1. **IDENTIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>2010 EU contribution to the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td><em>EU contribution: EUR 17.5 million</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method / Management mode / ref.</td>
<td>Joint management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC-code</td>
<td>52010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **RATIONALE**

2.1. **Sector context**

The achievement of the first Millennium Development Goal and the eradication of hunger worldwide remain as far off as ever. While agricultural commodity prices have decreased globally since their peak in mid-2008, they remain relatively high, especially in many developing countries, compared to the situation before 2005. The food crisis has had devastating effects on the poor and vulnerable, many of whom have been unable to gain access to adequate amounts of food. In addition, the financial and economic crisis, as well as climate change, are further aggravating the global food security situation. In consequence, it is estimated that the number of hungry and malnourished people has increased by 150 million, and that the total number of hungry people in the world now exceeds one billion.

As far as possible, national governments and the international community should reiterate and enhance their commitment to food security by improving aid effectiveness and increasing financial resources devoted to poverty in general and agriculture in particular. One of the most direct and effective strategies here is to concentrate on rural and agricultural development and the sustainable management of natural resources. In this context, scientific and technological advances in agriculture are recognised as one of the key factors for successful rural and economic development.

In this difficult context, the EC recognises and reiterates the importance of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) in helping to achieve MDG 1 through its investment in public research at regional and global level. Research on agriculture and sustainable management of natural resources (including land, water, soils and natural vegetation) and ecosystems has had a demonstrable impact on poverty reduction and food security. Since it was founded in 1971, the CGIAR has invested more than $7 billion in
research. Every dollar invested is estimated to have yielded $9 in additional benefits for the developing world.

The CGIAR underwent an independent external review in 2007-08. While recognising its impressive achievements to date, the review suggested that its effectiveness would be increased by a substantial series of reforms, including:

- A CGIAR Fund to harmonise fund flows from donors to programmes and to provide reliable multi-year financing of both core operations and programmes;
- A Consortium of Centres, as a legal entity with a Board and a Chief Executive Officer (CEO);
- A strategy and results framework, geared to three new strategic objectives and ensuring mutual accountability between the Consortium and donors.
- A set of mega-programmes to structure the research agenda in a comprehensive and coordinated way.

These reform proposals were accepted by the CGIAR Annual General Meeting in December 2008. A transition management team (TMT) has been established to take the reform process forward, starting in the course of 2010.

An additional outcome of the reform proposals is that the Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development (GCARD), scheduled every two years, will replace both the CGIAR AGM and the triennial meeting of the Global Forum for Agricultural Research (GFAR). GCARD will engage a broader range of stakeholders in setting the global research agenda. The first GCARD, in 2010, is being prepared by GFAR.

While the new CGIAR system is being put in place, a new contribution of €17.5 million is planned under the present Annual Action Programme (AAP) to co-finance agricultural research projects and Challenge Programmes with a direct impact on poor smallholders.

### 2.2. Lessons learnt

Although tangible improvements in research for agriculture and sustainable management of natural resources have been seen in Asia and Latin America, results have proved less effective on the African continent. It is therefore justified to invest more resources in the future, concentrating more on sub-Saharan Africa, and supporting current changes in the CGIAR by moving from a supply-based approach to a demand-based approach, building partnerships between scientists, extension services, smallholder organisations and other main stakeholders in the joint generation, application and evaluation of knowledge, and building on the innovation capacities of the poor themselves so as to maximise outreach and impact.

The EU contribution to CGIAR was positively evaluated in 2007 covering the period 2002-2005. A total of 140 research projects in Africa, Asia, Latin America, Central Asia and the Caucasus were co-funded by the Commission for an amount of €84 million. The high quality of the research was highlighted and specific positive impacts were identified, particularly in countries where adequate policies were in place. The work of the CGIAR centres was recognised as vital to the development of agriculture in the developing world. Continued, more predictable Commission support for CGIAR in the future is strongly recommended by the evaluation.
Lessons can also be drawn from the annual monitoring exercise carried out by the Commission to assess its co-financing of CGIAR activities. Recommendations include: i) an increased focus on policy research; ii) each project to have a clear strategy for the delivery of results to beneficiaries; iii) development of a coordinated framework for monitoring and evaluation; iv) provision of multi-year programmed funding; and v) through EIARD, advocacy for reform of the CG system.

The independent review of the CGIAR was comprehensive, and the report\(^1\) contains valuable lessons for the upcoming reforms. For example, a fragmented approach to the funding of particular projects is limiting the ability of some centres to meet core operational costs and is leading to uncertainty in future financing streams. Strategic partnerships to increase impact should be pursued with more emphasis by the reformed CGIAR.

2.3. **Complementary actions**

EU support for agricultural research in developing countries is based on the 2008 European Commission Non-Paper ‘Guidelines on Agricultural Research for Development’\(^2\). The Communication ‘Advancing African Agriculture’\(^3\), adopted by the EU Council\(^4\) and Parliament, sets out a specific approach to support agricultural research at continental level. The Africa-EU Joint Strategy\(^5\) recognises the importance of agricultural research for the attainment of MDG 1. All these policies confirm the relevance and usefulness of CAADP\(^6\) as a framework for advancing agriculture in Africa. EC agricultural policy for Africa reflects the priority areas of the CAADP\(^7\).

The implementation strategy proposes to concentrate EU assistance for agricultural research in developing countries on the poorest regions in the world (i.e. sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia) and in the following three priority areas, namely:

1. Support for the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), for the provision of international public goods. It is also planned to start a new collaboration with global partners others than CGIAR. Moreover, a global programme on agricultural research for development (ARD), focusing on collaboration with non-CGIAR global partners has been launched under the 2009 Annual Action Plan of the FSTP and receives an additional allocation under the present Annual Action Programme.

2. Support for regional and sub-regional ARD organisations, addressing common problems in a common manner. The major aim of this strategy is to facilitate cross-border collaboration between national agricultural research organisations in the South. At regional level, the focus is on strengthening knowledge, management and capacity for innovation and learning in agricultural advisory services. The EC has signed a

---

4. DG E II, 15110/07.
6. Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme.
7. The seven CAADP priority areas: Agriculture in Development Strategies; Sector Governance; Research; Knowledge Systems and Dissemination; Trade Facilitation, emphasising quality assurance and improvement; Natural Resource Management: Land, Fisheries, Forestry; Livestock Development and Disease Control; Risk Management.
Memorandum of Understanding with other donors to support FARA’s Medium-Term Operational Plan, and two projects are already under way with funding under the 2008 AAP. A further project — the Platform for African–European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development — has been approved for the 2009 AAP. At sub-regional level, the EC contributes to ASARECA (Eastern and Central Africa) and support for CORAF (Western Africa) is expected under the 2010 AAP.

3. Strengthening of broad-based national agricultural research systems under the 10th EDF programme.

Proposals for regional approaches to agricultural research, innovation platforms and technology transfer for Asia and Latin America are currently under preparation for the 2010 AAP.

2.4. Donor coordination

In recent years there has been growing collaboration between European governments and the European Commission in supporting new research approaches and mechanisms, including GFAR, regional and sub-regional research organisations, public-private research partnerships, Global Partnership Programmes, and Challenge Programmes. The European Initiative on Agricultural Research for Development (EIARD), endorsed by the Council and European Parliament in 1997, operates as an informal ARD policy coordination platform and has published a strategy for 2009–2013, in which effective coordination of European investment in CGIAR is one of four outputs. The EC supplies the Executive Secretary for EIARD and has participated with other donors in the working groups conducting the CGIAR review.

CGIAR institutions (Annual General Assembly, Executive Committee, and Science Council) already provide a mechanism for donor coordination, which is reflected in the many programmes jointly supported by several donors. The new CGIAR Fund, and associated Fund Council, will further improve the mechanism for donors to collaborate in making fund flows to CGIAR more effective and reliable, thus contributing to the overall efficiency and effectiveness of a reformed CGIAR.

3. Description

3.1. Objectives

The overall objective of this action is to reduce food insecurity and poverty through pro-poor agricultural development.

The specific objective is to promote pro-poor agricultural and rural innovation through the delivery of global/international public goods in the area of agricultural research.

3.2. Expected results and main activities

The programme will have a specific focus on agricultural and rural innovation for poor farmers in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Africa’s share will be approximately 50% of the total funding.

---

The expected results of the programme will be to contribute to:

1. The delivery of pro-poor scientific, technological and institutional innovations and policies;
2. The development/enhancement of pro-poor agricultural research and extension programmes, research capacity and institution building, responding to beneficiaries’ needs and mobilising their resources;
3. More active participation of low-income smallholder farmers, many of whom are women, as main beneficiaries and actors in research/extension programmes, through new research governance arrangements, also taking into account remote, risk-prone and marginal areas;
4. Learning through exchange of information, experience and knowledge and through scientific and producer association networks and (multi-)stakeholder platforms, with special attention to participatory and client-oriented approaches to foster collaborative innovation;
5. Improved complementarities and synergies with research programmes and activities financed through the 7th Framework Programme on research, technological development and dissemination.

Activities will include support for research projects and programmes, to enhance the dissemination and use of research results and the delivery of public goods, as well as to increase the participation of National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS), farmers’ organisations and regional research organisations in the CGIAR system, through GFAR, with particular attention to improving research and development connections/synergies.

Indicators
Centre Projects, Challenge Programmes and System-Wide Programmes will be addressed mainly under:

Strategic Priority 3. Reducing rural poverty through agricultural diversification and emerging opportunities for high-value commodities and products (indicator: number of technical options for income generation, targeting poor and food-insecure smallholders, made available to national advisory and extension services);

Strategic Priority 4. Promoting poverty alleviation and sustainable management of water, land, and forest resources (indicator: number of innovative technical options, including the sustainability dimension, developed with farmers and other stakeholders).

The present allocation also includes a specific allocation to GFAR, to maintain support for GCARD and subsequent consultations.

Finally, to ensure IFAD can meet its high-level technical management responsibilities, a Programme Management component (EUR 150000 ) will cover the costs of specific IFAD staff assigned to the programme (see 3.6).

3.3. Stakeholders

The main stakeholders in the programme are the 15 Centres for International Agricultural Research, and their research and dissemination partners: the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR), the regional and sub-regional fora, universities (South and North), advanced research institutions, national agricultural research centres, national ministries, civil society organisations, agricultural service providers, the private sector, international NGOs, UN organisations, and agricultural producers (through farmers’ organisations). The research
process and governance arrangements should allow for knowledge and innovation co-generative, bringing together different categories of stakeholders to develop approaches and technologies that build on local knowledge systems and are gender-responsive, and should ensure dissemination to the ultimate beneficiaries of the research outcomes, the farmer households.

3.4. Risks and assumptions

The main risks and assumptions for successful implementation of the programme are as follows:
- Mechanisms and linkages to transmit enhanced ARD knowledge to end users work effectively;
- The diverse, fragmented and pluralistic demand and visions for agricultural research can be translated into relevant and effective research outputs;
- The CGIAR reform process is implemented smoothly and in a timely manner, enabling existing programmes to be integrated into the new structure with minimum disruption of activities.
- CGIAR research activities are based on the priority needs of beneficiaries;
- CGIAR research outputs are produced in consultation with NARS, farming communities and other civil society actors, and are thus in a form that can be readily taken up by the appropriate actors along the delivery chain;
- Technical excellence is maintained in any restructuring of the 15 CGIAR centres.

3.5. Cross-cutting issues

Research priorities will be determined in the context of important global challenges and trends, including climate change, the global financial crisis and the rise in food prices. In addition, the globalisation of agricultural commodity markets, environmental degradation, rapid urbanisation and pandemics such as HIV-AIDS need to be considered. The gender aspect will be taken into account in the proposals, embracing the principles of gender equality, and support will be given to a specific system-wide programme focusing on gender. Another significant challenge is the need to involve formal education institutions more closely in research and extension, linking them to non-formal education initiatives and multi-stakeholder learning platforms.

