation of the long-term IDPs/refugees and natural resource management;
- In Darfur, the focus will be on helping the war-affected population to restart its livelihoods in low-intensity conflict areas.

In **Somalia**, more than a decade of civil war has created a protracted and complex emergency, which has eroded livelihoods, deepened poverty and increased vulnerability to food insecurity. Actions in relief, livelihood recovery, rehabilitation, and on underlying causes of food insecurity are needed concomitantly.

Actions under the LRRD component will mainly address food insecurity at the household level in central and southern Somalia, whenever possible complementing and expanding ECHO's operations. The targets will be the rural and urban poor who are facing mounting difficulties due to insecurity, sustained hyperinflation of food and non-food prices and unemployment. The FSAU estimates that in 2008, in southern and central Somalia, 30% of the total population will be in either an acute food and livelihood crisis or a humanitarian emergency. The food security crisis, traditionally associated with the rural population, will now affect about 22% of the urban population.

The main problem to be tackled will be the insufficiency or absence of income due to poor production assets and techniques or lack of employment opportunities.

The main actions will include:

- Cash transfer schemes: On the basis of Art. 120.2 of the Financial Regulation and Art. 184 bis of Implementing modalities, the maximum amount of financial support that may be paid to third parties by a beneficiary shall be EUR 100,000, with a maximum of EUR 10,000 per each third party.
- Income-generating activities and promotion of employment creation;
- Support for sustainable agriculture and livestock production, including improved access to markets through rehabilitation of infrastructures;
- Improving the livelihood of urban and peri-urban populations through employment creation, and supporting the development of urban small and micro-enterprises.

Actions will incorporate conflict prevention, gender, the environment and disaster preparedness as cross-cutting issues.

OTHER ACP COUNTRIES

In disaster-prone **Haiti**, the events of late summer 2008 have dramatically demonstrated the high-risk environment in which food production, distribution and consumption have to take place. The post-flooding economic paralysis has worsened the food availability crisis, with a severe limitation of income-generating opportunities for urban as well as rural households. Strategies to increase income have become a priority to respond to the emergency.

The lack of a strategy and capacity for the management of natural resources has left the country with a net loss of productive assets and vulnerable to natural disasters. Consequently, food security in Haiti is primarily an issue of productivity, storage and marketing.

The response strategy of this Action is aimed at restoring fertility and preserving further degradation of natural resources, as well as mitigating the issue of storage and post-harvest losses, which affects both consumption (food supplies) and future production (seeds), particularly at smallholder level. Because good maintenance of the rural road network is key for the farmers to access inputs and bring the produce to markets, specific actions are envisaged in this area.

It has to be noted that in Haiti, fragmented actions and individualistic strategies are typically institutional bottlenecks in the management of collective property. Cultural factors and stifled accountability in local institutions exacerbates the problem, and need to be addressed through the activities of this Action.

In the context of the current post-disaster scenario, the programme aims to ease the constraints in terms of economic access to food via labour-intensive actions, as part of the broader strategy for the management of natural resources and for the rehabilitation and maintenance of rural infrastructures.

Actions will be aimed at:

- Improving agriculture and livestock productivity and diversification through dissemination of farming techniques specially designed for soil and water conservation (e.g. productive agro-forestry);
- Increasing the availability and improving the management of natural resources in rural areas, partly via labour-intensive operations, to support household income;
- Improving decision-making and management through strengthening associations, and where appropriate market linkages and processing;
- Improving food availability by removing post-harvest losses and inefficiencies, and raising nutritional standards and education at household level.

The actions will strive to reach geographic concentration on focal areas of EC operations, maximising synergies with ongoing programmes. In the same spirit, the actions will seek to ensure continuity with actions funded under DG ECHO food aid LRRD actions.

ASIA

In **North Korea**, the humanitarian crisis ended in 2004. Food insecurity is now primarily due to long-term and structural problems. While the political context of North Korea gives little room for trying and introducing new practices other than technical ones⁷⁰, LLRD actions implemented over the last few years are continued.

All areas of action envisaged under this 2009 Action Plan have been identified and discussed with, as well as endorsed by, the DPRK authorities, without whom these actions could not be implemented. Since the food situation is somewhat more sensitive in urban areas, the programme covers both rural and urban areas. As mentioned under point 2.2, the needs and actions envisaged here are discussed with all stakeholders and donors or organisations active in the country.

The objectives for 2009 are: stabilising food production and availability by further building and strengthening the resilience of cooperative farms, communities and households (project component (i)), and strengthening the capacity of North Korean institutions involved in food security (in its widest sense) to tackle the current issues and initiate the changes required (project component (ii)). This second component includes the exposure of North Koreans to international partners and practices.

The project component will hence be twofold:

- (i) It will target cooperative farms, social institutions, small factories, research institutes, workshops, etc. Disaster risk reduction and environmental protection will be integrated in project design given the high volume of agricultural production that is grown on slopes and the risk of recurrent flooding in the country;
- (ii) It will aim to build and/or strengthen the capacity of North Korean research institutes, academies, universities, ministry departments, federations, etc. dealing with food security issues by initiating or pursuing contacts with foreign counterparts.

Provision of small and medium-scale farm machinery and equipment to reinforce and increase the cooperative farms' autonomy, as well as food production and resilience capacities, will also be planned. This equipment and machinery will be identified together with the end beneficiaries and DPRK authorities, and will be, as much as possible, linked to the project component.

A small amount will also be allocated to studies and/or to monitoring and evaluation activities.

In line with the above, indicative areas of action will focus on community-based and small partnership projects aimed at improving the nutritional status of the most vulnerable groups, and rehabilitating or strengthening production capacity via (among other things):

- Maintenance of technical production means;
- Training in diversifying food production;
- Introducing more self-reliant production facilities;
- Introducing innovative resource-efficient technologies, and agricultural techniques and farm management;
- Supporting post-harvest treatment and primary food processing;
- Knowledge-sharing, training and capacity-building actions.

Note: as usual, the scope(s) and objective(s) of the call(s) for proposals will be adapted to the latest available assessment of the food security situation.

⁷⁰ And keeping in mind the current EC mandate for the DPRK (i.e. no policy reform dialogue, for instance).

In **Afghanistan**, a large portion of the population is still highly vulnerable to shocks. LRRD actions will aim to further improve and stabilise livelihoods in areas or among population groups in Afghanistan that have been recovering from the impact of natural disasters or prolonged insecurity and that are as yet not benefiting from mainstream development programmes. Furthermore, food security actions will address the underlying and basic causes of malnutrition. Provisional data show that the level of global malnutrition as well as micronutrient deficiency among children is worryingly high. Pertinent actions supporting nutrition through community-based efforts in synergy with the health services are necessary to address this concern.

Close coordination will be ensured between the LRRD actions implemented within the Food Security Thematic Programme and those financed by the DCI geographic instrument as well as with operations carried out by other donors in Afghanistan, in the light of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action on Aid Effectiveness.

Indicative types of measures to be supported are:

- Stabilisation of populations in post-crisis situations;
- Actions addressing the underlying and basic causes of malnutrition at community level.

ENPI

In the **Occupied Palestinian Territory (OPT)**, actions will focus on the construction of small-scale wastewater treatment plants in rural areas and the promotion of the re-use of the treated effluent by smallholder farmers for agricultural purposes.

The introduction of such infrastructure will contribute to addressing both water resource depletion and water quality deterioration issues. The final beneficiaries of the action will be smallholder farmers. Through the introduction of irrigation, they will benefit from increased yields and incomes. Introduction of irrigation techniques will significantly reduce their vulnerability in a context of high unpredictability of rainfalls.

Special emphasis will be put on the training of farmers in the safe re-use of wastewater and in performing irrigation practices. The proposed action is in line with the Palestinian Authority's water and agricultural policies and builds on lessons learned from a previous EC pilot programme. It tackles priorities listed in the agricultural and infrastructure sections of the Palestinian Reform and Development Plan. By preserving scarce natural resources vital for food security (water), the action also intends to contribute to mitigate the negative impact of climate change on agriculture.

The main areas of action will be:

- Construction of the infrastructure (treatment plants, possibly sewage collection system and vacuum trucks) in areas administrated by the Palestinian Authority;
- Capacity-building activities dedicated to the municipality for the good management of the infrastructure (technical training, setting-up of a cost recovery mechanism including a billing and collection system, etc.);
- Agricultural training, including safe re-use of wastewater, irrigation practices, integrated pest management, for farmers.

Full financing of the action under the provisions of Article 253 of the Implementing Rules will apply.

3.3 Risks and assumptions

Risks and assumptions vary on the basis of specific local conditions and will be detailed in the Guidelines for the calls for proposals.

3.4 Eligibility conditions

All non-profit-making legal persons such as non-governmental organisations, public sector operators, local authorities, international (intergovernmental) organisations as defined by Article 43 of the Implementing Rules of the EC Financial Regulation (Commission Regulation 2342/2002 as last amended by Commission Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 478/2007).

3.5 Essential selection and award criteria

The actions will be mainly selected on the basis of a call for proposals procedure launched by the relevant European Commission Delegations in the different countries and by EuropeAid in the case of North Korea. In a limited number of cases (namely North Korea and Afghanistan), some activities will be implemented through calls for tenders for supplies and services.

The Commission Delegations, with support from HQ where necessary, will define the administrative and technical criteria for selecting projects based on the Country Technical Document.

The essential selection and award criteria for the award of grants are laid down in the Practical Guide to contract procedures for EC external actions⁷¹.

The maximum possible rate of co-financing for grants should normally not exceed 80% so as to allow specific countries to apply different (higher) rates as required. Full financing may only be applied in the cases provided for in Article 253 of the Financial Regulation Implementing Rules where financing in full is essential to carry out the action in question.

3.6 Schedule of calls for proposals

The indicative timetable for the calls for proposals is the second half of 2009.

3.7 Indicative amounts

Countries	Amount in €
West Africa	
Guinea Conakry	7,000,000
Central Africa	
Burundi	5,278,000

⁷¹ http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/procedures/implementation/practical_guide/index_fr.htm

Democratic Republic of the Congo	13,427,000
Central African Republic	5,000,000
East Africa	
Sudan	22,000,000
Somalia	7,000,000
Other ACP countries	
Haiti	6,000,000
Asia	
North Korea	9,000,000
Afghanistan	10,000,000
ENPI	
Occupied Palestinian Territories	9,480,000
TOTAL	94,185,000

4. SUPPORT MEASURES

Annual audits and visibility activities will be covered by the budget under the grant contracts to be awarded under the calls.

ACTION FICHE FOR FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
STRATEGIC PRIORITY 4: ADDRESSING FOOD SECURITY IN EXCEPTIONAL SITUATIONS OF TRANSITION
AND IN FRAGILE SITUATIONS
“FOOD AID AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SPECIAL HARDSHIP CASE PROGRAMME FOR PALESTINE
REFUGEES”

1. IDENTIFICATION

Title	Food aid and Implementation of the Special Hardship Case Programme for Palestine refugees		
Total cost	€5 million		
Aid method / Management mode	Project approach – joint management with an international organisation		
DAC code	52010	Sector	Food Security

2. RATIONALE**2.1. Sector context**

In June 2008, about 4.68 million refugees were registered within UNRWA in five fields of operation. Of these, 254 249 were beneficiaries of the Agency’s Social Hardship Cases (SHCs) Programme, which consists mainly of providing registered SHCs with a yearly allocation of USD 110, split into food rations (USD70) and cash subsidies (USD 40). With food prices soaring the cost of the food basket has dramatically increased to a current total of USD 179, which is equivalent to EUR 129.⁷² To target the beneficiaries of the programme more effectively, the EC has been funding the reform of the programme since 2005. This reform consists mainly of modifying the selection process of beneficiaries, from the current status-based approach to a needs-based approach.

Preliminary results in the Gaza Strip have shown that, of the total number of beneficiaries of the SHCs programme, roughly 65% of them remain below the abject poverty line (the abject poverty line refers to minimum food requirements). Moreover, approximately 32 000 of these abjectly poor refugees have not been benefiting from the SHCs programme.

According to recent studies by the World Bank/IMF and the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS), the Gaza Strip endured a severe economic decline in 2006, as a result of tight restrictions on movements and access of people and goods imposed by the Israeli government, and the financial crisis of the Palestinian Authority. Unemployment rates rose to 30%. Current coping mechanisms, such as selling assets, are likely to incur more debt, and support from family members abroad may soon be depleted.

The proposed project sets out to address abject poverty among the refugee population by providing €5 million to support the reform of the SHCs programme reform. The recent conflict has clearly exacerbated an already dire food security situation for the entire Gaza

⁷² Based on September 2008 exchange rate (\$1=€0.718).

population, with the livelihoods of many placed under further strain and local production capacity likely to diminish further.

2.2. Lessons learnt

This project will build on the results achieved so far by the SHCs programme reform. The EC has been supporting this reform project since 2005. This support mainly consists of the funding of a senior poverty adviser post within UNRWA's Social and Relief Department. The Department has completed the preliminary work, including the Gaza Strip and Jordan, and concrete implementation of the reform started in July 2008.

2.3. Complementary actions

Since 2000, the European Commission has provided some €15 million annually to UNRWA's Regular SHCs Programme, making it the largest contributor to this programme. This programme is complementary to the Commission and other donors' funding for UNRWA which falls significantly short of this organisation's real requirements.

From 2008 onwards, DG ECHO assumed support of this programme, as per its specific mandate, and provided €15 million towards the food aid delivered by UNRWA. They have not been able to do so this year and the Food Facility is therefore meeting this need. It is also complementary to DG ECHO's response to UNRWA's flash appeal. In 2007 and 2008, the European Commission provided €2.9 million towards initiation of the SHC reform, mainly through family income supplements to the abject poor. This reform aims at ensuring better and fairer targeting and alleviating poverty amongst the Palestinian refugee population.

2.4. Donor coordination

Since 2006, the European Commission has been an observer of the UNRWA Advisory Commission, the main body for donor and host country coordination. This structure has been expanded and revitalised and should play a key role in enhancing the dialogue between the various stakeholders, providing advice and assistance to the Agency, for the final benefit of the refugees. More recently, in 2007, the EC was chair of the Sub-committee on Programming of the Advisory Commission. This follow-up mechanism is working remarkably well, creating synergy between donors and a common understanding between contributors and host countries on UNRWA tasks, missions, challenges and achievements.

3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectives

The overall objective to which this project will contribute is to create stable political and social living conditions for Palestine Refugees in UNRWA's five fields of operation. The specific objectives are i) to help eradicate abject poverty among the refugee population and ii) to validate the methodological approach to reform of the SHCs programme.

3.2. Expected results and main activities

The contribution of the Commission should result in the removal of 29 070 refugees from absolute poverty in the five fields of operation out of 90,000 registered by UNRWA. The poverty gap of current beneficiaries of the SHCs programme still below the abject poverty line will be addressed. In other words the project is closely targeted in such a way as those significantly below the absolute poverty line will receive more assistance than those only

slightly below. The extremely poor not registered as SHCs will be embraced by the programme. The expected results – removal of a minimum of 29 070 refugees from abject poverty – may vary according to the total funds available. The main activity will consist of food aid distribution and cash transfers to the abject poor.

3.3. Stakeholders

The direct beneficiaries of this programme are Palestine refugees benefiting from the SHC programme and living under the abject poverty line.

3.4. Risks and assumptions

The following risks were taken into account during the design of the project:

- The political environment will deteriorate to an extent that will significantly affect UNRWA's operations.
 - Israel requires to grant relatively unimpeded access to Gaza and to allow cash to be transferred from the West Bank to the banks in Gaza

3.5. Crosscutting Issues

Good governance is integrated through the ongoing reforms of UNRWA administration and management. Since the Geneva Conference in 2004, UNRWA has engaged in a process of internal review in an effort to improve the quality and impact of their services to Palestinian refugees. Outputs thus far have included the Medium-Term Plan and the Organizational Development (OD) Plan. The OD process concentrates on reforming UNRWA's organisation design, management capacity and approach to achieving improved service delivery. In addition, UNRWA is also currently working on developing its Programme Strategy.

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Implementation method

The programme will be implemented in joint management with UNRWA by way of a contribution agreement as part of a Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA).

4.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

For agreements with international organisations, all contracts implementing the action must be awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents laid down and published by the international organisation concerned.

4.3. Budget and calendar

The total EC financial contribution to the project amounts to € million. The indicative breakdown will be as follows:

- i) Food and cash allowances and cost of distribution: € million

Implementation of the programme will take 12 months.

4.4. Performance monitoring

Achievements will be monitored regularly by UNWRA and the results will be reported regularly to the European Commission. Monitoring will also include an evaluation of the methodological approach to the reform of the SHCs programme.

The key indicator will be the number of refugees removed from abject poverty.

4.5. Evaluation and audit

The project will have an external independent evaluation, which will be directly managed by the European Commission in agreement with UNRWA. All auditing issues relating to this project are governed by the Verification Clause annexed to and forming an integral part of the FAFA.

4.6. Communication and visibility

The European Commission will ensure that UNRWA gives adequate visibility to the EC funding (press conference, brochures/flyers, media reports, etc.). Special focus in terms of communication will be put on the specific objective of the action – eradication of abject poverty – which is in line with the first of the Millennium Development Goals.