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

3.6. Implementation method

The CGIAR is an alliance of — among others — 15 international agricultural centres, which will each receive a share of the European financial contribution. At the time of writing, the CGIAR does not have the administrative and financial structures to manage the EC contribution, and the reform process is not yet complete. Accordingly, taking into account the restrictions on ‘re-granting’ in Article 120 of the Financial Regulation, the Authorising Officer is to implement this action in joint management with an international organisation chosen in an objective and transparent manner and in accordance with the provisions of Article 53(d) of the Financial Regulation.

- The International Organisation chosen is the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Agency of the United Nations, as covered by the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) signed between the United Nations and the European Commission;
• The choice of IFAD takes into consideration its specific expertise in agricultural research and its position as a donor and technical partner of the CGIAR for the same action;

• The Agreement to be concluded by the Commission will provide that IFAD’s management fee is limited to a minimum and complies with the provisions of Article 43 of the Implementing Rules for the Financial Regulation.

• IFAD will conclude the necessary implementing agreements with the various CGIAR centres as well as GFAR and AGRINATURA.

• In the design and implementation of the action, IFAD will be responsible for:
  
  o Assisting the EC in the selection of projects to be funded, and subsequently guiding the preparation of the research/programme proposals. IFAD and the EC will review and approve the final technical/financial proposals to be financed under this programme.

  o Reviewing and approving the technical and financial reports submitted by the centres benefiting from the contribution and preparing a consolidated report including IFAD comments and recommendations to ensure that EC-funded activities target smallholder farmers and have replicable positive socio-economic and environmental impacts on rural poverty reduction.

  o Carrying out, when required, field missions to supervise the implementation of the programme.

3.7. 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.

3.8. Budget and calendar

The total budget will be EUR 17.5 million. The operational duration will be 36 months.

The indicative budget breakdown in EUR is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CGIAR projects and programmes</td>
<td>15,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFAR</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme management</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total direct costs</td>
<td>17,150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indirect costs 350,000

Total 17,500,000

3.9. **Performance monitoring**

A sample of EU-funded programmes will be monitored in accordance with the present Contribution Agreement. Joint monitoring arrangements will be considered through EIARD. AGRINATURA (The European Alliance on Agricultural Knowledge for Development), the only pan-European tropical agricultural research organisations, will be contracted by for this purpose.

3.10. **Evaluation and audit**

Each CGIAR centre is audited on an annual basis and audit reports are sent to the European Commission through IFAD. Moreover, ad hoc audits may also be carried out by the European Commission and/or by IFAD.

3.11. **Communication and visibility**

The visibility of the EU will be assured through a continuous and active participation in the CGIAR governance bodies (Annual General Meeting, Science Council, Ad Hoc Working Groups, Executive Committee, etc).

A communication strategy will be developed and supported by IFAD to illustrate the main objectives, outputs, and activities of the European Commission -CGIAR partnership, through periodic press releases, brochures and other appropriate communication tools, updating of websites, participation and presentations in the relevant international meetings and events, etc.

CGIAR will be asked to make visible the EU contribution visible through its communication, at both system and centre level, in the form of reports, presentations, brochures, websites, etc. Standards regarding visibility will be derived from the ‘EU visibility guidelines for external actions’.

(https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/visibility/index_en.htm)

This action will also be communicated and made visible also through active participation by the European Commission in existing ARD coordination mechanisms, networks, multi-stakeholders platforms (eg. regional and sub-regional ARD fora), and donor coordination platforms (eg. EIARD).
ACTION FICHE FOR THE 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 No: 2009 / 021-076 |
| Total cost | EUR 20.5 million |
| Aid method / Management mode | Call for proposals — Centralised |
| DAC-code | 52010 Sector Food Security |

2. RATIONALE

2.1 Sector context

The EU 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, and issues relating to animal and human health. It also covers 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 that has a national and international public-good character as well as research that yields private gain.

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

---

9 Communication COM(97) 126 on the ‘European Initiative for Agricultural Research for Development’ (EIARD) was endorsed by the Council and European Parliament in 1997.
In the ‘Thematic Strategy Paper’ and the ‘Multiannual Indicative Programme 2007-2010’ for the Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP), the EU recognises the importance of investing in the provision of international public goods contributing to food security, in particular in the field of research and technology.\(^\text{10}\)

The FSTP addresses ARD along two dimensions:

1. At global level, building on the long-established cooperation with the Consultative Group on International Research for Development (CGIAR), while opening it up to new global partners to improve the outreach and impact of research at field level.

2. At continental/sub-regional level in Africa, Asia, and Central and South America.

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

\textbf{2.2 Lessons learnt on agricultural research for development}

The 2008 Guidelines on Agricultural Research for Development, developed by the European Commission, clearly spell out the lessons learnt at international and EU level.

The main lesson learnt from the past is that agricultural research for development can yield very high benefits, provided that (i) there is careful identification of needs, priorities, opportunities, and 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, supply of inputs, financing institutions, markets, institutional development, infrastructure investment, capacity building, land, and 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 the public and private sector with the equitable participation of smallholder farmers to maximise the direct and indirect impact on food security. This represents a move from a linear, top-down approach, bringing research to farmers through extension services, to a new paradigm, involving rural and agricultural innovation systems that link the public and private sectors with farmers, civil society organisations and the scientific community. The concept of ‘innovation system’ encompasses not only technological innovation itself, i.e. the diffusion of new technological products and services within the economy, but also 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 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,

\(^{10}\) 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.
systemic and interdisciplinary (e.g. the bio-physical and socio-economic disciplines). This approach, which has long been familiar, now needs to be scaled up and generalised.

As part of this agricultural innovation systems approach, it is crucial to encourage research players to develop ex-ante strategies and plans to 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 complements the corresponding action already approved in 2009 with an initial budget of EUR 5 million and other elements of the FSTP and the Food, Agriculture, Fisheries, and Biotechnology Thematic Programme under the EC’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP7-FAFB), together with actions run by the Member States. These are summarised below:

**Food Security Thematic Programme:**

- **FSTP — Global Research (CGIAR)** — EC EU 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 the 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 the Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA), the African Forum for Agriculture Advisory Services (AFAAS), and the Centre Africain de Recherches sur Bananiers et Plantains (CARBAP). 2009 (EUR 11 million) with proposed support for the Association for Strengthening Agricultural research in Eastern and Central Africa (ASARECA), International centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE) and Platform for African-European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development (PAEPARD).

- **FSTP — Continental & Regional African Food Security Programmes.** 2007-2010: EUR 94 million. In line with the EU Africa Strategy\(^{11}\), the Communication ‘Advancing African Agriculture’\(^{12}\) and the Joint EU-Africa Strategy\(^{13}\), 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, the main objective being more effective international donor community assistance for ARD.

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

---

\(^{11}\) COM(2005) 489.
\(^{13}\) Adopted in Lisbon, December 2007.
Several topics in the current (2009) call for proposals coincide with themes 2, 3 and 4 below. The FP7 FAFB programme for 2010 is currently being designed to be consistent with these themes.

Complementary actions by **Member States** include:

- France — ‘Promoting sustainable development in Agricultural Research Systems’ — ICRA\textsuperscript{14} and ECART-CTA\textsuperscript{15} 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 on agricultural research for development

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

Moreover, an auction floor for 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 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, 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 to and mitigation of climate change, and strengthen economic development.

\textsuperscript{14} International Centre for Development Oriented Research in Agriculture.

\textsuperscript{15} European Consortium for Agricultural Research in the Tropics — Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation ACP-EU.
The specific purpose of the action is to generate research results on a broad range of themes relevant to food security for smallholder farmers with the aim of supporting policy-making in this area while guaranteeing that research results reach the intended beneficiaries, low-income smallholder farmers, through dynamic innovative systems.

3.3 Expected results and main activities

In April 2008 a workshop was held with FARA\textsuperscript{16} and EFARD\textsuperscript{17} 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 SAG\textsuperscript{18}. 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 these 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 through improved soil fertility and 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 access to markets — enabling farmers to generate cash income from selling produce at markets, leading to greater stability of income and increased diversity of agricultural production;

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 neglected endemic diseases and zoonoses affecting livestock production and human health in developing countries.

Project methodology

Each project will:

1. Deliver pro-poor scientific and technological innovations and policy options;

2. Develop and enhance the links between agricultural research and extension programmes, research capacity and institution building, responding to beneficiaries’ needs;

\textsuperscript{16} Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa.
\textsuperscript{17} European Forum on Agricultural Research for Development.
3. Enhance the active participation of low-income smallholder farmers, as the main beneficiaries, along with other civil society and private players, in research/extension programmes;

4. Improve the exchange of information, experience and knowledge, through networks of scientific and producers’ associations 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 EU and their rural development enhancement context.

Full details of the requirements are included in the guidelines for applicants.

**Indicators**

Successfully completed research projects will constitute 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 presentations of project results 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 Cross-cutting issues**

Environmental sustainability, gender equality, good governance and human rights will be mainstreamed across all projects.

Climate change will be an overall cross-cutting issue in all projects — it will be evaluated under the technical criteria.
3.6 Eligibility conditions

The programme is open to all non-profit-making legal persons such as non-governmental organisations, public sector operators, local authorities, and international (inter-governmental) organisations as defined by Article 43 of the Implementing Rules of the EU 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 sub-component 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 the EuropeAid Cooperation Office at central level.

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

The maximum possible co-financing rate for grants should not normally exceed 80%, so as to allow specific countries to apply different (higher) rates as required. Full financing is possible only in the cases provided for in Article 253 of the Implementing Rules of the Financial Regulation, where full financing 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 apply to partnerships. However, in order to meet the requirements of the call, each proposal is expected to include several partners from developed and developing countries, including the research community, civil society organisations and commercial and government organisations.

3.8 Schedule of call for proposals

The open call was launched on 6 July 2009 with an initial deadline of 6 November 2009 for the submission of both concept notes and full proposals. On 19 October 2009, the deadline was extended to 15 January 2010.

Projects may not exceed a duration of 60 months from contract signature.

3.9 Indicative amount

The total budget of the call is EUR 25.5 million for 2009 and 2010. An amount of EUR 5 million was already agreed in 2009. Moreover, in AAP 2009 it was indicated that € 18,1 million would be made available to this programme in 2010. Because of additional available credit appropriations, a new amount of EUR 20.5 million to be financed from budget item 21.0201 of the general Budget of the European Union for 2010 will be added to finance selected projects under this call for proposals (EuropeAid/128500/C/ACT/Multi).

3.10 Performance monitoring

Taking into account the nature of the actions, performance will be monitored by assessing 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 call.
ANNEX 3

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

‘SUPPORT FOR THE WEST AND CENTRAL AFRICAN COUNCIL FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT’

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Support for the West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development’s (CORAF/WECARD) Mid-Term Operational Plan (2008-2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Total cost | Estimated total cost of the Multi Donors Trust Fund (MDTF): €41 million  
EU contribution: €11.475 million  
Other contributing donors: DFID (€9 million), and other donors (i.e. Spain, CIDA) |
| Aid method | Joint management with international organisation |
| DAC-code | 52010 Agriculture | Sector | Food Security |

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

An assessment of alternative region-wide priorities for an agriculture-led growth and poverty reduction strategy in West Africa (WA) was carried out in 2006 by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). The study, financed by the ‘Conseil Ouest et Centre Africain pour la Recherche et le Développement’ (West and Central African Council for Research and Development — CORAF/WECARD), performed an economic, strategic, spatial, and institutional analysis and recommended a set of alternative development priorities in agriculture. The conclusion was that, under current agricultural and non-agricultural growth rates, almost none of the West African countries can achieve a rapid reduction in poverty with the exception of Ghana. At present trends, therefore, current agriculture growth rates are inadequate to meet the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 1. In West Africa food insecurity is both a cause and consequence of abject poverty, a situation further compounded by conflict and post-conflict conditions, which are an important feature of many countries.

West Africa’s current population (290 million) will reach 430 million within the next 15 years. This growth will be accompanied by massive urbanisation, as 60 per cent of the population is projected to live in urban areas by 2020. This population expansion and urbanisation will increase the present level of poverty and food insecurity, especially if not accompanied by an increase in agricultural productivity and structural transformation. Nevertheless, the potential to stimulate agricultural growth exists. Rice shows the highest potential and could yield the largest producer benefits in many countries and the region as a whole. Livestock is also an important and strategic option, especially for the Sahelian zone. Root crops seem to be relatively important in many countries, while traditional export crops (cocoa, cotton, etc.) continue to play important role as well.
Agricultural growth depends not only on technology to generate high productivity, but also on regional integration in both commodity and input markets. Specific action is thus needed to re-launch agricultural research and to improve coordination and harmonisation, to ensure greater productivity.

Based upon the study’s recommendations, West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development (CORAF/WECARD) prepared a strategy and a five-year Mid-Term Operational Plan (MTOP) for 2008-2013 with the aim of increasing productivity and, most importantly, improving coordination and harmonisation. This MTOP follows the Framework for Africa’s Agricultural Productivity (FAAP) principles, linking it with pillar IV of the Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP).

2.2. Lessons learnt

CORAF/WECARD’s MTOP was conceived to add value to previous regional initiatives for research and development in West and Central Africa (WCA) and to tap into the experiences from other relevant past initiatives financed by the EC, such as the ‘Support Programme for Agricultural Research in West Africa’ (PARAO). The PARAO initiative (2001-2005) was in fact implemented by CORAF/WECARD in sixteen countries of West Africa. PARAO primarily provided institutional development and capacity support to CORAF/WECARD as an experiment in financing decentralised research and agricultural research policies through competitive grant schemes (CGS). In total, seven competitive projects were financed: i) regional integration and value chain development; ii) fodder crops management, iii) animal production improvement, iv) cassava, v) Arabian gum productivity increase, vi) botanical extract use for vegetable production, vii) market survey on vegetables. PARAO also provided funding for specialised actions on drought adaptation, e.g. to CERAAS (Regional Centre for Studies on the Improvement of Plant Adaptation to Drought) and to the ‘fallow research initiative’. Funds were also provided to research in agricultural policies.

PARAO, initially due to receive € 25.7 m7 million with multi-donor support, was financed solely by the EU (€12 million). Implementation was delayed largely due to procedural issues, inadequate coordination of efforts, and the challenges of transferring funds to actors involved in the implementation of projects in the field. Despite these difficulties, PARAO contributed significantly to strengthening the organisational capacity of the CORAF/WECARD secretariat and reinforced its position in the sub-region as an agricultural research facilitator and coordinator agency. PARAO therefore helped improve the administrative and financial management capacities of CORAF/WECARD and contributed to strengthening the research cooperation capacity of participating national agricultural research systems (NARS).

Taking into account the lessons learned, CORAF/WECARD made efforts to strengthen human resources and restore the confidence of development partners (DP). Also, with the aim of improving accountability and transparency in management, a Change Management Plan (CMP) was developed in conjunction with DPs. Covering 18 months from 2009 to 2010, this plan provides for changes to governance systems, programmatic areas, corporate systems and core functions. CORAF has been implementing it since early 2009. Two quarterly reports (January/April 2009 & April/June 2009) have been produced and assessed positively by the EU and other donors.
2.3. **Complementary actions**

This programme is one component in a series of global, continent-wide and regional programmes focusing on the Research and Development component of the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP) run by the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), to be supported by the EU and other development partners. This includes support for the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) and other providers of global public goods (€153 million), the Forum for Agricultural Research in African (FARA — €10 million), other sub-regional organisations (ASARECA — €4 million), 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 services, private sector bodies, farmer organisations, the African Forum for Agriculture Advisory Services (AFAAS— € 1.5 million) and PAEPARD (the Platform for African-European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development — €5.5 million).

2.4. **Donor coordination**

In conformity with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, the EU plans to use a harmonised mechanism to improve dialogue with donors and other stakeholders. Key areas for EU-African Union (AU) cooperation in agricultural development are outlined in the European Commission's Communication ‘Advancing African Agriculture’ (AAA), where the European Commission sets out principles focusing on regional and continental-level partners (FARA, CORAF/WECARD, ASARECA and SADC-FANR), global (GFAR) and European forums on agricultural research Agricultural Research (EFARD), the European Initiative for Agricultural Research for Development (EIARD), etc. CORAF/WECARD has emerged as the major sub-regional organisation for West and Central Africa, with the role of facilitating, organising, promoting and coordinating development partners’ support for research programmes and activities. CORAF/WECARD is therefore well-placed to i) facilitate donor coordination mechanisms, and ii) increase the effectiveness of development partners’ efforts to support research on agricultural innovation in line with the CAADP agenda. Development partners (DPs) have established a CORAF/WECARD DP group. There will be an Advisory Committee (AC) made up of representatives of the World Bank, each contributing donor (thus including the European Commission), and CORAF/WECARD.

3. **DESCRIPTION**

3.1. **Objectives**

The overall objective of CORAF/WECARD’s MTOP is ‘High broad-based agricultural growth sustainability established in WCA’.

The specific objective is ‘Broad-based agricultural productivity, competitiveness and market sustainability improved in WCA’.

3.2. **Expected results and main activities**

To achieve the MTOP’s specific objective (broad-based agricultural productivity, competitiveness and market sustainability) four key results must be attained:

i) **Result 1 — Appropriate technologies and innovations developed;**
ii) Result 2 — Strategic decision-making options for policy, institutions and markets developed;

iii) Result 3 — Sub-regional agricultural research system strengthened and coordinated;

iv) Result 4 — Demand for agricultural knowledge from target clients facilitated and met.

Eight programmes have been identified as a priority for the sub-region and form the basis of the MTOP. Activities under the eight programmes will take the form of research sub-projects with funding channelled through a CGS (Competitive Grant Scheme). The programmes fall into three broad categories:

**A-Technical research**

1. **Livestock, Fisheries and Aquaculture**: the programme primarily covers small ruminants, pigs, poultry and large ruminants while programming for fisheries is still being developed. Technical issues identified as high priority in consultation with stakeholders are: processing and adding value to livestock products for large ruminants; management systems (habitat, health, nutrition) for smallholders; forage management; breeds and breeding of local breeds; and animal health. Ongoing initiatives/projects include: (i) Management of Forage Resources for Sustainable Utilisation of Pastures in the Sahel; and (ii) Integrated Management for Forage Resources for the Intensification of Animal Production in the Agro-Pastoral Zone of West Africa.

2. **Staple Crops**: priority staple crops are cereals, roots and tubers and crops such as bananas and plantain. Technical issues identified are: crop improvement, processing, seed systems, transfer of technology, and processing for cereals, grain legumes and plantain/banana. Ongoing initiatives/projects include: Sustainable and ecological intensification of yam production with acceptable quality for processing consumption in Benin, Togo and Burkina Faso; and Potential use of botanical extracts on vegetables as an alternative to chemicals in peri-urban zones of Benin, Ivory Coast, Ghana and Togo.

3. **Non-staple crops**: non-staple priority crops include horticultural products, high-value crops, and crops emerging as economically significant. Technical issues identified as high priority include: initial processing/value addition (reducing exports of just raw material); crop improvement; seed systems; transfer of technology for productivity enhancement and reduction of yield loss; processing (methods and tools); vegetables and fruits; and high-value crops. Ongoing initiatives/projects include: Impact of Rhizobia Inoculation on the Productivity of Gum Arabic Plant and Dynamic Factors in Soil Bio-Functions.

4. **Natural Resource Management**: This programme covers a range of priority issues, including soil and water, biodiversity and forestry and agro-forestry, and has potential links with CAADP Pillar I. Technical issues identified as high priority include: development of methods for better characterisation and conservation of biodiversity; methods for soil fertility (integrated water and nutrient management); research on micro-dosing inputs (seeds and fertiliser); carbon sequestration; research on climate change indicators (biological) and consequences for agricultural productivity; and development of appropriate land use systems. Ongoing initiatives/projects include: Combining Water Harvest Techniques and Nutrient Management to Sustain Food Production in the Dry Lands of West Africa; Fertiliser micro-dosing and drought-tolerant varieties, technology transfer for small farmer prosperity in the
Sahel; and Promoting use of indigenous phosphate rock for soil fertility recapitalisation in the Sahel.

5.-Biotechnology and Bio-Safety: The programme is closely linked to ECOWAS and activities will be integrated with the other animal, crop and NR programmes, where this proves appropriate. The main priorities under this programme, identified during the consultation process, relate to policies governing biosafety.

B-Policy research
6.-Policy, Markets, Trade, Institutions and Socio-economics: The policy programme is a new commitment for CORAF, and requires the development of capacity as well as a clear strategy to identify the scale and scope of the programme. The focus of policy research is on identifying, developing and establishing policy-related partnerships that effectively address policy, trade, market, institutional, and socio-economic issues. Due to the current low level of expertise it is likely that the research under this programme will be commissioned mainly from specialist centres, although scientists at these centres will be obliged to compete for funds. Ongoing initiatives/projects include: Regional Integration, Market Access and Diversification of Agriculture within the UEMOA zone; Policy Options for a Competitive and Sustainable Milk Sub-Sector; and Promotion of agricultural product processing technologies in Benin, Togo and Burkina Faso.

C-Efficient research delivery
7.-Knowledge management: This programme directly addresses key CAADP targets for improving technology dissemination and information flows, and plays a key role in the delivery of CORAF’s own results. Knowledge management covers a wide range of issues and mechanisms and is closely linked to dissemination and uptake of knowledge, advocacy, coordination of effort, and experiential learning. Ongoing initiatives/projects include: Dissemination and extension network for improvement of livestock technologies; Regional Agricultural Information and Learning Systems (RAILS); Capitalisation and sharing of agricultural research innovations and results in West and Central Africa; and Dissemination of new agricultural technologies in Africa (DONATA).

8.-Capacity strengthening and coordination: CORAF is in the process of developing a strategy for its capacity programme, but the main focus for capacity strengthening is on non-conventional areas and is concerned with empowering stakeholders to identify and respond more effectively to their own needs. The programme targets public and private sector organisations, NGOs, farmers, universities, producers, trade organisations, IARCs, consumer organisations, technical partners, decision makers, and other sub-regional institutions. Ongoing initiatives/projects include: Strengthening Agricultural Research for Development in Africa (SCARDA).

An Environmental Management Framework (EMF) will be prepared to cover the requirements of all three policies.

CORAF/WECARD MTOP indicative cost breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme/programme</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
<th>Proportion of total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Research for Development Programmes</td>
<td>103 480 564</td>
<td>93 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Governance and Management</td>
<td>8 244 103</td>
<td>7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111 724 667</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is proposed to use a Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) to fund part of CORAF’s MTOP. This MDTF will be managed by the World Bank (WB) and will fund the following components:

1. **Research Sub-Projects**: to develop and deliver technologies and policy options in the eight programmes identified in the MTOP.

2. **Research Programme Support**: to support the activities of the eight Programme Management Units established by CORAF as part of their change management programme, whose responsibilities include i) planning and priority setting, ii) coordination and information sharing, iii) management of sub-project grants, including their monitoring and evaluation, and iv) capacity development and technical assistance.

3. **Governance and Administration**: to strengthen the governance and administration of CORAF, funding of the operational costs of the Secretariat, office equipment, participation in regional and international fora, capacity building in financial management, procurement, accounting and human resource management, and maintenance of an M&E Monitoring and Evaluation system.

4. **Change Management**: to support the completion of the change management plan.