ACTION FICHE FOR FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
STRATEGIC PRIORITY 4: ADDRESSING FOOD SECURITY IN EXCEPTIONAL SITUATIONS OF TRANSITION AND
IN FRAGILE SITUATIONS
“MYANMAR LIVELIHOOD AND FOOD SECURITY TRUST FUND (LIFT)”

1 IDENTIFICATION

Title/Number	Livelihood and Food Security Trust Fund DCI-FOOD/2008/20381		
Total cost	Overall budget: €80 million EC contribution: €9.5 million (from the present AAP) Other contributions: EC contribution: €10 million (Food Facility - batch 1) + EC contribution: €14.4 million (Food Facility - batch 4) DfiD (UK): €13 million Ausaid (Australia) to be confirmed ⁷³		
Aid method / Method of implementation	Project approach – Joint management with an international organisation (UNOPS – United Nations Office of Project Services)		
DAC code	52010	Sector	Food Security

17. RATIONALE**17.1. Sector context**

National situation: Despite vast natural resources, Myanmar is one of the least developed countries in the world. After decades of armed conflict and isolation, the country is severely off track in terms of achieving any of the Millennium Development Goals by 2015 without a substantial increase in external assistance and the development of national strategies. Before Cyclone Nargis devastated vast areas in the Delta region, also known as the country's rice bowl, it was estimated that some 45% of the national population in Myanmar were living below the poverty line. Insufficient job opportunities lead to low wages and consequently to low income levels. A recent survey⁷⁴ indicates that more than one third of all households – both urban and rural – have insufficient consumption expenditure to cover basic food and non-food needs. In rural areas, nearly two thirds of all households do not have access to land – or access to sufficient cultivable land – and cannot obtain external inputs. Lack of knowledge, traditional attitudes and social vices (gambling, drinking) further compound the problem. Vulnerable families depend heavily on natural resources as a source of food, income and fuel, which leads to environmental degradation and thus to a decline in land productivity and further poverty. Erratic rainfall patterns of late are another cause of loss of productivity. In urban areas, vulnerable people spend close to

⁷³ *Australia is participating 'in principle', pending Ministerial approval. AusAID Rangoon's Head of Post is hopeful that, should funds be approved, it may mirror Australia's 3DF contribution (AUD15m over 5 years). What about DFID? Any estimation as to their contribution?*

⁷⁴ *Integrated Household Living Conditions Survey in Myanmar, Ministry of National Planning and Economic Development, UNDP, UNOPS, 2007.*

70% of their income on food alone. This situation is exacerbated by the lack of a clear national strategy to reduce poverty and support food and livelihood security, the almost complete unavailability of government and formal rural credit, an unsatisfactory land tenure system, the low capacity of agricultural research and extension services, poor transport infrastructure, and restrictions on the movement of people and goods.

Nargis-affected areas: Cyclone Nargis struck Myanmar on 2 and 3 May 2008. The estimated resulting toll stands at 140 000 people dead or missing, 20 000 seriously injured, and some 2.4 million people severely affected. Most of the fertile land was devastated just as paddy farmers were at the last stage of harvesting their dry season crop. Nargis destroyed paddy warehouses and stocks, livestock, schools, health centres, small industries, private dwellings and clean water sources. Considerable support is required to enable people to rebuild their livelihoods and to secure the means to strengthen their resilience in terms of food security. Many have lost access to income for a considerable period of time.

17.2. Lessons learnt

To date, most donor-supported measures have been implemented by UN agencies and NGOs, both international and local, sometimes in collaboration with local stakeholders and community-based organisations. Outreach of intervention has remained limited compared to overall needs, highlighting the need to scale up activities and take a more strategic donor approach. Faced with a similar situation in the health sector, donors have been one of the driving forces in the formulation of a national strategy to curb malaria, HIV&Aids and tuberculosis. In that context, the establishment of the Three Diseases Fund has had a major impact both in terms of donor approach cohesion and in terms of results. It is acknowledged amongst development stakeholders – including the government – that the lack of a comprehensive strategic framework for food and livelihood security is reducing the efficiency (in terms of cost-benefits) and the effectiveness (in terms of both target and coherence) of the aid assistance.

17.3. Complementary actions

The European Commission is currently supporting 14 projects from the (former) Food Security Budget Line and from the *Food Security Thematic Programme* in the most food-insecure areas of the country. Some of these projects are linked to earlier DG ECHO operations, particularly in Northern Rakhine State and the Dry zone, reinforcing and facilitating the continuum between emergency and development. In November 2008, the European Commission launched a *Call for Proposals for the 2008 Food Security Programme for areas affected by cyclone Nargis*. Two projects of around €1 million each are expected to be supported. Support for livelihood activities countrywide, and particularly in border areas, is also provided by the thematic programmes: (i) *Aid for Uprooted People* (€8 million allocated annually in 2007 and 2008, €9 million allocated for 2009), and (ii) *Non-State Actors* (€2 million allocated in 2008, and €2.5 million planned for 2009). The latter programme supports activities contributing to poverty alleviation, particularly in the social sector (education, health and social welfare), and sustainable environmental development. **DG ECHO** has so far allocated a total of €39 million to provide life-saving assistance for cyclone-affected populations in the Delta. Humanitarian projects have also been addressing food aid and early recovery needs. The Fund will build on DG ECHO operations in support of LRRD.

DFID Burma has been contributing to food security and livelihood activities through international organisations and NGOs: (i) **IDE** (International Development Enterprise): £430 000 (since 2004) – agricultural livelihoods. For post-Nargis, IDE received £2.65 million for immediate agricultural inputs and support; (ii) **FAO** for Nargis relief assistance: £2 million for monsoon planting season inputs, and £0.25 million for agricultural coordination; (iii) **UNDP**:

since 2005 support for the *Human Development Initiative* (HDI) – £4 million (self-reliance groups and community development). For Nargis: £1.1 million for agricultural inputs. £0.5 million still pending on livelihoods and community-based approaches; (iv) **WFP** and **UNDP**: £0.6 million in support of emergency intervention in Chin State to curb rat infestation; and (v) **WFP**: £5.9 million for Nargis.

AusAID has provided a total of AUD55m for Cyclone Nargis relief activities, AUD30m of it focusing on relief work, early recovery and the re-establishment of livelihoods. Funds are allocated to priorities identified through the Consolidated Appeal and with a mind to the Post-Nargis Recovery Programme: AUD4m for Australian INGOs focusing on Nargis Early Recovery and Livelihoods (1 Jan-31 Dec 09), AUD1m to FAO, AUD5m to UNDP for Early Recovery, Livelihoods and Agriculture, and AUD12.5m (exhausted by end 2008) to WFP for Food and Logistics. Countrywide, AUSAID runs a Livelihoods Programme 2008-09 of AUD1m, contributes to the UNDP Human Development Initiative – CDRT and provides AUD3m per annum to WFP for Protracted Relief and Recovery (PRRO).

17.4. Donor coordination

The EU in Myanmar is committed to a lead role in implementing the *Paris Declaration* and the *Accra Agenda for Action on Aid Effectiveness*, as provided for in the European Consensus on Development, and the Accra Agenda for Action by advancing coordination, harmonisation and alignment. The European Commission Delegation and EU Member States are active participants in various coordination mechanisms, such as the Partnership Group for Aid Effectiveness. Work on the preparation of LIFT has been carried out by the donors intending to participate, with agreement reached on the principal programme documents, as drawn up with the support of a consultant engaged by the EC on behalf of the donors. Close donor coordination will continue through donor membership of the Fund Board. A Fund Board Consultative Group will also be established, bringing together stakeholders, including donors not contributing to the fund, to ensure the complementarity of different inputs related to livelihoods and food security.

LIFT will be fully aligned on strategies owned by the Government of the Union of Myanmar. In the Delta it will operate in the context of the *Post-Nargis Rehabilitation Programme and Plan* (PONREPP), and, in the strategic context for operations in the rest of Myanmar, is intended to be the *National Medium-Term Priority Framework* (NMTPF), which is being prepared with UN support.

18. DESCRIPTION

18.1. Objectives

The **overall objective** of LIFT is to make progress towards achieving Millennium Development Goal 1:⁷⁵ the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger in Burma/Myanmar.

LIFT's **purpose** is to improve the food and livelihood security of the most vulnerable populations in urban and rural areas.

18.2. Expected results and main activities

Expected result 1: diversified and increased household income.

The main eligible activities include: (i) promotion and establishment of village-level revolving funds and other micro-credit schemes; (ii) capacity building of community-based organisations,

⁷⁵ *Halve the number of people living on less than a dollar a day; achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people; halve the number of people suffering from hunger.*

(iii) skills training (small-scale home-based fish raising, fish net production, small marketing, weaving, tailoring, reading and writing, food processing, etc.); and (iv) local production of tools (e.g. hoes, spades, shovels, etc.).

Expected result 2: re-established and increased crop and livestock production, fisheries and sustainable harvesting of non-timber forest products.

The main eligible activities include: (i) capacity building among farmer and fishermen groups; (ii) promotion of optimal agronomic techniques (e.g. technical assistance, optimal use of fertilisers and pesticides, irrigation, seed production, post-harvest losses, improved fruit trees, etc.) and farm-based demonstration; (iii) improved access to credit; (iv) establishment of rice banks; (v) development of garden-type agricultural and horticulture production; (vi) support for small and medium-scale irrigation projects, small road infrastructure; (vii) better veterinary services and expansion of vaccination coverage; (viii) livestock and poultry production; (ix) training and support for in-shore and inland fishery production, crab fattening; (x) promotion of, training in and inputs for forest management for sustainable and economically viable land use (including reforestation for fuel wood and mangroves); and (xi) action to help mitigate the current food crisis and the volatility of food prices.

Expected result 3: effective support mechanisms in place for the benefit of local economic and employment development.

The main eligible activities include: (i) vocational training (engine repair, masonry, carpentry, infrastructure building, boat construction, small businesses and cottage industry management, etc.); (ii) development in marketing skills and activities to encourage business contacts within and outside target areas; (iii) support for community-based resource management systems; (iv) worker advocacy; and (v) support for farmer and private sector organisations.

Expected result 4: improved food and nutrition security, and mechanisms providing social protection.

The main eligible activities include: (i) capacity building and training among community-based organisations, (ii) improved or implemented small infrastructure and activities designed to improve the nutritional status of the beneficiaries, and (iii) support for safety net measures for the most vulnerable population, both in rural and in urban areas (e.g. cash transfers, cash for work, food aid, etc.)

Expected result 5: evidence generated to support policy improvements and decision-making.

The main eligible activities include: (i) studies, (ii) research, (iii) workshops, (iv) advocacy initiatives, and (v) summary reports on the impact of LIFT-funded activities.

18.3. Risks and assumptions

Risks consist primarily of:

- i. **Political risks:** Fluctuating relationships between the Government of the Union of Myanmar and donor governments may influence the Fund's performance and existence. The Government's political decisions may also constrain the Fund's activities. Mitigating action: regular dialogue between donors and the line ministries concerned to ensure that the above risks do not threaten the existence of the Fund or constrain its activities.
- ii. **Lack of trust** (between the communities and the authorities, between the authorities and the donors, between the authorities and the implementing agencies) may affect delivery to the point that the action is significantly weakened or interrupted. Mitigating action: transparency and other

trust-building measures will be encouraged by the Fund, particularly at community level and between local authorities and implementing agencies.

- iii. ***Lack of flexibility at national policy level:*** Fund activities would be negatively impacted to a significant degree should the national authorities not be persuaded to grant the necessary flexibility and operational freedom to the implementing agencies, with regard for instance to access to remote regions. Mitigating action: maintaining adequate relations with the authorities and transparency in programme content, achievements and difficulties should gradually increase the agencies' ability to deliver activities.
- iv. ***Divergence of views among donors:*** Donors, UN agencies and INGOs do not hold a common view on how to proceed in Myanmar to ensure that the population at large does not continue to suffer from the current situation. Mitigating action: LIFT is expected to be a unifying force among stakeholders in identifying a common approach. The Fund will closely coordinate its activities with non-Fund donors and with international organisations.
- v. ***Disconnection from national plans:*** For the results of aid to be sustainable, action must be consistent and tie in with national plans where they exist. This is key to helping Myanmar achieve its UN Millennium Goals and for donors and implementing agencies to move towards an exit strategy. While PONREPP provides an overall framework for action in the Nargis-affected area, there is a chance that the *Medium-Term Priority Framework* may not materialise. Mitigating action: the Fund will maintain close dialogue with the authorities and other stakeholders to ensure cohesion of action with generally accepted programming parameters.
- vi. ***Funding gap:*** Funds may not be readily available. Once the action is launched, expectations will rise among stakeholders. Momentum must be maintained until the Fund reaches its intended targets. Mitigating action: coordination among participating donors. The Fund Manager will advise the board on priorities to be given to activities/areas based on financial resources available at any given time.
- vii. ***Lack of monitoring coherence:*** There is a risk that the terms of reference of programme reviews commissioned by donors (LIFT and non-LIFT) will not be consistent. This would endanger donor consensus for a programme approach, and could lessen the effectiveness of LIFT. Mitigating action: the Fund will propose that the terms of reference of monitoring commissioned by the Fund and by other donors and international organisations be finalised in consultation with each other, and that results be shared.
- viii. ***Insufficient human resources:*** The Fund Manager must be authorised to recruit adequate human resources. Sufficient equipment must also be available, for example, to ensure effective monitoring capacity. Mitigating action: human and material resources levels will be discussed and agreed in consultation with UNOPS.
- ix. ***Fund Manager might not meet donors' expectations*** in terms of effectiveness, independence, and ability to implement activities in line with Fund policy. Mitigating action: close monitoring of the performance of the Fund Manager by the Fund Board and rapid instigation of corrective measures if deemed necessary.
- x. ***Extreme weather conditions, security considerations or population movements prevent delivery.*** Mitigating action: none possible.

18.4. Cross-cutting issues

The Fund's main focus will be the needs of the vulnerable, marginalised and underserved population groups. The Fund will help to improve pro-vulnerable people decision-making processes. In Nargis-affected areas, disaster risk reduction and adaptation to climate change, especially for coastal and low-lying areas, will be mainstreamed where appropriate. Evidence-based measures will address gender inequities. The Fund Manager will play a major role in ensuring that issues of equity are taken into account in operational work plans. Action addressing

the country's food crisis and food price volatility will be considered favourably. Good governance will be promoted in the agricultural sector, for example, through transparent mechanisms and accountability. Human rights will be addressed in relation to people's rights to have access to sufficient resources to cover their basic needs. Efforts will be made to promote the rights of ethnic minorities and marginalised groups.

18.5. Stakeholders

Vulnerable, underserved and marginalised population groups in rural and urban areas will be the final beneficiaries of LIFT. Intermediary stakeholders will be the implementing partners (UN agencies, INGOs, local NGOs, professional organisations, CBOs and, where appropriate, local civilian administrations). For Nargis-affected areas, additional stakeholders include the Tripartite Core Group (Government, ASEAN, UN) and the PONREPP (Post-Nargis Recovery Programme and Plan) team. Responding to the growing call for coordinated external assistance, the Fund gives participating donors and other stakeholders the opportunity to consolidate joint strategies and initiatives through regular exchanges and mutually reinforcing action, in line with any national programme approach whenever there is one. It also provides stakeholders with monitoring mechanisms to give them a better global understanding of situations, programmes/projects being undertaken or envisaged, achievements, constraints and outcomes.

19. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

19.1. Method of implementation

Joint management through the signature of a contribution agreement under the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) with UNOPS.

UNOPS has been selected by the donors because of its ability to provide financial and project management services to other organisations. LIFT procedures are similar to the Three Diseases Fund (3DF) modalities, for which UNOPS is the Fund Manager. Implementing partners are familiar with UNOPS. As 3DF Manager, UNOPS has delivered to the satisfaction of donors, authorities and implementing partners.

19.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

All contracts implementing the action must be awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents laid down and published by the International Organisation concerned.

19.3. Budget and calendar

Of the total anticipated programme funds of €80 million, the EC will provide:

- €5.5 million from the Food Security Thematic Programme, and
- €4.4 million from the Food Facility.

The financial decisions relating to the Food Security Thematic Programme and the Food Facility will be paid into one Trust Fund (LIFT).

The contribution from the current Financial Decision is €5.5 million.

Category Breakdown	EC	Contracting Authority/Paying Authority
--------------------	----	--

<u>Joint Management</u>	<u>9 500 000</u>	<u>EC</u>
TOTAL	<u>9 500 000</u>	

The operation will be for a period of 60 months from the time of signature of the Contribution Agreement with UNOPS.

19.4. Performance monitoring

The Fund Manager will design, develop and implement a monitoring and evaluation system specific to the Fund to monitor the performance of the implementing partners and ensure that fund resources are used effectively. The Fund Manager will maintain or obtain up-to-date information on aid delivered or planned by other stakeholders (“*Aid Tracking*”) and monitor national indicators in the sectors in which it is involved. The Fund Board and the Fund Manager will launch monitoring and evaluation missions to be carried out by independent consultants. The Fund M&E mechanism will gauge progress through the use of output and outcome indicators. In addition to the financial and administrative aspects of the Fund, indicators will also be developed to measure programme progress, including aspects such as scaling-up of coverage, geographic distribution, focus on the vulnerable, direct community/household participation, and equity issues. Household and community-level progress will be assessed and actions adjusted accordingly to meet community needs as they evolve. Demonstrable coordination of activities at township level will be a requirement for them to qualify for funding by the Fund and will be monitored continuously. Six-monthly narrative reports and yearly progress and financial reports will be submitted by the Fund Manager to the Fund Board, in addition to unscheduled reports that may be requested by the Board.

19.5. Evaluation and audit

Evaluations (mid-term, final, ex-post) and audit arrangements are an integral part of the contractual arrangement with international organisations. External evaluations and audits might also be carried out by independent consultants recruited directly by the European Commission – in accordance with EC rules and procedures and specifically established terms of reference, and in consultation with other donors –, bearing in mind the need to minimise the number of uncoordinated missions.