5. **Management, Administration and Supervision of the MDTF**

    **CORAF/WECARD MDTF indicative cost breakdown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme/programme</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
<th>Proportion of total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Research for Development Programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Research Sub-projects (8 programmes)</td>
<td>39300000</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Research Programme Support</td>
<td>8750000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Governance, Administration and Change Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Governance and Administration</td>
<td>7300000</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Change Management</td>
<td>1750000</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Management, Administration and Supervision of the MDTF</td>
<td>1800000</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total MDTF</strong></td>
<td>58900000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.3. Risks and assumptions**

CORAF/WECARD has identified a number of assumptions that need to hold in order for outputs and goals to be achieved. It is mainly assumed that: i) national and international stakeholders and partners cooperate to promote benefits; ii) governments meet or exceed the Maputo Declaration commitment of a 10% contribution to agriculture research and development (R&D); iii) civil society, especially producer organisations, are adequately resourced to operate efficiently; iv) harmonisation of processes and alignment of resources serve to reinforce strategy efforts. Risks might be mitigated during implementation if CORAF/WECARD puts in place a sound project management audit system to improve planning, monitoring and control of all aspects of the MTOP, and if monitoring includes measuring and assessing objectives/deliverables.
3.4. Cross-cutting issues

Increasingly, cross-cutting issues such as globalisation, political democratisation, liberalisation of economies, food and agriculture crises, growing international competition, overall insecurity and instability affecting small producers and the rural poor, urbanisation and migration, health and natural disasters, climate change, biotechnology, etc. have been at the forefront of debate within CORAF/WECARD. CORAF/WECARD has developed specific approaches to mainstreaming such issues. Concerning gender, CORAF/WECARD envisages i) disaggregating indicators by specific sets of stakeholders such as farmers, the private sector, women’s groups and commodity groups and ii) involving at least 20% women, youth and other vulnerable groups in research and development initiatives.

3.5. Stakeholders

CORAF/WECARD’s main stakeholders are the NARS, including NARIs (National Agricultural Research Institutes), universities, civil society, the private sector and agricultural advisory services of its member countries: Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Congo, Cote d’Ivoire, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Democratic Republic of Congo, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Chad, Togo. The MTOP has been developed with AU-NEPAD (New Partnership for Africa’s Development), ECOWAS, UEMOA, CILSS (Comité Permanent Inter États de lutte contre la Sécheresse dans le Sahel), FARA, IARCs (International Agriculture Research Centres), universities, farmers’ groups, civil society organisations and the private sector.

The key target groups are therefore the stakeholders of the 21 member countries with their various national agricultural research systems. Ultimately, the beneficiaries will be those demanding effective solutions to technical and policy problems affecting agricultural production, productivity and profitability, among whom are the rural and urban poor, small- and-large scale commercial producers, subsistence farmers and livestock owners, entrepreneurs and policy makers.

4. Implementation Issues

4.1. Implementation method

Implementation will be through joint management with the World Bank. No Financing Agreement will be signed for the implementation of this programme. An Administration Agreement of €11.475 million will be signed between the Commission and the World Bank, which will manage the funds on behalf of the Commission. The final amount may still be subject to adjustments as a function of final discussions with the implementing partner. The World Bank has confirmed that the MDTF will be a ‘Recipient-Executed Trust Fund’ or RETF (the World Bank appraises and supervises activities financed by the MDTF). The MDTF, at the World Bank to which donors will channel resources for implementation of the programme, is in the final stages of being set up.

The WB will transfer funds via a Grant Agreement to CORAF/WECARD, which is responsible for implementation. At CORAF/WECARD level, the implementation of the MTOP will be overseen by the Executive Director, based at the Executive Secretariat in Dakar. The Board includes representatives of NARS, Regional Economic Communities (RECs), Development Partners (DPs), Farmers’ Organisations (FOs), NGOs, the private sector, and
scientific partners. The Board will report to the General Assembly (of which the DPs are also members). The representation of donors in the Governing Board of CORAF/WECARD provides an opportunity for them to advise the Board. One donor represents all donors in a non-executive-capacity in the Board of Directors. The donor representative does not vote on Board decisions.

Each of CORAF/WECARD’s eight programmes will be led by a Programme Manager under the direct supervision of the Director of Programmes. There will be an Advisory Committee (AC) made up of representatives of the World Bank, each contributing donor (thus including the EC European Commission), and CORAF/WECARD. The AC will monitor the operation and implementation of the MTOP. It will meet at least once a year in conjunction with the wider CORAF/WECARD donor group, which has a broader oversight mandate. An MoU between CORAF and its Development Partners (DPs) is expected.

4.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

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

4.3. Budget and calendar

The overall budget for full implementation of the 2008-2013 CORAF/WECARD MTOP is about $112 million (corresponding to €78 million at the exchange rate of 3 Sept 2009, €1 = $1.418). Of this amount, the MDTF is estimated to cover $58.9 million (corresponding to €41 million at the exchange rate of 3 Sept 2009), with funds from the €11.475 million), DFID (€9 million) and other donors (Spain, CIDA). The operational duration will be sixty months (60) from the signature of the Administration Agreement with the WB.

As at 10 September 2009, CORAF/WECARD’s Development Partners (including EU and DFID through the MDTF) were planning to finance the MTOP with about 80 million of which $40.2 million is already secured. This represents 35% of the total MTOP requirement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount in $</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>% &amp; Status Sept 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DFID 19</td>
<td>£ 2000000</td>
<td>3300000</td>
<td>signed</td>
<td>4.12% secured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>£ 8000000</td>
<td>13200000</td>
<td>MDTF process</td>
<td>16.47% secured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>$ 7500000</td>
<td>7500000</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>9.36% secured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSG 20 /WB</td>
<td>$ 3000000</td>
<td>3000000</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>3.74% secured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFDB/FARA</td>
<td>$ 7175000</td>
<td>7175000</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>8.95% secured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>€ 11475000</td>
<td>16868250</td>
<td>MDTF process</td>
<td>21.05% pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOWAS</td>
<td>$ 23000000</td>
<td>23000000</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>28.70% pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTA</td>
<td>$ 275000</td>
<td>275000</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>0.34% secured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>$ 330000</td>
<td>330000</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>0.41% secured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARA/DFID</td>
<td>$ 4500000</td>
<td>4500000</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>5.61% secured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRDI</td>
<td>$ 1000000</td>
<td>1000000</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>1.25% secured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>80148250</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Secured</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>40280000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Pipeline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>39868250</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4. Performance monitoring

Performance monitoring will be carried out jointly by the Development Partners with the assistance of CORAF/WECARD according to the principles of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and the conditions set out in the Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF). For the MDTF, CORAF will prepare and submit to the WB a quarterly audited Interim Financial Report (IFR) satisfactory to the WB. The report will describe the sources and uses of the project funds, both cumulatively and for the period covered by the report, with a clear description of the actual and planned use of the funds.

### 4.5. Evaluation and audit

Under the MDTF, the DPs and CORAF/WECARD take joint responsibility for external evaluation. Further specific procedures will be defined in the Administrative Agreement. An external auditor, to be hired by CORAF under Terms of Reference acceptable to the WB, will conduct, in accordance with International Standards on Auditing (ISA), an annual audit of the project’s financial statements. A mid-term joint review will be carried out by CORAF/WECARD and the DPs in year three of the MTOP. Terms of reference for this review will be decided jointly.

### 4.6. Communication and visibility

CORAF/WECARD will ensure that the EU receives adequate visibility EU as co-financer, using, when applicable, the EU guidelines. A communication strategy will be developed by CORAF/WECARD jointly with the WB, in line with the MoU and MDTF, ensuring that the EU contribution is adequately acknowledged to all CORAF/WECARD stakeholders as well as non-African key collaborators.

---

19 £2 m of the £10 m has already been released directly to CORAF.

20 MSG: Mali, Senegal & Ghana.

### Annex 1  CORAF/WECARD Operational Plan — Logical Framework [2008-2013]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy of Objectives</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Objective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High broad-based agricultural growth sustainably established in WCA</td>
<td>1. 6% average annual increase in GDP from agricultural sector by 2015&lt;sup&gt;22&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>• Government statistics</td>
<td>[General Objective to Super Objective]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. At least 6% increase in the agricultural incomes of rural and other smallholder farmers by 2015</td>
<td>• FAO, World Bank, ADB and Economic Commission for Africa statistics and reports</td>
<td>• There continues to be strong cooperation between members and partners of national and regional R&amp;D systems to catalyse growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. At least 50% reduction in resources required for basic food purchases by the households of poor and vulnerable groups by 2015&lt;sup&gt;23&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>• ECOWAS, ECCAS and other regional organisation reports</td>
<td>• Political and social stability is maintained at national and regional levels to allow a fluid flow of resources, knowledge and technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Reverse, by 10%, the downward trend in the natural resource base — biodiversity, forest cover, land and water — by 2015&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>• UN COM-TRADE statistics and reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• UNEP statistics and reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Biodiversity Convention reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• FAO Forest Assessment Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>22</sup> Specific CAADP target.

<sup>23</sup> Specific MDG target to reduce by half the number of those considered to be food-insecure and living below the poverty line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy of Objectives</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators$^{25}$</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Objective</strong></td>
<td><strong>Productivity</strong> At least 4% increase in agricultural production for priority crops, livestock and fisheries per unit of input by 2011$^{26}$ <strong>Competitiveness</strong> At least 20% of commodities and products$^{27}$ conform to specific national, sub-regional and/or international standards by 2011$^{28}$ <strong>Markets</strong> At least 10% increase in inter- and intra-regional market share of agricultural products by 2011$^{29}$</td>
<td><strong>Government statistics</strong> <strong>Economic Commission for Africa statistics and reports</strong> <strong>FAO statistics</strong> <strong>ECOWAS and other regional organisation reports</strong> <strong>Selected CGIAR reports and publications</strong> <strong>External evaluation and impact assessment</strong> <strong>Appropriate UN organisations</strong></td>
<td>[Specific to General Objective] <strong>Contribution to improved rural infrastructure and market access is achievable</strong> <strong>Targeted response mechanisms exist for famine and improved food supply</strong> <strong>Benefits lead to improvements in livelihoods of rural and urban households</strong> <strong>Potential for expanding markets exists</strong> <strong>Improved markets are accessible with potential benefits to the poor and disadvantaged</strong> <strong>Competitive markets are accessible with potential benefits to the poor and disadvantaged</strong> <strong>National and international stakeholders and partners cooperate to promote benefits</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

$^{25}$ Indicators are disaggregated by specific sets of stakeholders such as farmers, the private sector, women’s groups and commodity groups.

$^{26}$ Baseline being 2.5% growth rate from 1998 to 2004 (IFPRI, 2006), Regional Strategic Alternatives for Agriculture-led Growth and Poverty Reduction in West Africa.

$^{27}$ Crop, livestock and fisheries, including processed goods.

$^{28}$ Derived from baseline information on commodities and products conforming to these standards.

$^{29}$ Baseline data of IFPRI 2003, Exploring Regional Dynamics in Sub-Saharan African Agriculture, DSGD Discussion Paper No 2, p. 44.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy of Objectives</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Results                 | 1. Appropriate technologies and innovations developed | 1.1 At least 15 appropriate technologies/innovations for crops, livestock and/or fisheries available to poor and vulnerable households by 2011. | • NARS annual reports  
• CORAF/WECARD annual reports  
• Operating Unit annual reports  
• Sub-regional organisation annual reports | [Result to Specific Objective] |
|                         | 1.2 At least 10 technologies for land rehabilitation for sustainable production developed by 2011. | | • The IAR4D paradigm is an effective approach for ensuring business unusual  
• Governments meet or exceed Maputo Declaration commitment of 10% contribution to agriculture R&D  
• Adequate infrastructure is maintained |
|                         | 1.3 At least 60 new multi-stakeholder partnerships and mechanisms for the development of appropriate technologies and innovations effectively operational by 2011. | | |

---

30 Indicators are disaggregated by specific sets of stakeholders such as farmers, the private sector, women’s groups and commodity groups.
31 Appropriate in this context means cutting-edge, demand-driven, affordable and accessible to poor and vulnerable households.
32 To include new and adapted technologies for production, post-harvest storage and processing.
33 Including female-headed, HIV/AIDS-affected and youth.
34 Three programmes with at least five projects each will result in fifteen projects; each project will develop at least one technology/innovation.

37 During the first five years it is expected that more and more effective partnerships and mechanisms will be established, given that IAR4D is still in its initial stage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy of Objectives</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results [continued]</strong></td>
<td><strong>2. Strategic decision-making</strong></td>
<td><strong>continued</strong></td>
<td><strong>• National policies and unfair competition do not compromise gains</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>options for policy,</strong></td>
<td><strong>At least 15 new and effective</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Enabling policies and conducive environments exist and are sustained</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>institutions and markets</strong></td>
<td><strong>multi-stakeholder partnerships and mechanisms for the development of policy, institutional and market options established and functional by 2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Extension services are effective</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>developed</strong></td>
<td><strong>At least 20 policy options have been proposed/recommended and advocated to decision makers at regional and national levels by 2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Effective platforms for consultation exist</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>At least 50% of proposed policy options are effective and operational by 2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Adequate resources and enabling environments exist</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>At least 10% improvement in overall sub-regional agricultural market performance by 2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>• The private sector and youth accept agriculture as a positive opportunity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>At least 10% reduction in farmer-pastoralist conflicts over resource use in WCA by 2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Civil society, especially producer organisations, are adequately resourced to operate efficiently</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• Regional and international markets support gains</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• Harmonisation of processes and alignment of resources serve to reinforce strategy efforts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• Political/economic environment does not negate gains</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

38 Indicators are disaggregated by specific sets of stakeholders such as farmers, the private sector, women’s groups and commodity groups.
39 IFPRI (2003), Exploring Regional Dynamics in Sub-Saharan African Agriculture, DSGD Discussion Paper No 2, p. 44.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy of Objectives</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results [continued]</strong></td>
<td><strong>3. Sub-regional agricultural research system strengthened and coordinated</strong></td>
<td>3.1 At least 50% capacity enhancement needs for implementation of IAR4D identified and addressed by 2011</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 At least 30% increase in effective partnerships and mechanisms operating in an IAR4D paradigm established, strengthened and effectively operational by 2011</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 At least 20% women, youth and other vulnerable groups are positively involved in IAR4D by 2011</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 At least 30% increase in the capacity of identified stakeholders to acquire information and utilise improved technologies/innovations to produce, develop, process and market agricultural products by 2011</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

41 The IAR4D is a new paradigm; this indicator is measured against set targets at programme levels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy of Objectives</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Demand for agricultural knowledge from targeted clients facilitated and met</td>
<td>4.1 At least 40% increase in met demand for appropriate knowledge, information and requested technology by 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 At least 40% increase in the number of stakeholder groups forming alliances for joint learning, knowledge and information sharing by 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 At least 30% increase in the number of users including vulnerable/disadvantaged stakeholders, able to successfully access relevant knowledge and information by 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42 The IAR4D is a new paradigm; this indicator is measured against set targets at programme levels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy of Objectives</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>[Activity to Result]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result 1</strong> Appropriate technologies and innovations developed</td>
<td>• Design and implementation of activities successfully follows the approach of the IAR4D paradigm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Determine and quantify the status of needs and opportunities for research [countries/sub-region]</td>
<td>• Governments exhibit and maintain political will with respect to relevant declarations, e.g. the Maputo Declaration of 10% national budget allocation to the agricultural sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Develop and strengthen partnerships</td>
<td>• Good/effective extension services are functional in the sub-region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Develop appropriate technologies and innovations through the IAR4D paradigm</td>
<td>• Staffing and resource levels are maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result 2</strong> Strategic decision-making options for policy, institutions and markets developed</td>
<td>• Good relationships with political stakeholders exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Identify market constraints and opportunities, including an analysis of existing agricultural policy</td>
<td>• Policy research at sub-regional level appropriate at national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Develop mechanisms to improve regional and international trade</td>
<td>• The financial and physical resource commitments of stakeholders, including public and private sectors, NGOs and producer organisations, are maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Promotion of market information systems</td>
<td>• Improved infrastructure is in place and effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Identify institutional constraints, including an analysis of major agricultural institutions in the sub-region</td>
<td>• A clear and shared vision and commitment exists/is adopted among stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Develop mechanisms to enhance institutional response to the production-consumption-market continuum</td>
<td>• Compatible organisational structures exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Harmonisation of processes for priority products [policies]</td>
<td>• Coordination brings added value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Harmonise and operationalise framework and procedures for quality control</td>
<td>• Good press and other media organisations exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop lobbying strategies [advocacy]</td>
<td>• Potential clients able to articulate demand effectively and have resources to respond to output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued…</td>
<td>• Paradigm shift in approach internalised by all stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities [continued]</td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result 3</strong> Sub-regional agricultural research system strengthened and coordinated</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Identify capacity and coordination needs and constraints of NARS in WCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Develop mechanisms to strengthen collaboration and partnerships between NARS and ensure an enhanced communication system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Support the RECs in convening and successfully implementing national roundtable discussions for CAADP implementation, with reference to Pillar IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Strengthen competitive funds for regional agricultural research and development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Develop and promote agricultural knowledge management systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Promote existing capacity strengthening interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Strengthen the capacities of stakeholders to analyse the value chain of priority products and the commercial policies of the agricultural sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy of Objectives</td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities [continued]</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assumptions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result 4  Demand for agricultural knowledge from targeted clients facilitated and met</strong></td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Identify the constraints, needs and opportunities for sub-regional information and communication systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Establish linkages with the regional and sub-regional knowledge management systems and formulate operational mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Develop a sub-regional strategy for communication and advocacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Develop a regional database on agricultural research and development outputs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Support NARS and partners in the collection and exchange of agricultural information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Develop sub-regional and national market information systems for priority products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Support diffusion and exchange of technological innovations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Diversify the framework for diffusion and dissemination of information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.9 Utilising a broad selection of mechanisms and media, promote output from stakeholder IAR4D-based activities within WCA, including:  
  4.9.1 Technologies and innovations  
  4.9.2 Commercial products as business opportunities  
  4.9.3 Decision-making tools  
  4.9.4 Policy options  
  4.9.5 Information systems |  |
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

‘REGIONAL PROGRAMME FOR RESEARCH AND INNOVATION IN AGRICULTURAL VALUE CHAINS IN CENTRAL AMERICA’

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>Regional Programme for Research and Innovation in Agricultural Value Chains (PRIICA — Spanish acronym)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Total cost  | EU contribution € 5,000,000
Inter-American Institute of Cooperation for Agriculture (IICA) contribution € 600,000 |
| Aid method / | Centralised management: direct grant to IICA, based on derogation (ARES 312804) |
| DAC-code    | 52010 Agriculture  Sector  Food Security |

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

Although the countries of Central America (Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama) are comparatively small and diverse, they face similar socio-economic, food security and agricultural challenges, share common agro-ecological and climatic conditions and collectively represent about 40 million people with a common cultural heritage. During the 1980s, the region’s economic progress was severely constrained with GDP growth barely reaching 2 % per year. Between 1990 and 2006, however, conflict resolution, macroeconomic stabilisation, and structural reform boosted annual GDP growth to 8 %. Unfortunately, this economic progress has not been accompanied by improved social conditions. Poverty is still widespread in all countries in the region, with the exception of Costa Rica and Panama, and income distribution remains highly uneven. In the last ten years, although poverty has declined in percentage terms, the total number of poor has risen due to population increase. Malnutrition in general, and in children in particular, has been identified as one of the main constraints limiting human capital and the viability of sustainable development.

Primary agriculture is often considered unimportant in terms of relative weight in GDP (between 10 and 30 % in some countries), but this is a superficial observation. Much of the sales and purchases in agriculture are conducted in an informal market and not recorded in the economy. Moreover, home consumption of agricultural products is even more significant in many rural areas. Furthermore, including agribusiness and food industries in the accounting increases the share of agriculture to 30 to 45 % of GDP.

The growing dependence on food imports in these countries is the result of several developments in recent years: first, low international prices, discouraging production and
encouraging imports, second, lower tariffs on imports of these products, and third, the significant decline in state-supported programmes for research, technology transfer and credit. Low investment in agriculture is also due to an unfavourable environment in terms of land tenure, legal security, policy adequacy, physical infrastructure and services. In general, Central America has seen an increase in the production of non-traditional crops, promoted by the development of infrastructure by the private sector favouring large producers and agribusiness. Concurrently, there has been a general neglect of traditional sectors utilising local technologies, which are characterised by low use of technological inputs, low yields, and insufficient connection to markets, resulting in decreased food availability for rural and marginal urban populations.

The percentage of the undernourished population in Central America is 14%. The only countries in Latin America that will probably not meet the Millennium Development Goal for undernourishment and malnutrition (MDG 1) are Guatemala, Nicaragua, Honduras and El Salvador. The main factors behind food insecurity in the region are: (i) reduced investment by countries in agri-food and nutrition, despite their importance; (ii) increased dependence on food imports; (iii) high levels of income inequality and inequity and/or access to resources — resulting in a high percentage of the population without access to food; (iv) the public sector’s failure to provide the services most needed by vulnerable populations (research and agricultural extension, basic health and education).

Focusing food security efforts on agricultural smallholders responds to two key aspects of Central American reality. First, poverty and malnutrition are largely concentrated in rural areas, where 60 to 80% of the poor live. These populations mostly rely on small-scale agriculture, whether as smallholders or as agricultural workers. Their low nutrition status is not so much due to the unavailability of food, but to their low incomes. To enable them to bring about a structural transformation in their subsistence production system, while at the same time taking into account their resource (e.g. land) limitations, it is essential to support the development of higher-value, more intensive systems. Higher-value crop or animal production (traditional or not) offers this potential, but its development in small-scale production systems and the integration of such systems in national or regional value chains have been insufficiently researched and promoted.

As regards agricultural research in Central America, there is great diversity in the national agricultural research systems (NARS) — from highly diversified NARS with multiple actors where universities play an important role, like in Costa Rica, to NARS with barely one or two institutions. Other NARS are under review, like in El Salvador. At regional level, it is worth noting the importance of the Central American Integration System for Agricultural Technology (SICTA — Spanish acronym), which aims to ensure the regional integration of R&D to promote institutional and technological change in agriculture, livestock and forestry. SICTA brings together the public agricultural research institutions of six countries, as a first step, with IICA supplying its secretariat.
Regarding the food security, the main problems restricting agricultural research in Central America are:

(1) Institutional fragility. National agricultural research institutions are very dependent on the shifting political climates, affecting personnel, orientation and setup.

(2) The existing agricultural research systems are: (i) different in each country, (ii) uncoordinated, (iii) lacking in private sector actors (such as producer organisations) and academic institutions (universities), and (iii) obsolete, often doing work unrelated to demand. In summary, most institutions do not have an ‘innovation systems’ approach, except partly in Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama.

(3) Limited skilled human resources in the public sector (excluding Panama). Only 10% of full-time employees or equivalents in the public sector have a PhD degree.

(4) Mainly constant overall expenditure over the past 10 years (US$90 million/year).

(5) Wage and operating costs dominating institution budgets. There are few institutions with capital costs higher than 25%.

(6) High dependence on external financing, particularly in Nicaragua and Honduras.

(7) Limited operational knowledge networking between researchers, and limited regional integration of research systems, thus not taking advantage of economies of scale in research.

(8) The value-chain approach is commonly forgotten among the research community, leading e.g. to a lack of economic viability of certain innovations.

(9) Limited consideration of more local staple food crops, such as roots and tubers.