19.6. Communication and visibility

LIFT is a pooled trust fund. Details of the contributing donors will be included on the LIFT website to be developed by the Fund Manager, on the website of the European Commission Delegation and in other documentation. The EC Delegation will pay particular attention to the European Commission Delegation to visibility of the support provided under the EU Food Facility. EC visibility will also be ensured through its lead role in the Donor Consortium and in policy dialogue with the government of Myanmar. The Fund Manager will draw up a visibility plan for the approval of the Fund Board

ACTION FICHE FOR FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
STRATEGIC PRIORITY 4: ADDRESSING FOOD SECURITY IN EXCEPTIONAL SITUATIONS OF TRANSITION AND IN
FRAGILE SITUATIONS
“SUPPORT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A NEW NATIONAL POLICY FOR FOOD SECURITY IN CUBA”

1. IDENTIFICATION

Title/Number	Support for the implementation of a new national policy for food security in Cuba		
Total cost	<i>Component 1:</i> 4, 400,000 € <i>Component 2:</i> 3, 600,000 €		
Aid method / Method of implementation	Project approach <i>Component 1:</i> Joint management with UNDP <i>Component 2:</i> Centralised management through call for proposals		
DAC code	52010	Sector	Food Security

2. RATIONALE**2.1. Sector context**

The continued increase in international food prices and the high dependency of Cuba on imported foodstuffs present an enormous challenge for Cuba. An estimated 80% of food consumption is imported, which amounted to some 1.7 billion USD in 2007, but is budgeted at 2.5 billion USD in 2008 for the same volume of food, due to price increases.

Moreover, being hit by hurricanes Gustav and Ike at the beginning of September and hurricane Paloma at the end of October had an enormous impact on the country's agricultural production. Estimated losses are now above 10 billion USD (equivalent to 20% of GDP and 100% of exports in 2007). 700 000 tonnes of foodstuffs were destroyed and the country has had to resort to using strategic food reserves.

In Cuba, there are over 6 000 agricultural cooperatives, organised into three types: Basic Unit Production Cooperative (UBPC), Agriculture Production Cooperative (CPA) and Credit and Services Cooperative (CCS). More than 42% of the total arable land used in the country is in the hands of UBPC cooperatives, which are a less efficient form of production due to their dependence on state-owned enterprises. As of last year, UBPCs were given greater autonomy, in order to match the autonomy granted to the other types of cooperatives.

With 51% of total arable land in the country (3.3 million ha out of 6.6 million ha) not being utilised, in September the state initiated a process of giving a maximum of 13 ha of land per person to individuals and cooperatives, on a 10-year renewable usufruct basis, to be used for food production purposes. According to official figures, over 75 000 individuals had already requested nearly 1 000 000 ha by the end of October. 70% of these new farmers have little or no previous experience in farming and food production. All individuals will join a Cooperative. This process will continue until all underutilised land is distributed and put into production.

An additional challenge for Cuba is the economic sustainability of food production: whereas 60% of inputs are obtained in Cuban Convertible Pesos (CUC), 90% of sales are in (non-convertible) Cuban Pesos (CUP), by state decree, thus providing little economic incentive to farmers and cooperatives. At present, cooperatives have only limited access to credit in CUP and no access to credit in CUC. The centralisation at national level of the decision-making process for food production inputs reduces the dynamics and flexibility of local initiatives responding to local demand.

In order to tackle these challenges, the country has designed a new national policy and strategy for food production and management. The purpose is to increase the quantity, efficiency and quality of food production. The key strategic catalysts of the new policy are:

- Transfer of the key role in food production from state-owned companies to cooperatives and individual producers.
- Decentralisation of the decision-making processes for the production and distribution of foodstuffs to the municipal level.
- Capacity building of cooperatives and their members through a basic business administration and cooperative management training programme.
- Capitalisation (in terms of access to equipment, technology and funds) of the cooperatives and farmers.
- Development of local economic mechanisms to increase economic incentives for farmers and to make the production process more flexible and demand-driven.
- Increase of food processing capacity in order to reduce food waste and create value-added potential.

The EC support to this new policy will be channelled through two components: (i) a contribution to the UNDP-managed PDHL programme and (ii) activities selected by way of a call for proposals and implemented by NGO's.

The decision to channel the EC contribution via a two-fold approach is based on relevant criteria, such as (i) the involvement of different types of partner organisations, each with a different intervention logic and a different geographical scope, (ii) the relative absorption capacity of NGO's, who already benefit from considerable funding under other EC instruments (ECHO Humanitarian Aid and Instrument for Stability) and Spanish bilateral cooperation and (iii) the support of the UNDP-managed PDHL Programme as a means of influencing the ongoing reform through very strong involvement of municipal and local authorities.

2.2. Lessons learnt

The UNDP programme for local human development (PDHL) has been active in Cuba for a number of years and has established a very strong foothold in the local municipalities concerned. One of the main lessons learnt from this programme is that support for new and innovative national policies and strategies can effectively be implemented in a few specific pilot territories, in partnership with both national and international stakeholders. This experience was confirmed via NGO-implemented activities in the field of agriculture in general and food security in particular, which have shown that involvement of all relevant stakeholders is key to obtaining tangible and sustainable results, especially in the specific context in Cuba.

Heavy procedures and mechanisms have at times been an impediment at national level, and it often proves easier to tackle those problems at local level. This experience was confirmed via other

programmes in support of national strategies, e.g. sugar industry restructuring process and the national housing plan.

2.3. Complementary actions

The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) in Cuba for 2008-2012 has been approved by the Cuban Government and the United Nations. The UNDAF defines five priority areas of intervention, including ‘Food security’ and ‘Local Human Development’. In both areas of intervention, the PDHL programme of UNDP was identified as the key coordination and programming mechanism, fully endorsed by Cuban Authorities. The UNDAF provides a coordination framework for all UN intervention in the field of Food Security.

The massive national and international response to the recent hurricanes also focuses on food security initiatives. As part of this response to post-hurricane humanitarian needs, Cuba received €2m from the ECHO Emergency Decision for the Caribbean region of €5m. An additional decision of €2m was taken to cover for continued humanitarian needs. Moreover, a programme under the EC Instrument for Stability is currently under discussion, which will focus on reconstruction and rehabilitation after the humanitarian aid phase.

Cuba will also receive an allocation under the recently approved EC Food Facility, which is likely to be channelled through the UNDP-PDHL programme, thereby ensuring coherence with the first component of this Programme. Support under the Food Facility will specifically target the revolving Credit Scheme implemented as part of the PDHL programme.

2.4. Donor coordination

EC-Cuba cooperation was suspended by Cuba in 2003 following the adoption of diplomatic measures by the EU. These measures were suspended in 2005 and lifted by the Council conclusions of 23 June 2008. A declaration resuming EC-Cuba cooperation was signed by Commissioner Michel and the Cuban Minister of Foreign Affairs on 23 October 2008.

Given the fact that no programming framework has been defined at this stage, parties have agreed to jointly identify priorities for future cooperation, based on development policy priorities and coordination with other development partners in Cuba.

In this context, the Cuban authorities have identified food security as their major development policy priority. This project is therefore fully in line with the priorities set by the Cuban Authorities.

Other donors in Cuba include the UN family agencies, and bilateral cooperation with Canada, Switzerland, Japan, and other countries. For the EU, Spain and Belgium already have bilateral cooperation programmes, and other Member States are preparing to resume cooperation through bilateral or multilateral channels. A number of European NGOs are active in areas related to agriculture in general and food security in particular.

The UNDP-managed PDHL programme in itself is a multi-donor programme with currently over 40 different donors in bilateral, multilateral and decentralised cooperation.

3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectives

The general objective of the programme is to contribute to the food security of the Cuban population, in the current complex international and national situation, by increasing both the production and the distribution of foodstuffs through support for cooperatives, farmers and local organisations.

The specific objective of the programme is to increase local food production and food access by way of an economically sustainable strategy, (i) through a contribution to the UNDP-managed PDHL Programme and (ii) through activities implemented by NGO's.

3.2. Expected results and main activities

COMPONENT NR 1: Contribution to the UNDP-PDHL Programme

The first component of the programme for Cuba under the Food Security Thematic Programme will be implemented through a contribution to the UNDP-managed PDHL programme.

The PDHL programme is an existing multi-donor programme managed by UNDP and designed to support the process of local development in the country. The programme seeks to achieve greater harmonisation between various national and international stakeholders working towards this complex objective. As such, PDHL contributes to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. It is an operational and management reference framework in which the country's development processes are mapped out with cooperation initiatives proposed by local stakeholders, following an analysis of the needs and priorities of each territory.

Expected results are:

1. 10 000 new farmers will develop food production capacity using the tools, mechanisms and technical assistance at their disposal.
2. 100 pilot cooperatives and their members will be provided with capital (in terms of access to equipment and technology) and develop their food production potential by using tools, machinery, equipment and technology.
3. Food processing mechanisms will be introduced, installed and used in at least 100 pilot cooperatives, reducing food waste and increasing value-added foods.
4. Managers and technicians in 100 pilot cooperatives will use and apply business administration and cooperative management techniques and tools in their daily activities.
5. 17 pilot municipalities will implement a decentralised food production and distribution management system, using the mechanisms available in the new national strategy: self-sufficient municipal strategic plans (in Spanish *planes de auto-abastecimiento municipales*), municipal offices of agriculture, local system of gathering and distribution, price incentives for selling food to social entities (community shops, hospital, schools, etc.).

Under PDHL leadership, a network of partner institutions will work together to develop and implement the project, using their competitive advantage on the different issues of the project (see Partnership strategy for the list of project partners). These national and international partners have been working with the PDHL programme for the past year on various local initiatives.

The main focus will be on farmers and their cooperatives, since they now account for some 70% of national food production. The project will work with two of the three types of cooperatives: the UBPCs and the CCSs. Development and improvement of the UBPCs is vital for the country, due to the fact that most of the arable land is in their hands and a national plan for UBPC development has

already been approved. The CCSs (new and existing) will also be included, since all the new farmers will be members of theirs.

The main activities proposed in the Project are:

- 1 Access and distribution of production inputs: quality seeds, fertilisers, tools and work equipment, plus support for the local agriculture innovation system of diversification and certification of quality seeds.
- 2 Capacity development for food processing with cooperatives and producers.
- 3 Training for cooperatives and producers on production issues.
- 4 Training on business administration, business plan, market studies, entrepreneurship and cooperative management.
- 5 Horizontal knowledge management of experience of municipalities and provinces.
- 6 Knowledge exchange and transfer at international level, North-South cooperation with EU entities and South-South cooperation with Latin America entities.
- 7 Integrated and participatory planning at municipal level.
- 8 Capacity development for municipal institutions responsible for local planning and coordination of food production and distribution.

The project will use the following instruments for implementation:

- 1 The recently created decentralised municipal delegation offices of the Ministry of Agriculture. They have the autonomy to facilitate and deal with all municipal entities related to food production. It is the key instrument for the decentralised process.
- 2 Municipal Working Groups. Created by the municipal government, these multidisciplinary groups are composed of specialists from the different institutions and organisations of the municipality, and aim to facilitate an integrated approach to local development. They are part of the UNDP/PDHL methodological approach to local development and have been used by local governments for ten years.
- 3 Self-sufficient municipal strategic plans. These plans aim not only to guarantee a certain quantity of food for the municipality, but also to deal with municipal food gathering and distribution. These tools have been approved by the national strategy but have yet to be developed and implemented; they are ideal for an integrated locally-driven approach to the problem.
- 4 Local Centres for Agricultural Innovation (CLIA). Local agriculture innovation system of bio-diversification and certification of quality seeds which are run by farmers with technical support from national R&D Centres. These local centres already exist in a number of pilot municipalities.
- 5 Training Plan. Based on a needs assessment conducted by the cooperatives in coordination with the Ministry of Agriculture, the training plan will focus on four key aspects: business administration, accountability, management of cooperatives and principles and rules of the cooperative movement.
- 6 17 pilot municipalities will be chosen to implement the programme (10% of the country). The criteria will be: successful experience in cooperative management, food production capacity, degree of impact of Hurricanes Gustav and Ike, successful experience in international cooperation programme management, country priorities and geographical diversity – to reach different agro-ecological and socio-economic contexts.

COMPONENT NR 2: Call for Proposals

The second component of the allocation for Cuba under the Food Security Thematic Programme will be implemented through a call for proposals launched by the EC Delegation in Cuba.

In terms of approach, priority will be given to projects ensuring a continuum with/complementing current EC-funded projects (DG ECHO, EDF, DCI geographic instrument, Instrument for Stability, Non-State Actors thematic programme, etc.) at country level, and where there are potential synergies with development projects supported by European Commission or other donors.

Activities eligible for financing under the call for proposals include:

- 1 Access to and distribution of production inputs.
- 2 Boosting and diversifying agricultural production.
- 3 Capacity development for farmers, cooperatives, producers and local institutions.
- 4 Training on several topics amongst which: production issues, business administration, business plan, market studies, entrepreneurship and cooperative management.

Activities will be further detailed in the Guidelines for the Call for Proposals.

3.3. Risks and assumptions

Successful implementation of this programme is based on the following assumptions:

- No major meteorological phenomenon will delay implementation or divert regular material supplies.
- The Cuban Authorities will continue their efforts to modernise the sector, and introduce more flexibility in the procurement of inputs and materials.
- the new national strategy implementation is supported by national and local entities;
- No structural delays or changes in the process and mechanisms for giving land and/or in the process of integrating the new farmers in the agriculture structure;
- The majority of people who receive the non-used land maintain their farmer role for the next years.

Further risks and assumptions may be further detailed in the Guidelines for the call for proposals.

3.4. Cross-cutting issues

The PDHL programme has a gender strategy and action plan that is currently under implementation.

Environmental sustainability is one of the selection criteria applied when evaluating local initiatives and proposals, and is a key issue in the context of the training supported by the PDHL programme.

3.5. Stakeholders

Stakeholders that will benefit directly from the programme include:

- Farmers and cooperatives, notably through increased access to equipment, technology and funds. The project will concentrate on new and existing farmers in pilot municipalities that were hit the hardest by the hurricanes and are situated in the least developed areas of the country (mainly the eastern provinces).
- Pilot municipalities, by way of a decentralised food production and distribution management system and mechanisms available in the new national strategy.

The Cuban population at large will indirectly benefit from the increased availability of food.

Partnerships will be established with Cuban and international entities with proven experience and knowledge. A list of partners already working with UNDP under the Human Development Programme

at Local Level (PDHL) is provided in Annex 1. They include the relevant line ministries, Cuban and European universities, research centres, etc.

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

COMPONENT NR 1: Contribution to the UNDP-PDHL Programme

Method of implementation

The programme will be implemented in joint management with UNDP, through the signature of a contribution agreement between the EC and UNDP, in line with the provisions of the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement signed between the EC and the UN.

Procurement and grant award procedures

All contracts implementing the project must be awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents laid down and published by the International Organisation concerned.

Budget and calendar

The total cost of the first component is estimated at 5, 600,000 €, with the following indicative breakdown:

Indicative Budget (€)	
Production inputs	1, 800,000
Mechanisation	1, 100,000
Food Processing	900,000
Training on business administration and cooperative management	400,000
Municipal Capacity	360,000
Coordination	900,000
Evaluation (by UNDP)	60,000
Audit (by UNDP)	60,000
Visibility	20,000
TOTAL	5, 600,000
EC contribution	4, 400,000
Other donor's contribution	2, 200,000

The indicative contributions of the different donors can be broken down as follows:

DONOR	€
EC	4, 400,000
CIDA, AECID, COSUDE, European Decentralized Cooperation	1, 100,000
UNDP	100,000
TOTAL	5, 600,000

The programme is expected to run for a period of 48 months. The total period of execution is put at 72 months from the signature of the contribution agreement.

COMPONENT NR 2: Call for Proposals

Eligibility conditions

The call for proposals will be exclusively targeted to non-governmental organisations.

Essential selection and award criteria

The actions will be mainly selected on the basis of a call for proposals procedure launched by the relevant European Commission Delegation in Cuba.

The Commission Delegation, with support from HQ where necessary, will define the administrative and technical criteria for selecting projects.

The essential selection and award criteria for the award of grants are laid down in the Practical Guide to contract procedures for EC external actions.

The maximum possible rate of co-financing for grants should normally not exceed 80% so as to allow specific countries to apply different (higher) rates as required. Full financing may only be applied in the cases provided for in Article 253 of the Financial Regulation Implementing Rules where financing in full is essential to carry out the action in question.

Schedule of calls for proposals

The indicative timetable for the calls for proposals is the last quarter of 2009.

Indicative amounts

The total amount earmarked for the call for proposals is 3,600,000 €

In order to increase the impact and avoid small and fragmented initiatives, the threshold for grant contracts selected under the call for proposals is set at minimum 500,000 € and maximum 1, 500,000 €

4.1. Performance monitoring

Regular monitoring activities are scheduled. As the exact baseline and target values will depend on the activities selected for financing and on the budget approved, further discussions with national authorities are needed to define these values.

4.2. Evaluation and audit – Support measures

For the first component, a mid-term evaluation and final evaluation of the project will be carried out in accordance with UNDP standard evaluation rules. The same applies to the audit at the end of the project.

For the second component, annual audits and visibility activities will be covered by the budget under the grant contracts to be awarded under the calls.

4.3. Communication and visibility

All actions will follow the standards of visibility described in the “Communication and Visibility Manual for EU External Actions” published in April 2008 and available at:

http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/documents/communication_and_visibility_manual_en.pdf.

The government and in particular the Ministry in charge of Cooperation (MINVEC) will be involved in the discussions on visibility.

In the context of the first component, a communication strategy will be drafted and implemented, based on the previous good experience of UNDP-Cuba.

In the context of the second component, visibility activities will be covered by the budget under the grant contracts to be awarded under the calls.

ACTION FICHE FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
STRATEGIC PRIORITY 5: PROMOTING INNOVATION TO ADDRESS FOOD INSECURITY
"INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO FOOD INSECURITY"

1. IDENTIFICATION

Title	Innovative approaches to food insecurity		
Total cost	<i>EC contribution: €20,000,000</i>		
Method/Management mode	Calls for proposals		
DAC-code, if applicable	52010	Sector	Food Security

2. RATIONALE

2.1 SECTOR CONTEXT

This component is meant to stimulate and capture innovative and locally owned, sustainable solutions to current and future food security challenges. It provides an opportunity not only for civil society and other non-state groups, but also for different public and private institutions to develop, test and disseminate best practices and innovations, which may eventually be scaled up or replicated in other areas.