Promoting consortia with a value-chain approach will help overcome several of these problems for innovation systems. This will strengthen links between the private sector, academia and government agencies. It will reinforce human capital by training personnel, taking advantage of the advances of certain institutions in specific aspects. The regional strategy for smallholders, as well as the consortium model, which ensures producer participation in establishing the research agenda, should improve the relevance of research to food security, ultimately attracting more funding from those national governments where MDG 1 is a priority.

Strengthening research networks at regional level will facilitate the exchange of experiences and the dissemination of new technologies at national level. The presence of these networks should allow innovations in a given value chain to be taken up across the whole region, despite the possible shortcomings in national agricultural research.

2.2. Lessons learnt

To the extent that the context for agricultural development has changed, ideas about what constitutes ‘research capacity’ have also changed. In the 1980s, the ‘national agricultural research system’ (NARS) concept focused development efforts on strengthening research supply. In the 1990s, agricultural knowledge and information systems (AKIS) recognised that research was not the only means of gaining access to knowledge. The AKIS concept continued to focus on research supply, but gave much more attention to links between research, education, and extension and to identifying farmer demand for new technologies. More recently, attention has turned to demand for research and technology and to the development of agricultural innovation systems (AIS), because strengthened research systems may increase the supply of new knowledge and technology, but may not necessarily improve
the capacity for innovation throughout the agricultural sector. AIS can be defined as a network of organisations, businesses, and individuals focused on putting new products, new processes, and new forms of organisation to economic use, together with the institutions and policies that affect their behaviour and performance. The innovation systems concept embraces not only the suppliers of science but the totality of actors involved in innovation and their interaction. This means that the organisational structure of agricultural research is now changing. The classical organisational model characterised by a central public research institution is shifting towards a new paradigm, with a variety of institutions playing complementary roles in the production, adaptation and dissemination of technology to improve agriculture.

Stimulating agricultural research in Central America is not easy due to the conditions in each country. At institutional level, there is a tendency towards the classical approach of concentrating on the phytogenetics of new staple grain varieties. From an international perspective, only the World Bank (WB) has paid significant attention to the role of research. According to the WB, research should not return to former approaches, but instead should develop AIS to link the three sectors, namely government, private (producer organisations) and academic (universities, research centres).

Important experience has been gained in the region with the management of technology through research networks. In an alliance between international centres and research institutes, research projects to grow corn, beans and potatoes have been promoted for roughly 20 years (Regional Maize Programme, Regional Bean Programme, and Regional Programme for Potato Development Cooperation). Positive results have been achieved as the programmes have released most of the resulting materials for use among the producers in the region. This process has received funding from the Swiss cooperation agency. Moreover, the research networking strategy has promoted the cultivation and development of vegetables, partly financed by the Taiwanese government. Based on lessons learned from these experiences, the implementation of the present programme should take into account the results achieved with regard to working methods and participation of producer organisations, government and the private sector.

2.3. Complementary actions

Food security has become a mainstream concept in European Union cooperation with Central America. In the past 14 years the EU has developed a number of programmes and projects through NGOs and with national governments. The Regional Food Security Programme for Central America (PRESANCA — Spanish acronym) has combined the issue of food security with support for regional integration as a necessary condition for overcoming the various social, economic, environmental, and government challenges. In Central America, the Food and Nutrition Security budget line funds bilateral programmes mainly in Nicaragua, Honduras and Guatemala, although its impact in El Salvador, Costa Rica and Panama is minimal.

A look at research under the Framework Programme (FP) shows that the participation of Central American institutions is minimal. In the 80 actions under the FP, the institutions of
Costa Rica are the most active, followed by Nicaragua and Guatemala. The most involved and active institution is CATIE. As regards thematic areas, the majority relate to development research and international cooperation, followed by ecosystem management and natural resources, and only in third place crop production.

Synergies should be a key point in implementing actions in order to avoid duplication, especially given the diversity of actors, themes and financing institutions in this sector. The regional project for the maize and bean value chains, also managed by IICA and financed by the Swiss cooperation agency, is considered especially important here. It has promoted the formation of consortia between higher education institutions, research centres and producer organisations to encourage the adoption of technologies in response to demands for innovation.

2.4. Donor coordination
The programme aims to work with cooperation and research partners at two levels:
(i) Regional Coordination. This unit will introduce the programme to the other cooperating partners at regional level and in the various regional integration forums. It will ensure that the programme reports are disseminated in these forums.
(ii) National Coordination. The national units will ensure that actions at national level are coordinated with other actions carried out with other sources of funding. They will ensure that the programme reports are disseminated in the national forums of cooperating partners and in the National Councils of Science and Technology.

3. Description

3.1. Objectives

The general objective of the programme is to contribute to increasing food availability and access through agricultural research as a tool in the fight against poverty and hunger.

The specific objectives of the programme are to:

(1) Support the creation of innovation consortia for agricultural research to meet the demand of smallholders. The innovation consortia will promote the participation of different actors in the agricultural sector, namely the private sector through farmers’ organisations, the government sector through institutions, and the academic sector via universities and research centres. They will carry out research projects on the basis of common research agendas.

(2) Promote the dissemination of technological innovation and the exchange of national and regional smallholders’ experiences, through methodologies such as ‘farmer to farmer’.

(3) Develop a regional strategy for agricultural research and innovation for smallholders.
The programme has **five strategic lines**, or fundamental approaches, to be taken into account in all actions at both regional and national levels:

(i) **Innovation system** (link between the government, private and academic sectors).
(ii) **Value chain** (to avoid fragmentation and isolation of the different subsystems: research, production, marketing and commercialisation).
(iii) **Focus on diversification** (diversified production systems at the level of smallholders, labour-intensive and gender approach, moving away from monoculture schemes).
(iv) **Focus on smallholders** (farmers with little land but good connections with markets and interest in diversifying production).
(v) **Consideration of climate change** (to ensure that innovations take into account future climate perspectives and variability).

Regarding the main value chains to be addressed, the following have been identified as offering strong potential to improve smallholders’ incomes, while allowing for income diversification and reducing the vulnerability of the target group:

1. Warm-climate vegetables such as tomatoes, peppers, onions and pumpkins (overall significance across the region);
2. Tropical roots and tubers such as cassava, yams (of importance on the Atlantic coast of Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Honduras).
3. Oilseeds; specifically sesame (on the Pacific Coast, particularly Nicaragua and Honduras);
4. Temperate-climate vegetables such as lettuce and broccoli (particularly important in Guatemala) and potatoes (Guatemala, Nicaragua, Costa Rica).

A more in-depth analysis of the feasibility of including other value chains (for example, dairy or fruits of overall significance for the region, such as mango) will be performed during the detailed planning of the project, to be carried out when the contract is being drafted.

### 3.2. **Expected results and main activities**

The expected results of the programme are as follows:

**R1. Innovation consortia are created and new technologies and practices are generated.**

**R1.1.** Sustainable mechanisms (innovation consortia) are consolidated to ensure that research is demand-driven.

**Main activities (at multi-national level):**

- Identification of key stakeholders, in each relevant country, for developing the research agenda in up to six selected value chains.
- Promoting an active role for (small) farmer organisations in defining research activities with practical contents.
- Organising a permanent and structured exchange of ideas and opinions related to innovation needs and coordination in research and development between the public, private and academic sectors (including strengthening national management institutions like FITTACORI in Costa Rica and FUNICA in Nicaragua and supporting...
the creation of similar organisations in countries lacking such institutions). Up to six multi-country ‘innovation consortia’ (IC) will focus on up to six value chains selected. Institutions from each country should be involved in at least two value chains. This will include the establishment of cooperation agreements between the parties. Special attention will be paid to identifying demand by producer organisations and to their participation in the monitoring and follow-up of IC activities.

- Promoting the strengthening of national budgets for innovation and research funded by the private, public and academic sectors.
- Identification of lessons learned and strengthening or establishment of information sharing mechanisms for a given value chain.

**R.1.2.** Innovative technologies or processes are generated and validated, contributing to improving the income-generating capacity of agri-food chains in the region.

**Main activities (at regional level):**

- Development of research agendas by the consortia for up to six selected value chains.
- Development of the terms of reference for research projects involving different actors. Regional collaboration will be exploited in particular to increase the skills of human resources in participating institutions.
- Call for research proposals.
- Evaluation of proposals under each agenda.
- Award of contracts.
- Implementation and monitoring of projects.
- Feedback on project results in the consortia and information-sharing mechanisms established in R1.1.

**R.2. Innovations are disseminated throughout the region, in particular among small farmers.**

**R.2.1.** Technological innovations disseminated at regional level.

**Main activities (at national, multi-national and regional levels):**

- Establishment of a strategy by the various national innovation systems, consortia and SICTA to disseminate successful innovations.
- Implementation and monitoring of the dissemination strategy.

**R.2.2.** Validated innovations adopted by producers.

**Main activities (at national and multi-national level):**

- Publicising the innovations produced under R1.
- Applying the ‘farmer to farmer’ methodology to disseminate and locally validate innovations.
- Evaluating the adoption and impacts of innovations (including gender effects).
R3. A regional strategy for research and innovation for small farmers is developed.

R.3.1. Strengthened regional network that feeds into innovation systems at national level.

Main activities (at regional level):
- Identifying strengths and weaknesses of the existing network.
- Expanding the existing network to incorporate the innovation systems and their various stakeholders.
- Strengthening communication between all actors.
- Promoting knowledge networks and exchange of information among different actors.

R.3.2 A regional agricultural research and innovation strategy plan for smallholders is established based on lessons learned and comparative advantages.

Main activities (at regional level):
- Mapping technological innovations and identifying key lessons.
- Promoting regional best practices.
- Developing and disseminating relevant publications.
- Defining a proposal for regional agricultural research and innovation for smallholders, based on lessons learned and taking into account national comparative advantages.
- Discussing and validating the proposal with all stakeholders, including regional farmers’ organisations (CSUCA\textsuperscript{43}, CTCAP\textsuperscript{44}).
- Submitting a proposal for negotiation in the Central American Agricultural Council (CAC) for possible inclusion in the Regional Agenda.

3.3. Risks and assumptions

The main risks for the programme are:

- Low participation of smallholders in identifying demand for innovation due to their weak organisational level.
- Continued fragmentation and failure to assume joint responsibilities among the different actors (private, government and academia), which could be a particular obstacle where the government is keen to expand its role in the economy and reluctant to recognise the benefits of collaboration with non-state/private actors.
- Value chains of importance to the programme are not organised and are not integrated within a market.
- Weak local and national leadership due to regional domination.
- Predominance of research on the production subsystem, ignoring other aspects of the value chain such as commercialisation, marketing and food-processing.

The impact of these risks can be reduced. In order to avoid low participation by smallholders’ organisations, it is essential that all research activities for innovation should concentrate on

\textsuperscript{43} Consejo Superior Universitario Centroamericano.

\textsuperscript{44} Comisión para el Desarrollo Científico y Tecnológico de CA y Panamá.
their particular problems and be demand-driven. In some countries, specifically Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Panama, there is significant communication between the private sector, the government and the academic sector. In other countries, e.g. Guatemala or El Salvador, where such interaction does not or barely exists, the implementing body has to stimulate this communication in order to avoid the above risks. Regional coordination of the programme can give important support to this constructive process of institutional integration.

The main assumptions are the following:

- Each country retains the will and shared responsibility to ensure an adequate and short-term response in the agricultural sector.
- A more positive attitude towards agricultural research in the future on the part of the governments of the Central American countries, responding to the need for strengthening national human capital.
- The demand for research is determined and generated by farmers’ organisations and initiatives (using methods such as ‘farmer to farmer’).
- The academic sector and government possess knowledge and appropriate research facilities for at least some priority issues.
- Academic and government researchers have the time, will and means to contribute.

The sustainability of the programme depends on several conditions, including: (i) the establishment of local innovation consortia between producer organisations, academia and government, (ii) opportunities for dialogue to update technological solutions, and (iii) increased budget allocated to agricultural research by Central American countries and regions in the coming years. The approval of the regional strategy for agricultural research and innovation for smallholders by the Central American Agricultural Council (CAC) is a key condition for the programme’s sustainability.

3.4. Cross-cutting issues

The programme will guide applied research in line with the environmental challenges identified at Central American level, in particular relating innovation results with the assessment of environmental impacts. The program focuses on innovation and development of value-chains managed by smallholders, which present two basic and functional issues combining their environmental systems with economic rationality.

The first is the existence of gaps between agricultural cycles and therefore periods with no income. During these intervals, farmers exert particular pressure on natural resources in the surrounding areas, leading to uncontrolled exploitation of wildlife and deforestation. Secondly, their lack of access to appropriate innovations in crop intensification using appropriate technologies tends to push them towards expanding the agricultural frontier.

Gender participation in the programme is based on the principle of equitable technology access. This is reflected particularly in the management of innovations by the family. The
results of research should be reflected in how they affect the involvement of family members (both men and women, youth and adults) and how resulting benefits in the value chains are distributed according to family composition. One of the criteria for research priorities will be the expected impact on women.

3.5. Stakeholders

Due to the economic, social and cultural differences between countries, programme implementation in each country will require the full support and participation of institutions and organisations concerned with agricultural research, food supply and nutrition. Some countries already have institutions with the capacity and leadership to bring organisations together, as in the case of Nicaragua (Fundación para el Desarrollo Tecnológico Agropecuario y Forestal de Nicaragua, FUNICA\textsuperscript{45}), Costa Rica (Fundación para el Fomento y Promoción de la Investigación y Transferencia de Tecnología Agropecuaria en Costa Rica, FITTACORI\textsuperscript{46}), Honduras (Fundación Hondureña de Investigación Agrícola, FHIA\textsuperscript{47}), Panama (Instituto de Investigación Agropecuaria de Panamá, IDIAP\textsuperscript{48}), El Salvador (Centro Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria y Forestal, CENTA\textsuperscript{49}), and Guatemala (Instituto de Ciencia y Tecnología Agrícolas, ICTA\textsuperscript{50}). Through national management institutions like FITTACORI, FUNICA and IDIAP, and others, the programme needs to place strong emphasis on stimulating discussion among national stakeholders, presenting demand-driven proposals, and handling procedures for the selection of innovation consortia (groups of related organisations with a common interest in developing a given research project). In the last two countries mentioned, however, the regional organisation may need to play a catalyst role at national level in order to guarantee implementation of the programme.

Regionally, it is important to have a body that has the capacity to manage different initiatives and to strengthen integration policies for agricultural research in the food and nutrition sector. At the same time, such an organisation must have offices in each of the countries to support implementation of the programme. Last but not least, the managing organisation must have sufficient capacity and experience in the area of agricultural research and innovation. Among the various possibilities, such as FAO, FIDA, or the international cooperation organisations of EU Member States (like GTZ), the Inter-American Institute of Cooperation for Agriculture (IICA) is the institution best suited to manage the programme and ensure technical cooperation on the programme’s central themes.

\textsuperscript{45} FUNICA is a civil non-profit organisation. Established in 2000, it brings together public and private institutions, universities, non-government organisations, and producer and professional associations concerned with science and technology in the agricultural sector.

\textsuperscript{46} FITTACORI is a private non-profit institution, with a public utility character. It main objective is to promote the generation and transfer of science and technology in the agricultural sector.

\textsuperscript{47} FHIA is a private non-profit institution with the aim of generating, validating and transferring technology to the national agricultural sector.

\textsuperscript{48} IDIAP is a public institution that regulates all public agriculture research activities. Its main objectives are to improve production and productivity and to increase smallholder incomes.

\textsuperscript{49} CENTA is a public scientific institution that develops and promotes the transfer of research in the agricultural sector.

\textsuperscript{50} ICTA is an autonomous public institution, responsible for promoting science and technology use in the agricultural sector.
IICA is a specialised agency of the Inter-American System, with the aim of encouraging and supporting the efforts of its member states to achieve agricultural development and well-being for rural populations. Established more than 60 years ago, IICA aspires to be the leading agricultural institution in the Americas and the partner of choice by virtue of the quality of the technical cooperation it provides and its contributions to sustainable agricultural development, food security and rural prosperity. Its competitive advantage is based on its accumulated wealth of knowledge regarding agriculture, rural territories, the diversity of peoples and cultures, and the agro-ecological diversity of the hemisphere. Its headquarters are in Costa Rica with a vast personnel specialised in research and innovation, and has national offices in all of the countries of the region with a minimum of three to four international experts per country, who have extensive programme management capabilities, links to the Central American integration process for agricultural research, and extensive experience in leading change processes in agricultural innovation.

Established by CAC as a regional mechanism for technology integration, the Central American Integration System for Agricultural Technology (SICTA) integrates national research systems and agricultural technology transfer. It operates through networking by product or subject area.

IICA will be responsible for the implementation and administration of the Regional Programme, upon the signing of an agreement with the European Union, which will establish the conditions for implementation. SICTA will undertake regional coordination of the programme by tracking commitments, facilitating communication with and between national actors, and ascertaining lessons to be learned. CAC will assist SICTA by supporting the implementation of actions under the topic of research and technology for food security.

In addition, all actors participating in the programme will be considered for membership of the research consortia: the private sector, such as farmers’ organisations, cooperatives and associations; the government sector, such as research agencies; and academia, including universities and research centres.

The Executive Secretary of SICTA and IICA have initiated a process of exchange in each target country, with national actors having already been contacted during the identification phase of PRIICA in order to ascertain their interest in and availability for the implementation phase. The contacted actors have expressed their interest in participating in and supporting implementation according to the conditions agreed between the European Union and IICA. Furthermore, this process will be reinforced during the preliminary planning required prior to the signing of the contract between the European Union and IICA.

**Consultation of stakeholders during the identification phase**

The identification mission conducted interviews with organisations and institutions in each of the six countries, in relation to innovations systems and agriculture. All had been selected by recommendation because of their importance and role. More than 60 organisations and institutions in the six countries of Central America were consulted, representing the three

---

51 See annex to the Action Sheet.
sectors involved in innovation: government, private sector and academia. In each country the mission also visited the offices of relevant international institutions, like IICA, FAO, IFAD, etc. In addition, the problem analysis and proposed strategy have been discussed with a group of experts belonging to these institutions. There is common agreement on the objectives and expected results as well as on the programme management approach. To select the institution to manage the programme, several criteria were identified:

(1) Office in each country where the programme operates.

(2) Broad technical and administrative capacities in the field of agricultural research.

(3) Extensive programme management capabilities in Central America.

(4) Links with the Central American integration process for agricultural research and for food and nutrition security.

(5) Extensive experience in leading change processes in agricultural innovation.

The table below presents an analysis of five organisations identified as potential implementers of PRIICA based on the above criteria.

Criteria for selection of the organisation to implement PRIICA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Criteria 1</th>
<th>Criteria 2</th>
<th>Criteria 3</th>
<th>Criteria 4</th>
<th>Criteria 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IICA/SICTA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIDA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0= Not desirable, needs improvement, 1= poor, needs amelioration, 2= satisfactory, 3= very effective.

Based on this analysis, the only institution that met the criteria was the Inter-American Institute of Cooperation for Agriculture (IICA). Furthermore IICA hosts the secretariat of the Central American Integration System for Agricultural Technology (SICTA).

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Method of implementation

The project will be implemented under centralised management, through the signature of a direct grant agreement for an amount of €5.0m between the Inter-American Institute of Cooperation for Agriculture (IICA) and the European Commission. In accordance with the provisions of the Financial Regulation applicable to the EU General Budget (PRAG 6.3.2), the direct award of a grant is justified by a ‘de facto’ monopoly and has been agreed by European Commission headquarters by note (reference ARES 312804). Some of the reasons justifying IICA’s de facto monopoly are: i) it is a specialised agency of the Inter-American System operating at continental level; ii) it is a renowned centre for agricultural research with
the capacity to expand in innovation and technology; iii) it has offices in all six countries of Central America where the programme will be implemented; iv) it has appropriate experience with similar programmes.

The programme is designed to bring about multi-stakeholder collaboration to ensure the success of innovation system and value chain approaches to production diversification among smallholders in Central America. It will be managed by IICA and guided and supervised by the Executive Secretariat of SICTA, which is located in IICA, also with support from the regional networks. The joint work of IICA and SICTA is supported by their Administrative and Technical Cooperation Agreement.

IICA will delegate the national management of the programme in the six countries to a national institute wherever possible, in accordance with EU procedures as set out in Annex 4 to grant contracts. If this is not possible, as in the case of Guatemala and/or El Salvador, the IICA office in the country will manage the programme.

Research consortia will be granted funding for their research proposals under a competitive funding scheme (call for proposals launched by IICA). IICA will design common terms of reference for such schemes, in accordance with respecting EU procedures.

4.2. 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, and in effect at the time when the procedure in question is launched. Any derogation from these principles must be justified. The essential selection and award criteria for grants are laid down in the Practical Guide to contract procedures for EU external actions. They are determined in accordance with the principles set out in Title VI ‘Grants’ of the Practical Guide (PRAG).

4.3. Budget and calendar
The expected EU allocation is €5 million, with €600 000 from IICA.
The project will be implemented over a period of **four years** starting on the date when the Financing Agreement is signed.

### 4.4. Performance monitoring

The project will be closely monitored by the Nicaragua staff of the EU Delegation staff, via field trips and reviewing of annual reports presented by IICA. The key indicators are those established in the log frame. They will be further specified in Annual Work Plans. They will be monitored through an internal system managed by IICA. External monitoring missions organised by the EU will be considered as complementary actions.

### 4.5. Evaluation and audit

The programme will undergo a mid-term evaluation. Audits will be carried out by external evaluators contracted by IICA. Moreover, verification missions can be executed by the European Commission.