The themes addressed cover a broad range of issues:

Pro-poor growth-orientated agriculture, fisheries/aquaculture and forestry with the emphasis on low-cost, locally owned, sustainable solutions

Alternative production methods (e.g. organic agriculture) providing new market opportunities

Food security and rural/local development (decentralisation, rural-urban linkages, local development and area-based management are priority areas in the new EU policy statement)

Sustainable management of and access to natural resources (land, water and energy), impact of the degradation of natural resources and of climate change on household and national food security

Urban and peri-urban food security, landless food-insecure people and income diversification through non-agricultural activities and agricultural non-food activities

Nutrition and the neglected issue of "hidden hunger" (micronutrient deficiencies have an enormous impact on the lives of mothers and children in particular)

Demographics, labour issues and migration

Relations between key social issues and food security (social protection and safety nets, HIV-AIDS pandemic, sanitation, the role of education in fostering food security, etc.)

Gender equity, minorities and ethnic groups usually targeted, such as the extremely poor and food-vulnerable

Prevention and preparedness strategies to avert food crises or mitigate their effects

Innovative approaches in Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development, in particular in complex and protracted crises.

This list is non-exhaustive and should be adapted to local conditions and assessed needs.

Innovative food security policies, strategies and approaches and their replication, as well as South-South dissemination, will be supported.

The actions will be implemented at country level and monitored by the relevant European Commission Delegations.

2.2 Donor coordination

Donor coordination will take place at country level and involve consultation with stakeholders at all levels.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE CALL FOR PROPOSALS

3.1 Basic act and financing source

The legal basis is Regulation (EC) No 1905/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 establishing a financing instrument for development cooperation⁷⁶.

The budget line is 21 02 01 for Food Security.

3.2 Objectives of the programme, fields of intervention/priorities, geographical scope and expected results

The objective of this component is to address old and new food security challenges through innovative and locally owned, sustainable solutions, which could be scaled up and mainstreamed.

Main expected results are: (i) innovative sustainable solutions to food insecurity problems, especially as proposed by the food-insecure themselves, are “captured”, encouraged and tested, and South-South replication and dissemination is facilitated; and (ii) preparatory and pilot projects lead to the adoption of a national food security strategy/plan and programme approach.

Indicators will be specific to each country and specified in the individual Calls for Proposals to be launched by the relevant European Commission Delegations.

Within the present AAP, the following countries will receive assistance:

Africa

In **Chad**, the main field of action in 2009 will focus on the *durability of the food security information system in place at the national level*. The efforts will be aimed at maintaining the results of the current year achieved through the technical support from the FAO to the Ministry of Agriculture. A Call for Proposals will allow innovative approaches to be put forward in order to enhance the current methods,

⁷⁶ http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/worldwide/food-security/documents/reglement_1905_2006_en.pdf

for example through the refining of data collection mechanisms to include household level information.

The action should:

- Improve national skills for the analysis of data on food security from an operational and strategic point of view. The activities will take place in the areas where higher risks have been identified.
- Support the Ministry of Agriculture and its divisions (particularly the Secretariat of the Action Committee for food security and crisis management) in collecting, analysing, and circulating information on food security.
- Ensure the continuity of the results obtained, such as the multidisciplinary working groups and local structures in place, as well as the publication of a bulletin disseminating early warning and other crucial information for food security.

This action gives decision-makers an opportunity to better understand the country situation through support from NGOs and other partners. The programme should allow the main stakeholders to design structural and rapid intervention in case of crises.

Furthermore, while early coordination has been ensured with the Regional Programme on Information Systems funded by the FSTP and managed by CILSS, further complementarities with this Programme will be established for the collection and utilization of data.

In Mauritania a Call for Proposals focusing on innovative approaches to food insecurity provides an opportunity to support pilot interventions already put in place by different national and international actors (such as Fews-Net, Unicef and the Ministry of Health, Caritas and local partners), while coordinating efforts with the Regional Programme on Information Systems funded by the FSTP and managed by CILSS.

In order to complement the food security monitoring system managed by the Observatoire de la Sécurité Alimentaire (OSA), which has proved unsustainable and lacking in transparency, these pilot interventions will allow a better response to local needs by refining the level of data collection and establishing better collaboration between the various food security actors involved in data collection and analysis.

Innovative approaches will focus on *production and access to information* so as to:

- Broaden the data coverage on emergency and structural approaches to food security;
- Improve and complete the collection of data on food production and consumption, especially at local level;
- Produce new data on market and commercial flows which are not currently documented.

The pilot approach should enable simple utilisation of data (cartography) as well as more transparent dissemination of data at local and national level, so as to improve governance on food security in Mauritania.

In **Niger**, the main areas of intervention will focus on *targeting mechanisms and social transfers/safety nets*, through NGOs' support to national institutions of the joint mechanism for mitigating the food crisis. Successful, albeit short-term experiments with NGOs' support to national structures through the Système d'Alerte Précoce (SAP) and the Ministry of Health have paved the way to longer-term collaborative efforts.

Actions will aim in particular at:

- Extending the capacity of the national structure in place (Dispositif National de Prévention et de Gestion des Crises Alimentaires) in order not only to manage crisis, but also to address the structural roots of food insecurity and malnutrition;
- Supporting and improving the targeting mechanisms put in place by the SAP. Until 2006, SAP was based only on the balance of cereal production and consumption; the aspects of vulnerability and malnutrition were added subsequently. However, there is no targeting mechanism at village or household level. Finer targeting mechanisms are needed in order to provide appropriate responses to the underlying causes of vulnerability.
- Encouraging innovative approaches of well-targeted social safety nets and cash transfer systems to address food insecurity and malnutrition at household level, while maintaining a global perspective.

International NGOs with local experience can further support the capacity building of the Cellule Crises Alimentaires (CCA). A Call for Proposals will make it possible to improve the existing system and to scale-up best practices.

In **Sudan**, the main areas of intervention will be:

- *Environmental and socially sustainable response/policy development* for IDP return in conflict areas, both rural and accelerated urban, incorporating woodless building technology for village reconstruction
- *Natural resource management*, specifically water harvesting, regulation of usage and land cover management
- *Conflict mitigation* through the integration of nomadic groups into rural planning.

In **Eritrea**, interventions will mainly focus on creating sustainable and innovative solutions for the management of natural resources and for sustainable agricultural growth, which can be used as models for bigger projects, particularly on the following themes:

Sustainable management of and access to natural resources (land, water and energy):

- Land management: the use of chemical fertilizers is regarded as the only option for maintaining soil fertility, but it is not sustainable. New techniques, such as conservation agriculture, organic fertilisers (a side effect of which is the production of methane gas for cooking and lighting at household level), could be introduced in Eritrea;
- Rainwater harvesting: some innovative methods which have been tested on a small scale could be scaled up for bigger projects; these include: fog harvesting, roof rainwater harvesting, rock harvesting and sub-surface dams;

- Access to energy in rural areas and carbon credits (Kyoto Protocol), for example through innovative methods to reduce the dependency on firewood, and making solar panels more efficient and less costly.

Pro-poor growth-oriented agriculture can be promoted through new technologies which are cost effective and locally available; this may include:

- Promotion of linkages between research and farmers;
- Improved access to new and cost effective technologies;
- On-farm food processing and preservation;
- On-farm seed multiplication and storage.

In **Zambia**, the main fields of intervention will be:

- *Health and Food Security Policies* (for instance, link between combating HIV/Aids with nutrition programmes and food assistance). Programmes aimed at reintegrating HIV affected/infected persons into the productive sector (agriculture in particular) once they have recovered their health status through nutritional support.
- *Nutrition monitoring information system* to address, for instance, Protein-Energy Malnutrition, micronutrient deficiencies and low birth weight.

Asia

In **Afghanistan**, high rates of global malnutrition and micronutrient deficiency among Afghan children are a matter of great concern. There are currently not enough operational initiatives in nutrition, whereas there is great potential for effective actions that could have a major impact on nutritional status of children under 5 years old. Therefore, the main field of intervention under the present component on innovative approaches to food security is:

- To support relevant *community based nutritional efforts*. These efforts will be closely coordinated with other food security projects and with the Basic Package of Health Services, of which the European Commission is one of the principal donors.

In **Mongolia**, the intervention will support small scale production to increase availability and quality of vegetables and other crops. Crop production used to be much greater before the 1990s, when it received large state subsidies. However, after the collapse of the Communism, Mongolia became dependent on expensive imported crops and other vegetables. This led to low consumption of vegetables and hence lower-quality diets for vulnerable groups. Thus, there is a need to increase supply close to the vulnerable strata of the population. To achieve this objective, the key activities will include:

- *Identifying areas suited to small-scale crop and vegetable production*, based e.g. on soil analysis and available water resources.
- Development and demonstration of *low-cost, low-level technologies* for a range of vegetables and other products.

- Local Crop Development Funds to support public *infrastructure for crop production*.
- Technical assistance to farmers for *production and post harvest support*.
- Development of *seed farms and distribution networks* for vegetables to provide high quality seeds for local farmers.

In **Cambodia**, soaring food prices have had a dramatic impact on city-dwelling net consumers, whose salaries have stagnated. This is having a disproportionate effect on the most marginalized sector of the population or those who spend up to 70% of their income on buying food. Therefore, the main areas of intervention of the Call for Proposals under this Programme will focus on:

- *Off-farm sources of income*: Promoting a better understanding of food insecurity in the outskirts of cities and creation of an environment conducive to quality jobs in micro and small enterprises in partnership with the private sector.

Latin America

In **Peru**, the particularly vulnerable group of small farmers in three Andean regions of Peru (Huancavelica, Ayacucho and Apurimac) will be targeted by means of innovative approaches to food security in order to improve their economic situation and social inclusion as part of a holistic approach to enhancing the various stages of the Alpaga wool production process. In particular, the main areas of intervention will be:

- Improve livestock management systems;
- Improve access to the market through the achievement of market quality norms;
- Capacity building for better social and financial management

3.3 Risks and assumptions

Risks and assumptions vary according to specific local conditions and will be set out in detail in the Guidelines for the calls for proposals.

3.4 Eligibility conditions

All legal persons that are non-profit making bodies – such as non-governmental organisations, public sector operators, local authorities, international (inter-governmental) organisations as defined by Article 43 of the Implementing Rules to the EC Financial Regulation (Commission Regulation 2342/2002 as last amended by Commission Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 478/2007) – are eligible.

3.5 Essential selection and award criteria

The actions will be mainly selected on the basis of a call for proposals procedure launched by the Commission Delegations in the different countries.

The Delegations, where appropriate with support from European Commission headquarters, will define the administrative and technical selection criteria of the projects which are to be included in the Guidelines to the call for proposals.

The essential selection and award criteria for the award of grants are laid down in the Practical Guide to contract procedures for EC external actions⁷⁷.

The maximum possible rate of co-financing for grants should normally not exceed 80 %, so as to allow specific countries to apply different (higher) rates as required. Full financing may only be applied in the cases provided for in Article 253 of the Implementing Rules of the Financial Regulations where financing in full is essential in order to carry out the action in question.

3.6 Schedule of calls for proposals

The indicative timetable for the calls for proposals is the second half of 2009.

3.7 Indicative amounts

Countries	Amount in €
Africa	
Chad	1,000,000
Mauritania	1,000,000
Niger	2,000,000
Sudan	4,000,000
Eritrea	2,000,000
Zambia	2,000,000
Asia	
Afghanistan	2,000,000
Mongolia	2,000,000
Cambodia	2,000,000
Latin America	
Peru	2,000,000
TOTAL	20,000,000

⁷⁷ http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/procedures/implementation/practical_guide/index_fr.htm

4. SUPPORT MEASURES

Annual audits and visibility activities will be covered by the budget under the grant contracts to be awarded under the calls.

**ACTION FICHE FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME –
STRATEGIC PRIORITY 5: PROMOTING INNOVATION TO ADDRESS FOOD INSECURITY
“FOOD SECURITY PROGRAMME 2009 - GEORGIA”**

1. IDENTIFICATION

Title/Number	FOOD SECURITY PROGRAMME 2009 – GEORGIA		
Total cost	€2.0m <i>CRIS DCI-FOOD 2009/021-059</i>		
Aid method/ Method of implementation	Sector Policy Support Programme: - Sector budget support (centralised management): €1.9m - Complementary technical assistance: €0.1m		
DAC code	52010	Sector	Food security

2. RATIONALE AND COUNTRY CONTEXT

2.1. Country context and rationale for SPSP

2.1.1. Economic and social situation and poverty analysis⁷⁸

Prior to the conflict in August 2008, the Georgian economy was on a strong growth track, with GDP rising by over 10% per annum. Economic policies were guided by reliance on the private sector for growth in a highly liberal trade, investment and business environment. The country attracted large volumes of foreign direct investment to sustain growth.

Despite high growth, job creation was weak, but poverty had begun to decrease. The pre-conflict unemployment rate of 13% concealed much under-employment. Had the war not happened, the government estimated that during the next four to five years up to 250 000 jobs would have been created, sufficient to cut unemployment to single digits, on the strength of rising foreign direct investment (pre-conflict FDI forecast: \$4-8 billion over the same period).

The conflict was a shock to the key pillars of economic growth. One major impact of the conflict has been a fall in investment, both domestic and foreign, and a steep decline in economic growth amidst rising unemployment.

The social burden arises mainly from the very high number of internally displaced persons following the conflict, which led to the need for shelter, food and social services programmes. Durable housing for the long-term displaced persons from both the 1992 and the 2008 conflicts remains a major challenge.

Unemployment and poverty rates are expected to rise over the next two years as a result of the economic slowdown. Preliminary estimates indicate that unemployment could increase from 13.3 percent in 2007 to 15.1 percent by 2010 and that the poverty rate could increase from the current 23.6 percent to 25.9 percent.

2.1.2 National development policy

The Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Programme (EDPRP) was finalised in mid-2003 and is currently being revised and updated. The document “Basic Data and Directions” (BDD)

⁷⁸ Data from “Georgia Joint Needs Assessment”, 9 October 2008 – UN WB.

provides regular information on planning, implementing and monitoring EDPRP priorities. The BDD is drafted within the medium-term expenditure framework (MTEF) and links overall national policies to sectoral strategies and the budget.

Georgia endorsed the European Neighbourhood Policy European Union–Georgia Action Plan (ENP AP) in November 2006. The ENP AP outlines the strategic objectives of the political and economic cooperation between Georgia and the EU. The main priorities identified in the ENP AP with regard to public financial management (PFM), social cohesion and poverty reduction are:

- to proceed with implementation of reforms in PFM, including the MTEF;
- to reform the social assistance and healthcare sectors, including establishing an effective legal base and effective management systems;
- to introduce effective poverty reduction measures aimed at significantly reducing the number of people with income below the poverty line and improving social cohesion; and
- to continue reforms of the social security system, notably to improve the targeting and effectiveness of social protection measures and social assistance, particularly childcare.

2.2. Sector context: policies and challenges

2.2.1 Sector context

Since the “Rose Revolution” in 2003, the Georgian government progressively developed its social protection system by establishing, in 2006, a new integrated cash benefit (“targeted social assistance” or “TSA”) implemented by the Social Assistance and Employment Agency (SAESA) under the Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs (MoLHSA). Social assistance has been reorganised to provide adequate support to vulnerable families to achieve reasonable welfare standards, linked to opportunities for income and employment programmes to promote future self-reliance. Policies for protection of children at risk have been strengthened and the emphasis has been shifted from institutionalisation under State care to support for care within the birth family or alternative family-based systems. These successive reforms have been formulated under the responsibility of the Government Commission on Child Protection and Deinstitutionalisation (GCCPD) within a “National Action Plan for Child Protection and Deinstitutionalisation” formulated in 2005 and the “State Childcare Reform Strategy 2006-08”.

The Child Welfare Policy and Action Plan for 2008-2011 (CWP&AP2008-11), the period covered by the ENPI, is in the process of adoption and will be supported by the EC-FSP2009 under an ongoing related EC-TACIS project (see section 2.5). Proposed programmes will support completion of the transfer of child protection responsibilities from the Ministry of Education and Science (MoES) to the Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs, in particular building and consolidating capacity for effective assessment of children at risk and State support for their continuing care and protection within their own families or by new mechanisms for family-based substitute support services.

2.2.2 Assessment of the sectoral budget and its medium-term financial framework

The draft 2009 budget presented on 15 November 2008 acknowledges the transfer of child protection responsibilities from the Ministry of Education and Science to the Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs. It also includes increases agreed by the GCCPD in the second quarter of 2008 for the parts of both the Childcare Programme and the deinstitutionalisation budget line transferred to the MoLHSA (from GEL 11 million in 2008 to GEL 16 million in 2009).

The corresponding MoLHSA MTEF for 2009-2012 has not been updated since the transfer was confirmed very late in 2008 and also disrupted by the conflict in August 2008.

2.2.3 Assessment of institutional capacity

The lack of adequate capacity within the public service remains a significant problem in Georgia. The problem now is mainly one of stability and continuity. Regular changes of Minister in line Ministries have been accompanied each time by widespread changes of staff at all levels within the Ministry. This policy makes institutional development and capacity-building very difficult. While progress has

been made, most line Ministries are still striving to develop an institutional structure that is appropriate to their mandate and overall policy plans. In particular, the transfer of child protection responsibilities from the Ministry of Education and Science to the Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs will force the latter slightly to revise its organisation chart and reorganise the relevant departments.

2.2.4 Overall framework for performance monitoring

In relation to the social sector component of the proposed programme, action plans for implementation of the National Policy on Child Protection and Deinstitutionalisation include measurable indicators of progress in terms of both process reforms and quantifiable changes in the numbers of institutionalised children, types of support service and beneficiaries of social assistance. Detailed formulation of these for the period 2008-2011 is fully included in the Child Welfare Policy and Action Plan for 2008-2011 (CWP&AP2008-11).

2.2.5 Macroeconomic framework

Over the last five years, Georgia has implemented far-reaching strategic reforms with the aim of developing a competitive private sector as the main driver of growth, with the State playing a supporting role by providing basic public goods and services, as seen in improvements in education and healthcare delivery and the introduction of a social safety net targeted to protect the extremely poor. Driven by rapidly rising foreign direct investment (FDI) flows, economic growth has averaged 10½ percent per year over the last three years and reached 12½ percent in 2007.

The crisis in August 2008 unleashed shocks to economic growth and stability in Georgia. Projections estimate growth of 3.5 percent for 2008 and 4 percent for 2009. These shocks have led to a weakening of investor, lender and consumer confidence, a contraction of liquidity in the banking system whilst banks have all ceased to extend credit, stress on public finances, damage to physical infrastructure, revelation of other infrastructure bottlenecks and increasing numbers of internally displaced persons.

However, before the conflict in August 2008, the overall macroeconomic situation was stable enough to make Georgia eligible for budget support. The government was following a prudent fiscal programme and had met all the relevant IMF criteria.

In addition, in the aftermath of the crisis, the IMF decided to sign a Standby Arrangement with Georgia providing for a total of US\$750 million to help to restore international confidence in the Georgian economy. Finally, during the donor pledging conference held in Brussels on 22 October 2008, an additional 3 400 million euros was promised to Georgia over the next three years by the international donors' community.

2.2.6 Public financial management

In March 2007 the Ministry of Finance (MoF) prepared a detailed strategy⁷⁹ and action plan for the period 2007-11. This sets out the priority areas of the MoF in terms of public financial management reform and specifies the action planned. Details of donor support are also set out, as are the areas where support is still required.

The recent public expenditure and financial accountability (PEFA) assessment provides for an updated and systematic diagnosis of the public financial management (PFM) system in Georgia and for a baseline for complementing the government's efforts to monitor progress on PFM reforms under way. The final report has been discussed and agreed with the government and was due to be made public before the end of 2008. Globally, the report recognises the significant progress on public financial management, but stresses that the internal and external control, personnel and payroll, public procurement and reporting systems need continued reform to enhance the effectiveness of public financial management.

The Ministry of Finance is due to revise its preview of public financial management reforms for the next three years (2009–2012).

⁷⁹ Ministry of Finance of Georgia – Strategy 2007-2011 and priorities for cooperation with development partners, March 2007.

2.3 Eligibility for budget support

Georgia meets the conditions for eligibility for budget support. In particular:

- (1) A well defined sectoral policy is in place and further improvements are being implemented (see section 2.2.1).
- (2) The macroeconomic stability eligibility criterion is met (see section 2.2.5).
- (3) The PFM eligibility criterion is met (see section 2.2.6). A credible and relevant programme to improve PFM is being implemented.

2.4. Lessons learned

The FSP's initial priority in the social sector was to improve access to food and combat general poverty by means of reform and financial support for the family allowance benefit (FAB). Budget support for orphanages led the FSP to become involved in the wider reform of the childcare system which was based exclusively on institutional care. The FSP TA supported a number of initiatives in this area, mainly aimed at deinstitutionalisation, that is reducing the large number of children placed in institutions. By the end of the programme, albeit after a good deal of difficulty and delay, the FSP had achieved considerable success in prompting the government to adopt strategies, structures, legislation and personnel to implement a comprehensive childcare programme.

2.5. Complementary action

The activities planned under this programme will complement ongoing activities under EC-TACIS in selected line Ministries (Finance, Health and Education). A TACIS project in the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs is addressing issues relating to the reform of children's institutions. Also, since October 2008, an EC technical assistance project (TACIS –AP 2006) directed towards the Budget Department of the MoLHSA will support development of appropriate linkage between medium-term policy and annual budgetary expenditure, within a well prepared, strategically based medium-term expenditure framework (MTEF).

2.6. Donor coordination

For several years the EC-FSP has been a member of the Deinstitutionalisation Working Group (DWG) which was instrumental in bringing together experts from international and national NGOs, multilateral and bilateral donors and government agencies active in the field of child protection. This working group, promoted by the EC-FSP as a significant local resource for the reform process, was represented in a number of working groups established under the Technical Secretariat of the Government Commission on Child Protection and Deinstitutionalisation (GCCPD), an inter-ministerial body designed to coordinate the activities of the three key government ministries in the field of child protection (MoES, MoLHSA and MoF) to formulate and implement a unified government strategy for the reform. The EC-FSP, together with Every Child, represented the DWG in the Technical Secretariat (whose membership also includes representatives of the other major international agency involved in child protection, UNICEF).

3 DESCRIPTION

3.1 Objectives

General objectives

The overall objectives of the proposed EC Food Security Programme for 2009 (sectoral budget support) are in line with the government of Georgia's National Action Plan for Child Protection and Deinstitutionalisation formulated in 2005 and its State Childcare Reform Strategy 2006-08 and aim:

(i) to align Georgia's child welfare policy with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child; and
 (ii) to guide government initiatives and strategies on child welfare reform and deinstitutionalisation, extending their scope towards development of a sustainable, modern child welfare system.

The EC Food Security Programme for 2009 (EC-FSP 2009) will also contribute to further implementation of the Child Welfare Policy and Action Plan for 2008-2011 (CWP&AP2008-11) in particular to:

- (a) ensuring that Georgia has widespread and accessible support services for families struggling to meet their children's needs because of poverty or other risk factors;
 - (b) creating systems for reporting and reacting to child abuse in order to ensure that children are protected as far as possible; and
 - (c) reducing reliance on large-scale institutional care for children who require the care of the State.
- It will also enable the European Commission to remain actively involved in the public financial management reform process, as indicated in priority area 3 in the ENP Action Plan.

Specific objective

The specific objective of the EC-FSP 2009 is to help the government of Georgia to improve the design, management, delivery, monitoring and effectiveness of State programmes and other services related to the ongoing reform of child welfare and family protection.

3.2 Expected results and main activities

Expected results

The expected results of the EC-FSP 2009 in Georgia will be development of:

- (a) a rolled-out, integrated system of needs-based, individual services and benefits for parents and children;
- (b) a State child protection policy which puts the legislation and a referral and intervention system into action;
- (c) high-quality, needs-based, individual family-centred and varied services for children in need of State care at local level; and
- (d) management structures in the Ministries responsible and funding mechanisms which continue to support progress on the child welfare reform.

Activities

Progressive roll-out of an integrated system of needs-based, individual services and benefits for parents and children in the country.

- Needs assessments for new services to support children and families carried out in up to 10 "raions" (administrative districts);
- New family support services which prevent separation of children from their biological families developed in up to 10 raions;
- Number of children and family social workers increased to at least 250 by the end of the first quarter of 2009.

Development of a State child protection policy to put the legislation and a referral and intervention system into action.

- Testing of child protection referral and response procedures completed in four pilot regions by the end of the third quarter and the final procedures embedded in law;
- Child protection rehabilitation services established in at least five regions;
- National policy on child protection developed.

Development of high-quality, needs-based, individual family-centred and varied services for children in need of State care at local level.

- New models of family substitute care developed (e.g. emergency foster care, short-term foster care, respite foster care, short-term places in small-group homes, etc.);
- Three-year plan developed for closure of institutions and/or reduction of numbers of children in institutions in line with CWP&AP2008-11 targets;
- First year of regulation of national childcare standards for all residential care providers successfully implemented and effect on quality of service provision evaluated.

Management structures in the Ministries responsible and funding mechanisms continue to support progress on the child welfare reform.

- Three-year funding plan approved by the GCCPD and included in the Basic Data and Directions (BDD) projections for 2010-13:
 - *the BDD reflects child welfare as a separate line and shows a consistent increase in available resources over time;*
 - *a similar increase over FY 2009 is reflected in the FY 2010 budget submissions approved by the MoF;*
- Action plan for transfer of child welfare from the MoES to the MoLHSA implemented on schedule to ensure minimum disruption to provision of services;
- Regular meeting of the GCCPD to coordinate implementation of CWP&AP2008-11.

3.3. Risks and assumptions

The proposed programme is based on a number of assumptions that are considered valid:

- § Political and economic stability will be recovered and any adverse impact of the conflict in August 2008 will be overcome by the support from donors and development of new markets;
- § Continued progress on improving governance and a recovery in tax collection and other revenue;
- § Transparent government expenditure programmes in support of clearly defined priorities based on national and sectoral policies and strategies;
- § Continued commitment by the government to the process of establishing a family-based childcare system for children at risk;
- § Commitment to honour international obligations, including those under the ENPI, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, etc.

The main risks to the programme relate to the possibility that the institutional development and training necessary to implement the programme successfully will be curtailed by government action and changing priorities.

3.4. Stakeholders

The MoF bears overall responsibility for implementation of the EC-FSP2009 and is therefore the primary stakeholder. The Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs is also a major stakeholder and will be responsible for implementing the reforms agreed as part of this programme. However, the final stakeholder will be civil society, in particular vulnerable children.

3.5. Cross-cutting issues

By definition, implementation of this programme will have a positive impact on the overall conditions of vulnerable families and children, including gender equality, good governance and human rights.

4 IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Method of implementation

The proposed method of implementation is direct centralised management.

As the proposed programme takes the form of budgetary support, the method of management is centralised, i.e. the budgetary support operation itself is managed solely by the Commission. The budgetary support will be untargeted and, as such, will be channelled directly into the *Unified Treasury Account* of the government of Georgia. Once released, the funds will be used like all other normal budgetary resources of the government and managed in compliance with the laws and regulations of Georgia.

4.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

All contracts implementing the action must be awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents laid down and published by the Commission for the implementation of external operations and in force at the time the procedure in question is launched.

The essential selection and award criteria for grants are laid down in the Practical Guide to contract procedures for EC external actions. The maximum possible rate of co-financing for grants should not exceed 80 percent. Full financing may be granted only in the cases provided for in Article 253 of Commission Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 2342/2002 of 23 December 2002 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Communities.

The procedure for awarding contracts for this action will be open to all natural and legal persons covered by the ENP Regulation. Further extensions to other natural or legal persons by the authorising officer concerned will be subject to the conditions set out in Article 21(7) of the ENPI Regulation.

4.3. Budget and time-table

The total amount proposed for the programme is €2.0 million, out of which €1.9 million is for budgetary support and €0.1 million for technical assistance.

The programme envisages an allocation of €1.9 million to the State budget of Georgia in one set instalment, indicatively in FY 2009.

The technical assistance component of the programme will be managed by the Commission in accordance with the needs of the programme. It will be used to assist with management of the programme, for the external review tasks and for *ad hoc* policy advice if requested by the beneficiary.

4.4. Performance monitoring and criteria for disbursement

Conditions governing the release of funds will be set out in the Financing Agreement signed between the Commission and the Georgian government. General conditions will relate to the stability of the macroeconomic framework and improvement of public financial management. A general and coherent approach will guide formulation of these general conditions regarding other ongoing sectoral budget support in Georgia, in particular the SPSP on public financial management.

Specific conditions will refer to the expected results set out in section 3.2.

4.5. Evaluation and audit

Prior to disbursement of the set instalment, an independent review will assess compliance with the relevant general and special conditions.

4.6. Communication and visibility

Communication and visibility will be ensured in coordination with the MoF. As the programme unfolds, the European Commission will, in cooperation with the MoF, will organise appropriate public relations activities to keep the general public informed of developments.

All actions will follow the standards of visibility described in the “Communication and Visibility Manual for EU External Actions” published in April 2008 and available at:

http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/documents/communication_and_visibility_manual_en.pdf

ACTION FICHE FOR FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
STRATEGIC PRIORITY 5: SPECIAL ALLOCATIONS TO CHRONICALLY FOOD-INSECURE COUNTRIES
(TRANSITIONAL PROGRAMMES)
“PHASING-OUT PROGRAMME OF SUPPORT FOR FOOD SECURITY IN HONDURAS (PASAHA)”

1. IDENTIFICATION

Title/Number	“Phasing-out Programme of Support for Food Security in Honduras (PASAHA)” (AAP FOOD 2009)		
Total cost	<i>EC contribution: €2m</i>		
Aid method/Method of implementation	Sector policy support programme: - Sector budget support (centralised management)		
DAC code	52010	Sector	Food security

2. RATIONALE AND COUNTRY CONTEXT**2.1 Country context and rationale for SPSP***2.1.1. Economic and social situation and poverty analysis*

Honduras, after growing 6.3% in 2007, may have a rate of growth of 4% for 2008. Its international currency reserves are still tending to decrease: in 2006 they covered 5 months' worth of imports, in 2007 they covered 4 months of imports, and the tendency in the last quarter of 2008 was that they only covered 3.5 months.

The public debt continues to increase, rising from 2 985.38 million dollars at the end of 2007 to 3 089.02 million dollars at the end of the first quarter of 2008. The deficit of the Central Government rose from 21.1 million Lempiras in 2007 to 546 million Lempiras at the end of the first quarter of 2008 (Economic Report, UNAT, March 2008).

During 2007 poverty indicators continued to follow a downward trend, bringing total poverty down from 61.8% in 2006 to 60.1% in 2007, this being especially noticeable in the rural population where the fall was 2.7 percentage points. Extreme poverty fell from 48.5% of the population in May 2006 to 42.9% in May 2007.

If it were to continue this tendency, Honduras would reach some of the Millennium Goals, in particular those on reducing extreme poverty and infant mortality of children below five years of age.

In 2007 the GDP per capita was USD 1 635 (USD 1 462 in 2006).

*2.1.2. National development policy**(i) National development policy and strategy*

The Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) is the framework on which most effort in the fight against poverty concentrates. The Strategy for Implementation of the Food and Nutritional Security Policy is contained in this strategy both as a cross-cutting issue and as an operational component.

The budget assigned by the State to the PRS is nearly 46% of the total budget, of which 78% corresponds to national funds, 12% to debt relief, 8% loans and 2% donations. Most of the

expenditure corresponds to the heading of salaries and wages in the education and health sectors, which accounted for approximately 76% of expenditure in 2007.

The budget for 2008, in compliance with the forecasts agreed with the International Monetary Fund, anticipates growth of 4.8% of GDP, inflation of 9% and a public sector deficit of 1.5%. The total amount of the budget is more than 61 billion Lempiras (approx. 2 billion euros).

(ii) *Credibility of the policy and strategy*

The national Strategy for Implementation of the Food Security Policy (SFSP) has already achieved a degree of maturity, in particular in the inclusion of specific budget lines for activities prioritised by the institutions involved.

(iii) *Ownership of policy and strategy by government in general and sector ministry specifically*

The government has integrated the priorities of the Food Security Policy in the new version of the Poverty Reduction Strategy and in the “Country Plan” document, which is considered as the guiding instrument for public investment in the medium term.

The Secretariat of the Presidency has played a significant leadership role in the implementation of the Strategy for Food Security, constituting and coordinating a Technical Unit for Food Security.

2.2. Sector context: policies and challenges

(1) *Sector context:* The concept of food security is well integrated in the policies and strategies of the Government of Honduras and is going to be an integral and additional part of the update of the PRS which is in the process of being approved. Furthermore, the SA demonstrated its relevance in the approval of a “Food and Nutritional Security (FNS) Policy 2006-2015” (approved in 2006) and the Farming Development Plan 2004-2021. Likewise, the Guidelines of the Strategy for Implementation of the FNS Policy have been included by the Secretariat of Government and Justice in its methodology for the preparation of the Municipal Development Plans. These Plans provide the planning framework for prioritised food security activities by the central and local administrations, ensuring the linking and coordination of investments at local level.

(2) *Main findings of the assessment of the sector budget and its medium-term financial perspectives*

Poverty spending as a percentage of GDP has been maintained in recent years: it was 8.9% in 2005 and 8.7% in 2006 and 2007. A similar increase is expected in the coming years, approaching 9.7% in 2010, the target set by the Government (ERP Report, 2007).

(3) *Description of the coordination process with the beneficiary country and/or other donors, e.g. Member States*

The Strategy for Implementation of the Food Security Policy (SFSP), has a permanent mechanism of socialisation and coordination by the Government. Since 2007, an annual meeting has been held on its implementation.

(4) *Assessment of institutional capacity*

During the last two years, the Strategy has consolidated the instruments and mechanisms that enable its implementation, and in particular:

- (a) The initiatives have been integrated under the Municipal Development Plans.
- (b) The gender aspect has been taken into account, with special reference to the selection of the beneficiaries.

- (c) Sub-committees on land use and socio-productive initiatives have been set up to coordinate and harmonise the activities of the institutions involved in the prioritised municipalities.

The proposed programme aims to consolidate the achievements of the PASAH in the framework of the implementation of the Food Security Policy. According to the last report (December 2008) relating to the 2007 goals, it shows a good level of results achieved.

Overall framework for performance monitoring for the implementation of sector policies and strategies

The Ministry of the Presidency has a Technical Support Unit (UNAT) responsible for the Management by Results System, which enables both physical and financial advances in the fulfilment of the stipulated goals to be measured quarterly. In 2008, specific indicators of the SFSP were integrated in this system. An evaluation carried out by the World Bank on the data reported by the National Statistical Institute (INE) has demonstrated the reliability of the data that the latter offers.

(5) *Macroeconomic framework*

On the one hand, economic growth has been positive (6.3% in 2007) and, on the other, inflation has risen, in particular in the first six months of 2008 (9%, with an annual forecast of 11%). In addition, there has been an expansion of bank credit and an increase in imports with a significant drop in currency reserves (\$120 million). In the last few months, the tax deficit has been reduced, thanks to the improvement in the public finances of the National Electric Energy Company (ENEE).

Growth of 4 to 4.8% in 2008 in comparison with 6.3% in 2007 is forecast. The balance of payments deficit was -10.1% in 2007, combined with a fall in remittances of funds from emigrants, which has resulted in a significant contraction of the international reserves of the Central Bank, falling, in October 2008, to USD 2.4 billion, covering 3.5 months of imports compared with 4 months at the end of the 2007. This situation is due largely to the deceleration of the United States economy, in particular to the crisis in the mortgage and financial sector, as well as to the non-implementation of the monetary programme agreed in the Stand-By Agreement with the IMF, that looks to reduce inflationary pressure, contain the growth in credit and increase international reserves.

It is hoped that economic policies will return to sustainable levels in the first quarter of 2009, after the primary elections, when the Government will be able to take corrective measures to monetary and exchange policies, giving more flexibility to the band of fluctuation of the local currency with respect to the USD, in order to maintain external competitiveness and boost currency reserves.

The quality of the existing PFM system

In October 2005, the Information System for Contracting and Procurement of the State of Honduras, "HonduCompras", was introduced as the sole medium for publicising and managing contracts put out for tender by the bodies included within the scope of the Law on State Contracting.

An assessment of the process of improvements in PFM

The Government is implementing the Law on State Contracting, to better regulate national procurement, as well as the Integrated Financial Management System (SIAFI), which is in the process of integrating all the institutional implementing bodies in a single management system. The Regulatory Office for State Contracting and Procurement (ONCAE) supervises the application of the above-mentioned law. Its effectiveness in performance could be improved as well as

coordination with the SIAFI. Improvement of the quality of the human resources of the public sector, through a Civil Service professionalisation plan, is essential.

2.3. Eligibility for budget support

- (4) The Food Security Policy is currently under implementation and has been partly supported by the EC through the PASAH.
- (5) At the end of 2008, the Stand-By Agreement with the IMF was off track, mainly due to the imbalances in the country's macroeconomic situation and fiscal and monetary policy. It is anticipated that the GoH will take corrective measures in the first quarter of 2009.
- (6) The SIAFI is now established and operating. The link with ONCAE is expected in the course of 2009.

2.4. Lessons learnt

The Programme of Support for Food Security in Honduras (PASAH) has contributed significantly to strengthening institutionality and has implemented two components: one to bring in municipal planning regulations oriented towards the sustainable management of natural resources, and the other to strengthen the planning of local economic development (Municipal Development Plans) with the support of local initiatives on food security.

Territorial planning. The municipalities benefiting from the programme have been strengthened in their local development planning capacity and support for FS in the most vulnerable communities. The support for the legislation of the municipal territory has enabled lands to be legalised and participative management plans to be formulated, with focus on gender, directed towards the use and control of sources of water for domestic use and also administration of the areas of human settlement.

Socio-productive initiatives. These are carried out with the facilitation of sustainable financial resources, technical accompaniment and extension to improve access to and use of foodstuffs. This operation has required the organisation of the beneficiaries in business methodology (production cooperatives and rural credit unions).

In addition, the following has to be taken into account:

- The importance of interinstitutional coordination for effective implementation of operations.
- Good coordination on a central level both with the Secretariat of Government and Justice, with respect to the methodology for the preparation of the Municipal Development Plans and with the PRS with respect to the financing of food and nutritional security projects with a gender focus.
- The involvement of the Ministry of Finance in the signing of interinstitutional operative agreements to overcome the difficulties in ensuring the financial commitment for the fulfilment of the goals stipulated in the Strategy.
- The indicators and goals need to be included in the System of Management by Results to facilitate the financial and technical follow-up of their fulfilment.

2.5. Complementary actions

European Commission:

- Support for the Implementation of the Poverty Reduction Strategy (APERP): there is a strong relationship in view of the fact that food security is a cross-cutting issue and a specific component of the Poverty Reduction Strategy.

- Support Programme for Decentralisation (PROADES): a budgetary support programme, in the Secretariat of Government and Justice.
- Regional Food and Nutritional Security Programme (PRESANCA): a programme within the structure of regional integration which aims to strengthen national food security structures.
- Credit funds for food security (Land Purchase Fund and FINSA — previous EC-managed food security programmes in Honduras), currently under the responsibility of the Honduran Bank for Production and Housing (BANHPROVI).

Other donors:

- Rural Competitiveness project (COMRURAL) of the World Bank.
- Fund for the Millennium Development Goals (Spain) — Food Security Window: implemented by the United Nations system.

2.6. Donor coordination

The existence of the Budgetary Support Group, created two years ago, provides a useful forum for discussions with the main donors involved in this type of cooperation: World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, Germany, Sweden, Spain and the European Commission. With regard specifically to food security, there is an FS subcommittee within the Round Table for Agro-forestry Coordination. The participation of the donors together with civil society and government institutions in the Consultative Council on the Poverty Reduction Strategy (CCERP) is likewise an element that favours dialogue, coordination and the follow-up of food security measures of an interinstitutional character. The implementation of the National Food Security Strategy, co-financed by the PASAH, is complementary to the Millennium Goals and to the implementation of PRS activities.

3. Description

3.1. Objectives

General objective: to contribute to the achievement of the general objectives of the Poverty Reduction Strategy, in the framework of the MDGs, with special reference to rural poverty and reduction of child malnutrition, in order to contribute to the economic and social development of the population in a state of food insecurity and of the rural economy as a whole.

Specific objective: to consolidate the results achieved by the Programme of Support for Food Security (PASAH) in its contribution to the reduction of the food vulnerability of the rural population of municipalities prioritised from a gender perspective. Supporting the development of actions in the framework of the National Food and Nutritional Security Strategy and of a local government strengthened in its planning capacities for local development and prioritisation of food security actions.

3.2 Expected results and main activities

Consolidate the most successful aspects of the PASAH: (a) the commitment of the municipalities with regard to investments in the micro watershed management plans; (b) improvement of municipal property land administration; and (c) strengthening the municipal planning process in food security, focussing on the gender issue.

Institutional strengthening. Interinstitutional coordination and social consultation on food security as well as the monitoring and evaluation of the impact of the latter are institutionalised.

Municipal development. The town councils which are beneficiaries of the programme are strengthened in their capacities for sustainable management of natural resources, in their heritage, the planning of local development and in the prioritisation of food security actions incorporating these elements as

essential components of the Municipal Development Plans and integrating a focus on gender in the local Food and Nutritional Security initiatives under those plans.

Interinstitutional operational coordination. The institutions involved in the Food and Nutritional Security Strategy incorporate the guidelines and priorities, directed towards the prioritised population, in their corresponding operational plans and the follow-up of their fulfilment through the system of management by results.

3.3. Risks and assumptions

Risk:

The economic programme of the Government is being subjected to strong pressures that can destabilise it and aggravate the situation:

- Major claims for pay increases from both the education and health sectors.
- The holding of primary elections in November 2008 and presidential elections in November 2009 will step up the pressure on the Government to increase expenditure and keep paying subsidies.
- The global economic crisis is beginning to have an impact on the Honduran economy with reduced inflows of foreign exchange given the lower remittances from emigrants, principally based in the United States.

Additionally the Government has begun restructuring the social sector with the creation of the Ministry of Social Development and the Solidarity Network, which, in theory, will assume the powers that the Social Cabinet currently holds with respect to its role of coordinator of social policies.

Assumptions:

- The Government and the International Monetary Fund reach a consensus on implementation of the Stand-By Agreement, have available quarterly reports on the fulfilment of the latter and the bases for the negotiation of a new Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF).
- The Government respects the agreement and keeps its commitment in implementation of the Food and Nutritional Security Policy.
- The macro-economic situation is kept stable and the political pressure of the 2009 elections on the budget remains controlled.
- The Food Security Strategy joins an institutional structure that ensures continuity in the priorities of guidelines and goals for the preparation of the institutional POAs, and is incorporated in the goals stipulated under the System of Management by Results; and the system enables a statistical breakdown of the goals of Food and Nutritional Security.
- The Poverty Reduction Strategy remains a budgetary priority.

3.4. Stakeholders

Beneficiaries: the direct beneficiaries of the programme will be the priority population of the prioritised municipalities in the south of the department of Francisco Morazán, and the departments of Lempira and Valle.

Civil society plays a very significant role through the Consultative Council on the Poverty Reduction Strategy (CCERP) when defining both guidelines and priorities to give follow-up to the fulfilment of the stipulated goals.

3.5 Cross-cutting issues

The Food and Nutritional Security Strategy is a cross-cutting issue of the Poverty Reduction Strategy. In addition it has an explicit gender focus in both its approach and its operational sections.

Both the component for strengthening local government and that for sustainable management of natural resources are clearly detailed in the operational methodology of the action stipulated in the Strategy for Implementation of the Food and Nutritional Security Policy. The activities prioritised in

this Strategy have a particular impact on the environmental aspect, having incorporated land use and micro-watershed delimitation actions.

4 Implementation issues

4.1 Method of implementation

Direct centralised management. The institutional programme counterpart is the Ministry of the Presidency, being responsible for implementation of the national Food Security Policy.

The operational method of this programme will be indirect support for the general budget of the Republic through budgetary aid in the form of a currency facility, in compliance with Regulation EC No 1905/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a financing instrument for development cooperation (DCI). The total cost is estimated at €2 million.

Aid will concentrate on two budget years: 2010 and 2011. In financial year 2010, the budgetary support will consist of a fixed tranche of €1 million, bound to the existence of the macro-economic conditions that permit implementation of budgetary support. It is also dependent on the existence of structural conditions as well as fulfilment of the political commitments on the implementation of the Food and Nutritional Security Policy, as one of the essential elements of the Poverty Reduction Strategy.

In financial year 2011 the budgetary support will consist of a variable tranche of up to a maximum of €1 million, following evaluation of progress made using the advance in 2010 towards the goals of the indicators of results in the framework of the operations prioritised in the Strategy for Implementation of the Food Security Policy.

The Support Programme for Food Security of Honduras has an International Technical Assistance component until January 2011 that will be able to support the Government of Honduras in the first year of this operation.

4.2. Procurement and grant award procedures [*/programme estimates*]

NA

4.3. Budget and timetable

The total contribution of the European Commission is estimated at two million euros for this programme from 2009 to 2011, of which one million euros will be paid as a fixed tranche and 1 million euros as a variable tranche.

Tranche/million €	2010	2011	TOTAL
Fixed	1		1
Variable		0~1	1
TOTAL	1	0~1	2

The operational duration of the programme will be 36 months.

The programme is a sector budget support programme that aims to assist Honduras in implementing the Poverty Reduction Strategy in the long term and the Food and Nutritional Security Strategy in the medium term.

4.4. Performance monitoring and criteria for disbursement

The Government will present the evidence for the fixed tranche during the first quarter of 2010. As this action has been designed to consolidate the ongoing PASAH support to the Strategy for Implementation of the Food and Nutritional Security Policy, this payment is linked to the Government commitment to continue with FS implementation during 2009.

The Government will present the evidence for the 2011 variable tranche during the third quarter of 2010, in order to allow the EC to evaluate it and to confirm the amount of the payment to be included in the 2011 national budget.

The conditions are basically the same as the ongoing PASAH, with a better definition on the basis of the lessons learnt during the implementation of the Food Security Policy. In the annexed document, the conditions and indicators are detailed.

4.5. Evaluation and audit

Not applicable

4.6. Communication and visibility

The visibility strategy is guaranteed by a specific contract financed by the PASAH to be implemented until 2011. The approved Working Plan for the next two years is line with the strategy of the present proposal.

ANNEX 1:

COMPARACION PRINCIPALES INDICADORES SOCIALES

En cuanto a la situación de los mayores indicadores sociales comparados con otros países de la región, la situación es la siguiente:

Esperanza de vida al nacer

		GUATEMALA	BELICE	EL SALVADOR	HONDURAS	NICARAGUA	COSTA RICA	PANAMÁ	REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA
Ambos Sexos	1995-2000	66.34	72.55	69.43	69.84	67.95	77.28	73.78	68.59
	2000-2005	68.91	71.89	70.63	70.97	69.48	78.13	74.74	70.07
	2005-2010	70.16	71.67	71.77	72.05	71.01	78.79	75.57	71.40

FUENTE: CELADE: Centro Latinoamericano y Caribeño de Demografía, División de Población de la CEPAL: Base de Datos del Boletín Demográfico No. 73: América Latina y el Caribe: Estimaciones y Proyecciones de Población 1950-2050.

Tasa de mortalidad infantil

	GUATEMALA	BELICE	EL SALVADOR	HONDURAS	NICARAGUA	COSTA RICA	PANAMÁ	REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA
1995	49	36	46	37	41	14	23	42
2000	39	34	35	33	34	13	20	33
2004	33	32	28	31	31	11	19	27

FUENTE:
UNICEF/OPS: Fondo de las Naciones Unidas para la Infancia: Monitoreando la Situación de Niños y Mujeres
Base de Datos en Línea en <http://www.childinfo.org/>

NOTA:
+/ODM-Objetivo 4 / Meta 5 / Indicador 14

Tasa de mortalidad infantil en menores de 5 años

	GUATEMALA	BELICE	EL SALVADOR	HONDURAS	NICARAGUA	COSTA RICA	PANAMÁ	REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA
1995	64	44	37	49	53	16	30	53
2000	53	41	29	43	43	14	26	40
2004	45	39	24	41	38	13	24	32

FUENTE:
UNICEF/OPS: Fondo de las Naciones Unidas para la Infancia: Monitoreando la Situación de Niños y Mujeres
Base de Datos en Línea en <http://www.childinfo.org/>

NOTA:
+/ODM.-Objetivo 4 / Meta 5 / Indicador 13

Población con fuente de agua mejorada

		GUATEMALA	BELICE	EL SALVADOR	HONDURAS	NICARAGUA	COSTA RICA	PANAMÁ	REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA
Nacional	2000	91	90	80	87	76	97	90	92
	2004	95	91	84	87	79	97	90	95
Urbana	2000	96	100	92	94	90	100	99	97
	2004	99	100	94	95	90	100	99	97
Rural	2000	86	82	63	81	59	92	79	84
	2004	92	82	70	81	63	92	79	91

FUENTES:
OMS/UNICEF: Organización Mundial de la Salud y Fondo de las Naciones Unidas para la Infancia : Programa Conjunto de Monitoreo de Provisión de Agua y Saneamiento. Disponible en: www.wssinfo.org

NOTA:
+/ ODM. - Objetivo 7 / Meta 10 / Indicador 30

**ANNEX 2:
PROPOSED CONDITIONS & INDICATORS**

Conditions to carry out the fixed disbursement

Conditions	Evaluation date	Sources of verification
1. Positive evaluation by the European Commission of the macro-economic, tax and budgetary environment of Honduras.	March 2010	BWI EC
2. Positive appreciation of the European Commission on the advance in implementation of the Food and Nutritional Security Policy	March 2010	Reports from the Ministry of the Presidency - PRS Reports
3. Institutionalisation of the programming and operational mechanism of Food Security in the Social Cabinet and its reflection in the institutional POAs	March 2010	Executive Agreement Minutes Social Cabinet
4. Integration, in compliance with what is approved by the Social Cabinet, of the sectoral goals of food and nutritional security in the system of Management by Results	March 2010	Report on Management by Results (Ministry of Presidency - UNAT)
5 That the subject of Food and Nutritional Security is integrated in a permanent and operational way in the Consultative Council of the Poverty Reduction Strategy (CCERP), to enable dialogue and concertation on implementation of the Food and Nutritional Security Policy with participation of the public sector, civil society and donors.	March 2010	Minutes of Meetings of the Consultative Council of the for the Poverty Reduction Strategy (CCERP).

Conditions to carry out the variable payment

Indicators	Goal	Evaluation date	Weight	Source of verification
1 Expenditure on salaries and wages of the Central Government as percentage of the GDP (compensatory tax neutrality measure of the transfers to town councils)	9%	July 2010	10%	BWI
2. Reduced rate of child malnutrition	22%	July 2010	10%	Reports PRS, National Statistics Institute, Min. of Health, UNDP
3. Amount of the budget assigned to the Poverty Reduction Strategy has been spent in compliance with the definition established by the Bretton Woods Institutions.	46.5%	July 2010	10%	Reports BIW Reports SIERP Reports SIAFI
4. Municipalities of Fco. Morazán, Lempira and Valle prioritised by the Food and Nutritional Strategy (FNS), with the declaration of micro-river basins, management plans and maps of zoning incorporated in the Municipal Development Plans	15	July 2010	20%	Reports on Management by Results. ICF and Municipalities' reports
5. Municipalities with municipal property legalised using the establishment of property title on common forest lands and urban national and urban common lands in the priority municipalities of the FNS Strategy of Fco. Morazán, Lempira and Valle.	10	July 2010	20%	Report Management by Results. INA and Town Councils Reports
6 Municipal Womens' Offices strengthened technically to assure the incorporation of the focus of gender equality in the Municipal Development Plans assuring the suitable prioritisation and register of beneficiary women in the FNS initiatives.	20	July 2010	20%	Reports on Management by Results Reports by INAM and Municipalities
7 Annual Report of monitoring and follow-up based on Management by Results which enables implementation of the FNS Strategy to be measured in a simple and verifiable way	1	July 2010	10%	Report on Management by Results Reports from Min. of Presidency

FICHE-ACTION POUR LE PROGRAMME THÉMATIQUE DE SÉCURITÉ ALIMENTAIRE

PRIORITE STRATEGIQUE 5. ALLOCATION SPECIALE EN FAVEUR DES PAYS D'AMERIQUE LATINE EN SITUATION D'INSECURITE ALIMENTAIRE CHRONIQUE (PROGRAMMES DE TRANSITION) «PROJET D'APPUI A LA PRODUCTION DE SEMENCES VIVRIERES POUR LA SECURITE ALIMENTAIRE AU NICARAGUA – PAPSSAN»

1. IDENTIFICATION

Intitulé	Projet d'appui à la production de semences vivrières pour la sécurité alimentaire au Nicaragua, PAPSSAN		
Coût total	10,5 millions d'euros		
Méthode /Mode de gestion	Gestion décentralisée		
Code CAD	52010	Secteur	Sécurité alimentaire

2. JUSTIFICATION

2.1. Contexte sectoriel

Le Nicaragua connaît des difficultés quant à la disponibilité des aliments et souffre d'un déficit commercial structurel de près de 25% des calories totales consommées. Le problème présente une dimension «macro» dans la chaîne des facteurs concernant la production primaire et la circulation (échange, transformation, transport, échange jusqu'au consommateur) et une dimension «micro», relative aux revenus et à l'alimentation des ménages. La hausse du prix des produits alimentaires constitue, dans le contexte régional et mondial, une menace supplémentaire dont les effets ne peuvent pas encore être mesurés.

Accroître la production et non les surfacesensemencées implique d'augmenter durablement les rendements. Historiquement, les grains ont connu une progression très lente. La croissance de la production agricole de denrées alimentaires de base au Nicaragua a toujours été due à l'augmentation des surfaces cultivées, mais on note que les périodes où elle s'est intensifiée correspondent à la mise en œuvre de programmes de renforcement de l'utilisation de semences de qualité et d'intrants.

L'offre et la demande de semences et de variétés varient selon les cultures, mais globalement, l'utilisation de semences certifiées, achetées à chaque période de semences, représente environ 15 % des surfaces consacrées à la culture des grains à l'échelon national, contre 60 % pour les variétés locales (variétés créoles). Les 25 % qui restent correspondent donc à la réutilisation des semences de variétés améliorées mises de côté par les agriculteurs lors de la récolte précédente, ce qui implique une perte de qualité génétique de ces semences due, entre autres, aux mauvaises techniques de sélection et aux conditions de stockage. La chaîne de distribution des semences certifiées inclut, dans des proportions variables selon les cultures, le gouvernement, les établissements commerciaux et les associations de producteurs.

2.2. Leçons tirées

Il s'avère très important, pour accroître les rendements agricoles de manière durable au Nicaragua, d'investir pour que la majeure partie des producteurs de denrées alimentaires ait durablement accès à des semences de qualité et à des variétés améliorées.

L'analyse des chaînes de production et de commercialisation révèle que cette ligne d'action a des conséquences différentes selon les denrées et que l'on devra en tenir compte pour définir les plans d'action des composantes de l'intervention. En effet, la façon d'aborder la question de l'amélioration et de la production de semences de qualité doit varier en fonction des particularités de chaque culture et de son marché.

Outre qu'il se propose d'améliorer les quantités et la qualité de la production nationale, le projet poursuit un objectif au niveau «micro», à savoir l'augmentation des revenus des exploitants agricoles. L'accroissement de la production représentera donc une opportunité pour divers secteurs du monde agricole. Pour y parvenir, il s'avère nécessaire d'encourager l'utilisation de semences de qualité et de variétés adaptées aux contraintes, aux besoins et aux marchés, et de veiller aussi bien à la quantité qu'à la qualité des produits.

Cela signifie que l'intervention doit s'orienter vers des modalités qui permettent d'augmenter les volumes de production, tout en améliorant les qualités du produit et son utilisation, et d'engendrer une plus grande équité entre les agents et les espaces sociaux (marchés) ainsi que dans l'organisation des chaînes de commercialisation qui déterminent les revenus des producteurs.

Pour réaliser cet objectif, il faut que l'ensemble des entités du système public des semences soit doté de capacités suffisantes en matière de réglementation et de normes, de surveillance et de contrôle, afin de relever le défi que pose l'utilisation massive de variétés améliorées et la qualification des processus de sélection et d'amélioration des variétés locales.

L'offre de semences de qualité ne se réfère pas exclusivement aux variétés dont la production a fait l'objet de surveillance et qui sont certifiées. Elle englobe également les variétés locales (ou «créoles») dont le potentiel est élevé et qui sont diversement adaptées à leurs utilisateurs et aux marchés, mais qui requièrent, au minimum, de bonnes pratiques de production et des processus de sélection et d'amélioration.

Il est nécessaire d'intensifier la production de semences de qualité, qui doit être placée sous une surveillance appropriée pour satisfaire aux exigences de la certification afin de pouvoir répondre au moins à la demande potentielle aujourd'hui insatisfaite. Il s'avère également nécessaire que la production de semences de variétés locales soit techniquement encadrée et fasse l'objet de surveillance, non seulement parce qu'il s'agit de certifier des ressources génétiques nationales, mais aussi parce qu'elles présentent un fort potentiel d'utilisation et sont bien acceptées par les marchés; non seulement pour qu'elles soient conservées et étudiées dans leur milieu naturel, mais aussi parce qu'elles peuvent contribuer à accroître la production, non pas au sommet, mais à la base de la pyramide.

La production, le traitement et la conservation de semences de qualité requièrent généralement des installations et des techniques spécialisées, aujourd'hui insuffisantes et centralisées. Il est par conséquent nécessaire de multiplier les installations et de diffuser les techniques afin de couvrir l'ensemble du pays.

2.3. Actions complémentaires

L'intervention, qui se propose d'accroître l'offre de semences de qualité et de variétés améliorées et d'en promouvoir l'utilisation, est complémentaire des actions de la CE actuellement en cours qui visent l'amélioration de la sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle (SAN) chez les populations les plus vulnérables.

Avec le programme régional de sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle pour l'Amérique centrale (PRESANCA II), un protocole d'accord portant sur la composante 2, l'acquisition de connaissances, sera probablement souscrit pour: i) la formation des ressources humaines du projet - entre autres, les ingénieurs agronomes et les chefs de file des organisations d'exploitants agricoles - en matière d'amélioration des semences; ii) la gestion des connaissances portant sur le thème des semences et leur diffusion auprès des différentes institutions et universités, de manière à potentialiser et à encourager l'échange d'information et d'expériences.

Une coordination sera établie avec le programme de développement local et de sécurité alimentaire (PRODELSA) et des échanges d'information seront facilités dans les communes d'intervention du projet, tout particulièrement là où il est prévu de construire une partie des infrastructures et d'installer des équipements destinés à la gestion de l'après récolte. Des synergies seront également créées entre les groupements de producteurs de semences financés par les fonds d'investissement du PRODELSA (gérés par les municipalités) et les activités du projet.

2.4. Coordination entre bailleurs de fonds

Tous les bailleurs de fonds mentionnés ci-dessous participent à l'approche sectorielle du SPAR et de la déclaration de Paris. Le projet, dans son domaine de compétences, contribuera à renforcer les mécanismes d'alignement et d'harmonisation entre acteurs publics et acteurs de la coopération internationale.

Les principales interventions soutenues ou mises en œuvre dans le cadre de la coopération concernant ce thème, et avec lesquelles une coordination devra être établie, relèvent du programme AMUNIC-PNUD (Association des municipalités nicaraguayennes - Programme des Nations unies pour le développement) - ou la forme adoptée pour sa continuation - qui est implanté dans le tiers des municipalité du pays, et du programme spécial de sécurité alimentaire PESA (FAO - INTA), qui s'est déplacé vers la sphère des politiques mais conserve encore des éléments significatifs d'appui technique à la production.

Une stratégie sera mise en place pour relier ce projet à d'autres interventions sur les thèmes de l'offre et de l'accès aux semences certifiées et améliorées, de la sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle et du développement rural, afin de parvenir à une plus grande complémentarité. Elle consistera à fournir et à échanger des informations, à mettre en commun les expériences les plus réussies et, dans la mesure du possible, à mener des actions conjointes. Il est prévu d'établir une coordination entre le projet et les autres initiatives du SPAR qui ont un rapport avec le champ d'action de l'intervention.

Les opérations prévues par la Banque mondiale (BM), actuellement en préparation, visent également l'appui à la mise en œuvre du PNSC. Il conviendra donc de faire en sorte que la coordination avec cet organisme soit plus opérationnelle.

3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectifs

L'objectif général du projet proposé est de contribuer à l'accroissement de l'offre permanente ou de la disponibilité à l'échelle nationale de produits alimentaires de base, à l'augmentation des revenus des exploitants agricoles et de la capacité des ménages à se procurer des aliments, par le biais de l'augmentation de la productivité agricole.

Cet objectif constitue également un moyen d'atteindre l'un des objectifs supérieurs du niveau national ou «macro», à savoir la stabilisation du prix des aliments de base.

L'objectif spécifique est d'accroître la productivité des grains (haricots, maïs, riz, sorgho) ainsi que d'autres produits agricoles importants grâce à une intervention centrée sur l'amélioration de l'offre et de l'accès aux semences certifiées et aux semences locales améliorées de grains (variétés créoles et créolisées), et par le renforcement des capacités des institutions qui font partie du SPAR, des organisations de petits et moyens producteurs de semences certifiées ainsi que des producteurs de grains utilisateurs de semences.

L'impact sur la sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle sera non seulement obtenu par la disponibilité des aliments, mais encore par la consommation. En effet, le projet se propose d'inclure plusieurs variétés d'aliments dans ses opérations. Outre les denrées qui fournissent de l'énergie et des protéines végétales, il envisage de porter son attention sur les autres aliments, dont le déficit est au centre de l'insécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle (INSAN) au Nicaragua.

3.2. Résultats attendus et activités principales

Les résultats attendus, les activités et les indicateurs du projet sont présentés ci-après.

Résultat 1: les services d'appui technique, de vulgarisation et de développement entrepreneurial sont renforcés.

Activités

- 1.1. Renforcer les organisations d'exploitants agricoles concernées en matière de développement entrepreneurial.
- 1.2. Transférer et diffuser, parmi les organisations d'exploitants bénéficiaires, les technologies d'après récolte et de traitement.
- 1.3. Encourager les alliances stratégiques afin de promouvoir le développement technologique et entrepreneurial.
- 1.4. Faciliter le marketing des produits.
- 1.5. Former des techniciens chargés de la vulgarisation ainsi que des conseillers agricoles.
- 1.6. Capitaliser l'expérience pour ce qui est de l'appui technique, de la vulgarisation et du développement entrepreneurial.
- 1.7. Développer la coordination des acteurs locaux qui sont en relation avec l'ensemble de la chaîne.

Indicateurs

- i. Au moins soixante membres des organisations d'exploitants agricoles ont accès aux formations portant sur le développement entrepreneurial et les plans d'affaires.
- ii. Les organisations d'exploitants bénéficiaires connaissent des technologies d'après récolte et de traitement.
- iii. Les organisations d'exploitants des cinq zones participent à des processus innovants aux cotés d'universités et de centres de recherche.
- iv. Au moins trente-cinq rencontres d'affaires, quinze foires de commercialisation des produits et cinq études de marché sont réalisées dans les zones d'intervention du projet.
- v. Au moins cinq écoles de terrain (ECA) destinées à la formation de techniciens et vingt ECA destinées à la formation de conseillers agricoles sont implantées; au moins dix ateliers avec des techniciens et trente ateliers avec des conseillers agricoles sont réalisés; cent quinze parcelles témoins sont établies et deux cent soixante évènements de démonstration pratique sont réalisés; au moins vingt visites de terrain pour des échanges avec des conseillers agricoles et trente visites de terrain pour des échanges avec des producteurs de semences sont réalisées.
- vi. Les expériences sont capitalisées et diffusées auprès de différents agents du développement.

Résultat 2: la caractérisation, la sauvegarde, la production qualifiée et l'utilisation élargie des variétés locales de grains et autres aliments sont renforcées.

Activités

- 2.1. Caractériser et nettoyer les variétés de semences créoles et créolisées.
- 2.2. Développer la recherche pour l'amélioration des semences locales, en garantissant l'équipement et contribuant aux investissements des coopératives de premier degré en pour améliorer leurs propres capacités de production de semences.
- 2.3. Appuyer la préservation des semences locales dans des banques de germoplasme et par l'usage et la construction d'installations adéquates pour la divulgation et promotion des *cultivars* locaux (vitrines).
- 2.4. Soutenir la production de semences de variétés locales par l'amélioration de techniques de production et de manipulation.

Indicateurs

- i. Au moins deux catalogues de variétés élaborés et publiés.
- ii. Un système de recherche pour l'amélioration des semences locales est mis au point et son fonctionnement est garanti.
- iii. Au moins vingt communes assistent ou sont représentées aux ateliers et aux échanges d'expériences qui visent l'amélioration des semences locales, et ces expériences sont capitalisées, par la mise en place de vitrines locales de promotion des qualités agronomiques et nutritionnelles des *cultivars* sélectionnés localement.
- iv. La production de semences locales est mise en place et développée dans au moins vingt communes.

Résultat 3: les infrastructures et les équipements pour la gestion après récolte des semences produites sont en place et s'accompagnent d'un appui visant le développement de marchés locaux.

Activités

- 3.1. Construire les centres de stockage et de traitement de semences à Pantasma, Yalí, Matagalpa, Estelí et Nueva Guinea, en collaboration avec les instances fédératives du mouvement coopératif.
- 3.2. Contribuer aux investissements requis par les coopératives de premier niveau pour la production de semences de qualité, y compris les petites installations d'irrigation.
- 3.3 Contribuer aux investissements requis par les coopératives de premier niveau pour le traitement et la conservation *in situ* de semences de qualité pour l'approvisionnement de la demande locale.
- 3.4. Compléter et renforcer l'organisation des entreprises associatives semencières, y compris les moyens nécessaires pour leur développement institutionnel, en particulier la prospection des marchés locaux.
- 3.5. Mettre en place des processus et des dispositifs destinés à rapprocher les fournisseurs et les demandeurs de semences, en appuyant les mécanismes de fonctionnement en réseau du secteur coopératif.

Indicateurs

- i. Les unités de stockage de Pantasma, Yalí, Matagalpa, Estelí et Nueva Guinea fonctionnent et les producteurs y gèrent l'après récolte.

- ii. Au moins cinq entreprises associatives de second niveau, spécialisées dans le stockage régional et la commercialisation de semences certifiées sont créées.
- iii. Au moins 60 coopératives de premier niveau ont été équipées et se sont développées comme organisations actives dans la chaîne des semences.

iv. Des processus similaires d'articulation de l'offre et la demande locale de semences sont assurés à petite échelle, autour des coopératives de premier niveau.

- v. Dans les cinq zones, la demande de semences est identifiée et l'offre assurée. Les processus et les dispositifs destinés à rapprocher fournisseurs et acquéreurs de semences fonctionnent.

Résultat 4: le système de certification et la gestion institutionnelle de la politique relative aux semences sont consolidés.

Activités

- 4.1. Appuyer le renforcement des capacités techniques opérationnelles de la direction des semences (DS).
- 4.2 Renforcer les capacités des services de surveillance des chaînes de production, de conservation et de traitement fournis aux producteurs de semences certifiées et élargir la couverture.
- 4.3. Appuyer la création du réseau des conseillers agricoles chargés de promouvoir les semences et d'encourager l'utilisation de semences certifiées.
- 4.4. Renforcer la gestion institutionnelle de la politique relative aux semences et la formation des techniciens en matière de réglementation et de normes.
- 4.5. Mettre en place le dispositif d'accréditation des entités publiques et privées pour la participation au marché des semences, le processus d'analyse et le dispositif d'inspection.

Indicateurs

L'équipe technique chargée du conseil auprès des exploitants agricoles est complète et dispose d'un logiciel spécialement conçu.

- i. Environ 2 500 producteurs de semences certifiées bénéficient d'un accompagnement pendant les trois campagnes agricoles de l'année.
- ii. Au moins quarante conseillers agricoles s'intègrent au réseau et participent à un atelier de formation, au moins trois foires aux semences sont organisées et une publication sur les semences certifiées est réalisée.
- iii. La loi 280 sur la production et le commerce des semences et ses instruments normatifs spécifiques est reformulée, et au moins quarante techniciens de la direction des semences (DS) et du secteur public agricole et rural (SPAR) sont formés en matière de réglementation et de normes.
- iv. Le processus d'accréditation des entités publiques et privées fonctionne.

3.3. Risques et hypothèses

Il existe un risque institutionnel. D'une part, que les politiques actuellement favorables au projet et à sa présente orientation ne soient pas poursuivies avec la même volonté, tant sur le plan des ressources financières et humaines que de la capacité institutionnelle. Et d'autre part, que les bailleurs de fonds perdent confiance dans l'appui au secteur rural prévu dans le cadre de la déclaration de Paris (mécanisme de montage financier commun - *basket fund* - dans le cas présent).

Par ailleurs, existe le risque de ne pas parvenir à assurer la complémentarité des actions des institutions chargées de la mise en œuvre du projet. Ce risque sera minimisé par des processus

d'explication du projet, de dialogue et de coordination aux différents niveaux (national et territorial). Les multiples acteurs du projet, y compris les organisations d'exploitants, y prendront part.

Au cas où les institutions du SPAR, se fondant sur leur propre point de vue institutionnel, lanceraient à contretemps des actions isolées - par exemple, si au moment de finaliser la production des semences certifiées, la construction des installations requises pour leur traitement et stockage n'était pas achevée - l'efficacité et l'impact du projet s'en ressentiraient. C'est en élaborant un plan global des opérations (PGO) de manière participative et sectorielle, principalement en prenant en compte l'ensemble des institutions du SPAR dans chaque territoire, que ce risque pourra être tempéré.

La création d'un comité technique de coordination et de suivi réduit le risque de manque de coordination interinstitutionnelle, qui est classique dans une opération de cette nature. Ce comité permettrait de renforcer la coordination de l'ensemble des composantes du projet. L'on espère que des actions convergentes concernant les différents piliers de la SAN seront mises en œuvre aux échelons national et local et que les acteurs clés joueront leur rôle et veilleront à articuler leurs activités dans chaque zone. De cette manière, une action intégrale en matière de SAN pourra être menée à l'avenir.

Pour ne pas encourir de risque, il s'avère nécessaire que les institutions du SPAR collaborent entre elles, se coordonnent et partagent leurs expériences; que l'INTA dispose de la capacité technique suffisante pour garantir que les installations soient prêtes à temps et qu'elles soient conformes aux spécificités requises, et qu'il prenne en charge les activités de recherche et d'amélioration des semences locales; que la fondation FUNICA soit en mesure de créer des réseaux locaux de marchés, d'échange et d'information; enfin, que la DGPSA soit à même de capitaliser le renforcement institutionnel. Pour contrecarrer les risques, il faut:

- pour la composante 1: un accompagnement technique intense, le renforcement des capacités de la DS de la DGPSA, de l'INTA et des entreprises de production de semences et l'inclusion de semences d'autres denrées alimentaires importantes pour la SAN;
- pour la composante 2: un accompagnement technique intense pour diffuser les bonnes pratiques et garantir la surveillance de la production des semences locales sélectionnées et améliorées;
- pour la composante 3: un accompagnement technique intense centré sur le renforcement des capacités de l'INTA et des organisations d'exploitants à gérer les centres de stockage et de traitement des semences, ainsi que la production, traitement et stockage des semences au niveau local;
- pour la composante 4: un accompagnement technique pour renforcer les capacités institutionnelles de la DGPSA et l'inclusion dans le programme d'une formation visant à préparer les certificateurs locaux destinés à prendre le relais.

3.4. Thèmes transversaux

Pour ce qui est des questions de genre, dans la mesure où l'économie familiale repose en grande partie sur les femmes, ces dernières se trouvent dans une meilleure position pour prendre part aux décisions liées à la production d'aliments et décider, par exemple, s'il vaut mieux privilégier la production destinée à la consommation ou celle destinée à la vente. Les femmes sont donc associées au thème de l'utilisation des semences de qualité et des variétés dès le premier maillon de la chaîne de production.

Concernant les volets relatifs à la biodiversité et au changement climatique, l'intervention se fonde sur les éléments de jugement exposés dans la stratégie environnementale régionale (ERA): «La conservation de la biodiversité, en particulier des écosystèmes du monde agricole, est importante pour la production d'aliments nutritifs et pour maintenir les bases écologiques qui soutiennent la vie. C'est

sous cet aspect qu'elle revêt de la valeur pour la durabilité de l'agriculture. Sa viabilité se pose plus en termes de conservation que de préservation, puisqu'elle repose sur la connaissance que l'on en a, sur ses possibilités d'utilisation et sur sa protection. Si on la méconnaît, on ne peut l'utiliser, et si on ne l'utilise pas maintenant, ou s'il n'existe pas d'attente quant à son utilisation future, sa protection n'est pas viable.».

De telles considérations indiquent que la conservation de la biodiversité n'est pas uniquement une affaire de banques de matériel génétique pour la recherche future et relevant de l'intérêt international. Il s'agit en premier lieu de préserver la résilience des systèmes sociaux de production en ce qu'ils ont de plus sensible, à savoir la diversité des variétés cultivées. Conservation et utilisation ne s'opposent pas, au contraire, c'est en utilisant que l'on conserve.

En outre, parmi les risques environnementaux les plus graves, figure l'augmentation de l'utilisation d'engrais minéraux et de pesticides qu'occasionnera l'extension de l'utilisation de variétés plus exigeantes. Il faudra contrecarrer ce risque en promouvant systématiquement la mise en place de systèmes de production agricole fortement intégrés aux écosystèmes naturels et pour lesquels les semences locales (ou créoles), améliorées de manière appropriée, présentent un avantage significatif car elles sont peu dépendantes des intrants agricoles.

3.5. Parties prenantes

Les acteurs importants du secteur public sont regroupés au sein du secteur public agropastoral et rural (SPAR), placé sous l'égide du ministère de l'agriculture et des forêts (MAGFOR) dont la tutelle s'exerce au moyen de deux grands dispositifs: la formulation et le suivi des politiques et la réalisation d'actions directes par l'intermédiaire de ses bureaux territoriaux. Cette institution, située au cœur des politiques nationales relatives à la production de denrées alimentaires, met en œuvre de vastes programmes pour tout ce qui a trait à l'offre et à la demande de semences de qualité, tel le programme agro-alimentaire de semences, exécuté par le MAGFOR lui-même, instrument dont le but est d'accroître la disponibilité alimentaire pour les familles qui produisent des grains sur de petites parcelles. Ce programme privilégie en outre les zones ayant un potentiel biophysique et social présentant le moins de risques en matière de production.

En amont, le programme national de semences certifiées (PNSC), que cette intervention se propose d'appuyer, cible la chaîne de la production de semences. L'Institut national de technologie agropastorale (INTA), dont le mandat est l'innovation technologique, joue un rôle central dans ce programme. Il appuie l'organisation des petits et moyens exploitants en coopératives pour qu'ils s'impliquent dans le processus de production de semences, dans la promotion de groupements d'entreprises semencières ainsi que dans l'accès aux marchés d'intrants agricoles, aux produits et services financiers. Le projet travaillera aussi avec la direction des semences à la direction générale de la protection sanitaire (DGPSA) du MAGFOR, qui règlemente la production et la certification des semences.

Toujours dans le cadre du PNSC, la FUNICA, fondation à caractère mixte, encourage l'organisation des petits et moyens exploitants en groupements d'entreprises semencières et fournit des services technologiques visant l'accroissement de leurs rendements; aux cotés de l'INTA, la FUNICA aura une incidence sur l'amélioration des compétences et des savoir-faire des exploitants en vue de renforcer le développement entrepreneurial des quarante organisations qui produisent et commercialisent des semences certifiées.

En outre, toute une gamme d'acteurs importants de la société civile, parmi lesquels des fondations, des associations professionnelles et des organismes de développement, sont regroupés dans deux organisations dont le leadership, dans le monde paysan, en matière d'amélioration participative de

semences locales (ou «créoles») demeure incontesté: 1) le programme «De paysan à paysan» (PCaC), important mouvement au sein de l'Union nationale des agriculteurs et des éleveurs (UNAG) qui œuvre pour l'amélioration des semences créoles ou locales dans le but d'assurer l'autosuffisance de la paysannerie, et qui encourage la recherche paysanne (caractérisation, reproduction des expériences, stockage des différentes variétés, diversification des variétés et développement de marchés); 2) le centre de recherche pour le développement rural et social (CIPRES), association à but non lucratif qui a mis en œuvre de façon continue des actions visant le développement technique, organisationnel et économique des petites exploitations et mène un projet de recherche participative pour l'amélioration des variétés créoles de maïs, de haricots et de sorgho; 3) deux laboratoires universitaires (phytotechnique et biotechnologies) sont impliquées avec INTA dans certaines phases du projet; 4) Des coopératives de premier degré qui ont pris la production de semences de grains de base comme axe stratégique et sont en voie de consolidation au sein de structures plus amples (Unions et Fédérations de coopératives).

Le groupe cible final du projet est la population en proie à l'insécurité alimentaire dans cinq municipalités prioritaires du PNSC (Pantasma, Yalí, Matagalpa, Estelí et Nueva Guinea) ainsi que plus de 150 000 exploitants utilisateurs, tant pour les grains que pour d'autres cultures essentielles, de semences et de variétés améliorées ou locales, certifiées ou bien dont la production a fait l'objet d'une surveillance. Le projet bénéficiera directement aux petits et moyens producteurs de semences certifiées associés au sein de coopératives (haricots rouges, haricots noirs, riz, maïs blanc, maïs jaune et sorgho blanc), de même qu'aux conseillers agricoles et aux techniciens chargés de la vulgarisation agricole du SPAR.

4. QUESTIONS DE MISE EN ŒUVRE

Le bénéficiaire sera la République du Nicaragua. L'organisme de mise en œuvre qui dirigera et exécutera le projet pourrait être l'INTA par délégation du bénéficiaire. Depuis son siège à Managua, l'INTA sera chargé d'appuyer la conduite des aspects techniques et veillera à la cohérence de l'ensemble du projet en collaboration avec l'AT. Au niveau local, l'organisme de mise en œuvre s'appuiera sur un/e facilitateur/trice territorial/e (point focal) dans chacune des cinq zones d'intervention du projet; ce qui garantira la cohérence de l'exécution des différentes composantes et des différentes parties prenantes dans chaque territoire.

L'organisme de mise en œuvre en collaboration avec la DGPSA/MAGFOR et la fondation FUNICA, organisera les processus d'appels d'offres pour l'accompagnement des organisations de producteurs de semences améliorées, ainsi que pour la passation des marchés (infrastructures, équipement) et l'exécution de l'appui à la recherche participative et à la production de semences locales (créoles), tâche qui sera déléguée aux organismes attributaires.

L'organisme de mise en œuvre comptera sur l'appui d'un expert international permanent et un comité interinstitutionnel technique et de suivi.

4.1. Mode de gestion

- **Option 3:** Gestion décentralisée partielle via la signature d'une convention de financement avec le Nicaragua.
- 3(1) Procédures de passation de marchés et d'octroi de subventions

- 3(1)I: La Commission soumet les procédures de passation de marchés à des contrôles ex ante pour les marchés publics de plus de 50 000 EUR, et à des contrôles ex post pour ceux ne dépassant pas 50 000 EUR. La Commission soumet toutes les procédures d'attribution de subvention à des contrôles ex ante.
- 3(2) En cas de décentralisation des paiements (possible uniquement lorsque les procédures de passation des marchés correspondants ont été décentralisées)
 - 3(2)I: Dans le cadre des devis-programmes, les paiements sont décentralisés pour les coûts de fonctionnement et les contrats dont le montant ne dépasse pas les plafonds indiqués dans le tableau ci-après.

L'ordonnateur compétent s'assure, par l'utilisation du modèle de convention de financement en gestion décentralisée, que la séparation des fonctions d'ordonnancement et de paiement ou des fonctions équivalentes au sein de l'entité délégataire est effective et permet en conséquence de procéder à la décentralisation des paiements pour les contrats dont le montant ne dépasse pas les plafonds indiqués ci-dessous:

Travaux	Fournitures	Services	Subventions
< 300 000 EUR	< 150 000 EUR	< 200 000 EUR	• 100 000 EUR

4.2. Procédure de passation de marchés et d'octroi de subventions

- Contrats

Tous les contrats mettant en œuvre l'action doivent être attribués et exécutés conformément aux procédures et aux documents standard établis et publiés par la Commission pour la mise en œuvre des opérations extérieures, tels qu'en vigueur au moment du lancement de la procédure en cause.

La participation au marché pour l'action décrite par la présente fiche est ouverte à toutes les personnes physiques et morales visées par les *bases légales* prévues par le règlement financier applicable au budget général. L'ordonnateur compétent peut étendre la participation à d'autres personnes physiques ou morales sous couvert du respect des conditions établies par les *articles 31, paragraphes 7 et 8*, du règlement (CE) n° 1905/2006 (ICD).

- Règles spécifiques applicables aux subventions

Les critères de sélection et d'attribution essentiels pour l'octroi de subventions sont définis dans le «Guide pratique des procédures contractuelles dans le cadre des actions extérieures de la CE». Ces critères sont établis conformément aux principes stipulés au titre VI «Subventions» du règlement financier applicable au budget général. Toute dérogation à ces principes doit être dûment justifiée, en particulier:

- si le financement de l'action est intégral (dérogation au principe du cofinancement): le taux de cofinancement maximal envisageable pour les subventions est de 80 %, si le financement est intégral, il faut alors fournir une justification. Un financement intégral ne peut être accordé que dans les cas visés à l'article 253 du règlement de la Commission (CE, Euratom) n°2342/2002 du 23 décembre 2002 établissant les

modalités d'exécution du règlement financier applicable au budget général des Communautés européennes;

- s'il y a dérogation au principe de non-rétroactivité: une subvention peut être octroyée pour une action ayant déjà commencé si le candidat peut démontrer la nécessité de démarrer l'action avant l'attribution de la subvention, conformément à l'article 112 du règlement financier applicable au budget général des Communautés européennes;
- dans le cadre des règles spécifiques applicables aux devis-programmes. Tous les devis-programmes doivent respecter les procédures et les documents standard définis par la Commission, tels qu'en vigueur au moment de l'approbation des devis-programmes concernés.

4.3. Budget et calendrier

La durée du projet sera de 48 mois à partir de la signature de la convention de financement.

L'Assistance technique internationale comprend au moins deux experts long terme et des missions de courte durée visant à appuyer L'organisme de mise en œuvre pour l'élaboration du POG, à apporter un appui-conseil en matière d'amélioration des plantes, d'innovation technologique et de marchés, et à appuyer ponctuellement la mise en œuvre d'actions de renforcement institutionnel, de formation et de capitalisation des expériences. Le chef d'ATI sera doté d'un pouvoir de visa sur les contrats et paiements.

Deux missions d'évaluation (mi-parcours et finale) ainsi que des audits annuels seront effectuées par des équipes d'experts indépendants. Des missions de monitoring externe de la CE auront lieu une fois par an.

Le budget indicatif du programme est le suivant:

Résultats/Activités	Contribution UE en €
Résultats 1⁸⁰.	900,000
1.1. Renforcer les organisations d'exploitants concernées en matière de développement entrepreneurial	225,000
1.2. Transférer et diffuser, parmi les organisations d'exploitants bénéficiaires, les technologies d'après récolte et de traitement.	225,000
1.3. Encourager les alliances stratégiques et la gestion de ressources financières par des projets, afin de promouvoir le développement technologique et entrepreneurial.	50,000
1.4. Faciliter le marketing des produits	220,000
1.5. Former des techniciens chargés de la vulgarisation agricole et des conseillers agricoles	70,000
1.6. Réaliser des visites de terrain pour l'échange d'expériences et la mise en place de parcelles témoins.	110,000
Résultat 2⁸¹.	2,000,000
2.1. Caractériser les variétés.	100,000
2.2. Développer la recherche pour l'amélioration des semences locales	500,000
2.3. Appuyer la préservation des semences locales	1,000,000

⁸⁰ Il comprend la formation, les services de vulgarisation, les foires agricoles, les rencontres d'affaires et les échanges d'expériences.

⁸¹ Il comprend les services de formation, l'assistance technique, les intrants agricoles et les équipements destinés à l'amélioration génétique, ainsi que les frais de fonctionnement.

2.4. Soutenir la production de semences locales.	400,000
Résultat 3⁸².	4,700,000
3.1. Construire les centres de stockage et de traitement de semences à Pantasma, Yalí, Siuna, Matagalpa et Estelí.	2,220,000
3.2. Renfort des capacités installées en production de semences (dont équipements irrigation)	400,000
3.3. Renfort des capacités installées en traitement et conservation	1,400,000
3.4 Compléter et renforcer l'organisation des entreprises semencières.	300,000
3.3. Mettre en place des processus et des dispositifs destinés à rapprocher les fournisseurs et les demandeurs de semences	400,000
Résultat 4.	900,000
4.1. Appuyer le renforcement des capacités techniques opérationnelles de la direction des semences.	350,000
4.2. Renforcer les capacités des services de surveillance des chaînes de production, de conservation et de traitement fournis aux producteurs de semences certifiées et élargir la couverture.	350,000
4.3. Appuyer la création du réseau des conseillers agricoles en semences chargés de promouvoir les semences et encourager l'utilisation de semences certifiées.	100,000
4.4. Renforcer la gestion institutionnelle de la politique relative aux semences et la formation des techniciens en matière de réglementation et de normes.	50,000
4.5. Mettre en place le dispositif d'accréditation des entités publiques et privées pour la participation au marché des semences, le processus d'analyse et le dispositif d'inspection.	50,000
5. Assistance technique internationale (missions à court et long terme)	1,500,000
6. Audit / évaluations externes	200,000
7. Visibilité et communication	100,000
Sous-total	10,300,000
8. Imprévus	200,000
GRAND TOTAL	10,500,000

4.4. Suivi de l'exécution

Le système de suivi et d'évaluation sera établi par l'INTA, tout en s'inscrivant dans le système général du SPAR; il se chargera de répondre aux besoins de l'intervention, avec l'appui initial de l'équipe locale de gestion pour la conception et le fonctionnement du système de suivi concernant la gestion et l'évaluation.

4.5. Évaluation et audit

Des missions annuelles d'évaluation et d'audit seront effectuées par des équipes d'experts indépendants. Les missions de contrôle externe, effectuées une fois par an, débiteront au moins six mois après le démarrage des activités du projet. Une revue à mi-parcours et une évaluation en fin de projet sont prévues.

4.6. Communication et visibilité

⁸² Il comprend la construction des centres de stockage et de traitement de Pantasma, Yalí, Siuna, Matagalpa y Estelí, de même que l'achat de semences certifiées, les investissements en équipements et en aménagement des infrastructures ; le conseil spécialisé, les foires, les échanges et les parcelles témoins ; la formation, la publicité et les coûts de mise en route des entreprises semencières.

Une stratégie d'information, de communication et de visibilité des résultats et des objectifs atteints par le projet sera mise en œuvre, conformément aux directives de l'UE en ce domaine, et en particulier son manuel de visibilité.

**ACTION FICHE FOR FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
“SUPPORT MEASURES”**

1. IDENTIFICATION

Title/Number	Support measures (under Priorities 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5) <i>CRIS DCI-FOOD/2009/21078</i>		
Total cost	€ 666 859.09		
Aid method/ Management mode	Direct centralised management		
DAC code	n.a.	Sector	n.a.

2. DESCRIPTION

Support measures are planned for actions eligible under the Food Security Thematic Strategy paper (FSTP).

Such measures (e.g. audits, evaluations, studies, identifications, information sessions, special events, etc.) might be implemented in the framework of any of the objectives of the programme.

All unspent funds will be added to the budget allocations for the calls for proposals covered by this Annual Action Programme.

2.1. Method of implementation

In the case of centralised direct management, procedures will be followed as laid down in EuropeAid's "Practical guide to contract procedures for EC external actions".

2.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

The relevant procurement and grant award procedures established in the "Practical guide to contract procedures for EC external actions" will apply.

3. Basic act and financing source

The legal basis is Regulation (EC) No 1905/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 establishing a financing instrument for development cooperation⁸³.

The budget line is 21 02 01 for food security.

⁸³ http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/worldwide/food-security/documents/reglement_1905_2006_en.pdf