### 4.6. 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. Standards regarding visibility will be derived from the ‘EU visibility guidelines for external actions’ [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/visibility/index_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/visibility/index_en.htm).
### Annex 1: Logical framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme description</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Verifying sources</th>
<th>Assumptions/Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Objective</strong></td>
<td>To increase food availability and access through agricultural research as a tool in the fight against poverty and hunger.</td>
<td>Proportion of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption (MDG1 target 1.C). Proportion of rural population below $1 (PPP) per day (%; MDG1 target 1.A.).</td>
<td>FAO statistics. ECLAC statistics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Objective 1</strong></td>
<td>To support the creation of innovation consortia for agricultural research to meet the demand of smallholders.</td>
<td>1.1. Up to six innovation consortia for agricultural research established in the region. 1.2. Up to six innovation agendas for agricultural research (one per agri-food chain) established in the region.</td>
<td>1.1.1. Consortia established (programme report). 1.2.1. Agendas established (Programme report).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Objective 2</strong></td>
<td>To promote the dissemination of technological innovations and exchange of experiences among smallholders nationally and regionally, through methodologies such as ‘farmer to farmer’.</td>
<td>2.1. Six exchanges of experiences among smallholders at regional level. 2.2. Farmers’ organisations and specialised institutions applying the ‘farmer to farmer’ methodology in agricultural diversification programmes.</td>
<td>2.1.1. Systematised experiences. (Programme report). 2.2.1. Programme report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme description</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Verifying sources</td>
<td>Assumptions/Risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop a regional strategy for agricultural research and innovation for smallholders.</td>
<td>3.1. A regional network operates to support the national research and innovation systems. 3.2. Three strategic alliances with other regional/international programmes. 3.3. Lessons learnt in agricultural research and innovation for the smallholders at regional level.</td>
<td>3.1.1. Regional network operational. Programme report. 3.2.1. Strategic alliances established. Programme report. 3.3.1. Document published.</td>
<td>Low prioritisation of economic, social and agricultural aspects in the regional agenda by Central American integration institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Objective 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>R1.1.Sustainable mechanisms (innovation consortia) are consolidated to ensure that research is demand-driven.</strong></td>
<td>Farmer organisations approve the research activities and participate in the follow-up of these activities. The exchange of opinions and ideas between the public, private and academic sectors has been formalised and is operational with full participation of the three sectors, especially farmers’ organisations. The existence of a national fund for research and innovation in agriculture with contributions from the three sectors.</td>
<td>Documents, contracts, exchange of letters. Annual reports of national management institutions; creation of this type of institution in El Salvador and Guatemala. National agreements, signed by the three sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme description</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Verifying sources</td>
<td>Assumptions/Risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 1.2. R.1.2. Innovative technologies or processes are generated and validated, contributing to the income-generating capacity of agri-food chains in the region.</td>
<td>Research agendas for each agri-food chain agreed. A minimum of 30 technologies generated that respond to problems identified in the agreed research agendas. Monitoring system established for programme stakeholders.</td>
<td>Research agendas. Catalogue of technology generated. Stakeholder monitoring system established by the institutions.</td>
<td>Predominant orientation towards production, ignoring other aspects of the value chain. Weak participation of smallholders in the demand for innovation. Ongoing fragmentation and failure to assume joint responsibilities among different actors (private, government and academia).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 2.1 R.2.1. Technological innovations disseminated at regional level.</td>
<td>Technological innovations disseminated in each country and in the region.</td>
<td>Annual working plan for the Programme. Annual evaluation of the Programme.</td>
<td>Limited communication between stakeholders. Low interest of regional integration associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 2.2 R.2.2. Validated innovations adopted by producers.</td>
<td>Assessment of the contribution of innovation to the chain and farmer incomes. Annual evaluation of the Programme.</td>
<td>Report on adoption of innovations. Annual evaluation report on the Programme.</td>
<td>Value chains do not have farmers’ organisations and are not integrated within the market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme description</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Verifying sources</td>
<td>Assumptions/Risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 3.1: <strong>R.3.1. Strengthened regional network that feeds into innovation systems at national level.</strong></td>
<td>Participation of stakeholders from national innovation systems in the regional network.</td>
<td>Programme reports. SICTA reports.</td>
<td>Low participation of knowledge-generating institutions (governmental and academic).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 3.2: <strong>R.3.2 Regional agricultural research and innovation strategy plan for smallholders is established, based on lessons learned and comparative advantages.</strong></td>
<td>Up to six systematised agri-food chains for smallholders in the Central American region. Regional agricultural research and innovation strategy plan for smallholders.</td>
<td>Programme publications.</td>
<td>Insufficient coordination between national and regional levels. Insufficient political willingness on the part of CAC to be involved in the Regional Agenda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 2 — LIST OF KEY STAKEHOLDERS FOR PRIICA

The following list, though not exhaustive, comprises key stakeholders in efforts to strengthen innovation systems for food security in Central America. They belong to government, private sector, or academia. Their participation should be considered in the research consortia to be established through PRIICA. (Needs to be classified by country and by category (academia / government / private sector))

AGROCYT: Competitive Fund for Technological Agro Food Development (Guatemala)
APEMEP Association of Small and Medium Producers
CATIE Tropical Agricultural Research and Education Centre
CENTA Centro Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria y Forestal
CEPREDENAC Coordination Centre for Natural Disaster Prevention
CIAT International Centre for Tropical Agriculture
CIMMYT International Centre for Maize and Wheat Improvement
CNAA National Chamber of Agriculture and Agro-Costa Rica
COHCIT Honduran Council of Science and Technology
CONACT National Council of Agricultural Technology
CONACYT National Council of Science and Technology
CONICIT National Commission on Science and Technology Research
CONCYT (1) National Commission on Science, Technology and Innovation
CONICYT (2) Nicaraguan Council of Science and Technology
CONITTA National Commission on Agricultural Research and Technology Transfer
CSUCA Higher Confederation of Central American Universities
CTCAP Commission for Scientific and Technological Development of Central America and Panama
DICTA Directorate for Agricultural Science and Technology
ENA National Agricultural School (El Salvador)
FACA Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, University of Panama
FAIGRO Foundation for Agricultural Innovation Technology
FAIT Support Fund for Agricultural Technology Research in Nicaragua
FAO offices of the United Nations Organisation for Food and Agriculture in each of the countries
FHIA Honduran Agricultural Research Foundation
FITTACORI Foundation for the Promotion and Advancement of Research and Agricultural Technology Transfer in Costa Rica
FUNICA Foundation for Technological Development of Agriculture and Forestry, Nicaragua
FUNPROCOOP Foundation for the Promotion of Cooperatives (El Salvador)
ICTA Institute of Agricultural Science and Technology (Guatemala)
IDIAP Research Institute of Agriculture, Panama
IHCAFE Honduran Coffee Institute
IICA offices of the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture in each of the six countries
INTA (1) National Institute on Innovation and Technology Transfer in Agriculture, Nicaragua
INTA (2) Agricultural Technology Institute, Costa Rica
MAG Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (El Salvador, Costa Rica)
MAGA Ministry of Agriculture and Food (Guatemala)
MAGFOR Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Forestry (Nicaragua)
MIDA Ministry of Agricultural Development (Panama)
RDA Rural Development Institute (Nicaragua)
SAG Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (Honduras)
SENACYT National Secretariat for Science, Technology and Innovation (Panama)
SICTA Central American Integration System of Agricultural Technology
SINALYT System Technology Alliance for Agriculture and Forestry (El Salvador)
SNITTA National Research and Technology Transfer (Honduras)
UES University of El Salvador
UCR University of Costa Rica
UNA, National Agrarian University (Nicaragua)
UNAG National Union of Farmers and Ranchers, Costa Rica
UNAN National Autonomous University of Nicaragua
UNPAP National Union of Agricultural Producers of Panama
USC University of San Carlos de Guatemala
UZ Zamorano University
ANNEX 5

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

‘Strengthening pro-poor agricultural innovation for food security in the Andean region’

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>Strengthening pro-poor agricultural innovation for food security in the Andean region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>Total contribution: €5250000 &lt;br&gt;EU contribution: €5000000 &lt;br&gt;CIP contribution: €250000 &lt;br&gt;(CIP = International Potato Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method/Method of implementation</td>
<td>Project approach / Joint management (IFAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC-code</td>
<td>52010 Sector Food Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

(1) The five countries of the Andean Region (Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela) have a total population of more than 120 million inhabitants and are characterised as low- to mid-income countries. Like other Latin American countries, they confront great social and economic inequities, including profound disparities in food security.

In Bolivia, for example, 22% of the population is undernourished and 27% of pre-school children have stunted growth. In Peru and Ecuador, 15% of the population also suffer from malnutrition and a quarter of children from stunted growth. Colombia and Venezuela have similar deficiencies, although at a less critical level. In these countries, food insecurity is concentrated in certain geographical areas with high poverty levels.

(2) One option for tackling problems of food insecurity is to foster pro-poor innovation. In the Andean region, however, strategic skills for pro-poor innovation are limited, both technologically (e.g. limited capacity to carry out effective research to improve crop and post-harvest management and natural resource management, or to develop or select appropriate agricultural technologies) and institutionally (e.g. limited capacity to organise and coordinate participatory and collaborative R&D processes, to effectively manage knowledge, or to influence policy processes). Innovation services are embryonic and poorly linked to the problems driving food insecurity in the different geographical areas within countries.
(3) The EU's Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP) of the European Commission (EC) is one of the financial instruments used to support Agricultural Research and Development (ARD) with a regional focus.

This proposal responds to the first strategic priority of FSTP: To support the delivery of public goods which contribute to food security and to food research and technology and contribute to achieving the first Millennium Development Goal (MDG) of reducing, by half, hunger and extreme poverty throughout the world by the year 2015.

2.2. Lessons learnt

(1) Food security is a cross-cutting theme in programmes to eradicate poverty and forms part of several agricultural development programmes with a territorial focus. The evaluation of the EU's food security programme (PASA) in Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru shows that a participatory territorial development strategy has already been implemented. There is a tendency to strengthen demand-based programming to promote alliances between scientific bodies, the public sector and the private sector, with more active participation by small producers and their organisations, thus maximising the direct and indirect impact of ARD on food security.

(2) Another lesson that can be drawn from the regional CAN (Comunidad Andina de Naciones) programmes (2002–2006) is the importance of national ownership of programmes with a regional approach, taking into account each country’s national and local contexts.

(3) In more general terms, as the IAASTD\textsuperscript{52} study indicated, there is a need (and a tendency) to develop and strengthen innovative skills in response to the need for food security and sovereignty. In this context, the International Potato Centre (CIP) has developed a ‘Pro-Poor Research and Development Cycle’ that includes methodologies for: coordinating research supply and demand; strengthening public-private innovation platforms in each country (national component); generating knowledge, practices, and technologies; and establishing alliances between national research systems (NARS) and international research centres affiliated with the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) (regional and global component). Moreover, in the Andean region, some valuable regional experiences have been gained, such as CIP’s Papa Andina Regional Potato Programme, which links research and development to improving food security and reducing poverty, by exploiting potato biodiversity as a resource for improving the well-being of poor farmers in high Andean regions. Papa Andina also promotes gender equity in access to the programme.

This proposal is an opportunity to extend and generalise the experiences with and approaches to agricultural innovation by applying them in specific territories in the region, to address issues of food insecurity.

2.3. Complementary actions

Specific actions or programmes implemented in the Andean countries to improve food security can be grouped into three categories: (1) inclusive territorial development, (2) agricultural production, and (3) research and research networks. A prominent role in this

\textsuperscript{52} International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development, 2009.
regard is played by some of the EU’s strategic projects in the region or in individual countries (e.g. ECHO in Ecuador and Colombia, along with EURO-PAN Peru Nutrition — €60m — and PASA III Bolivia — €80m — both about to start), and the Peace Laboratories in Colombia (€100m).

In this region, CIP (Peru) and CIAT (Colombia) are specialised CGIAR research centres receiving funding from the EU for global research programmes leading to results that are public goods for global use (such as the management and conservation of genetic resources).

Additionally, each centre conducts specific programmes on research for development with restricted funding from different donors as part of a regional Andean strategy. These include: ‘Alianza Cambio Andino’ (CIP and CIAT with support from DFID); ‘Papa Andina’ (CIP with support from the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation [SDC], New Zealand’s International Development and Aid Agency [NZAID New Zealand], and other donors); and CONDESAN (Consortium for the Sustainable Development of the Andean Eco-Region). Other donors also fund complementary national and sub-regional initiatives such as Altagro, a food security project in highland Bolivia and Peru supported by CIDA (Canada).

Other regional initiatives are being implemented by the Andean Community, CAN (Intercan, Cescan, Socian, Pradican, Drosican and others, climate change with GTZ, Food Security in Indigenous Territories), IICA with Andean Regional Integration, and Prociandino (food security with territorial development).

In Peru, the FAO also participates in a Joint UN project ‘Improving the Nutrition and Food Security of Children in Peru: a Capacity Building Approach’ (€6m, funded by Spain).

There is also scientific cooperation between the Andean countries and European scientific teams under the 6th and 7th Research Framework Programmes. CIP participates in one of these research projects, VALORAM.53

2.4. Donor coordination

FORAGRO (Forum for the Americas on Agricultural Research and Technology Development) is a regional coordination mechanism for technological innovation. It is coordinated by IICA and forms part of the Global Forum for Agricultural Research (GFAR), headquartered in Rome.

Apart from this regional coordination platform, there are few other regional or national donor coordination mechanisms for technology innovation or food security. There is, however, some donor coordination experience with regional initiatives, such as Papa Andina, which receives funds from several donors, including SDC, NZAID, the International Development Research Centre (IDRC, Canada), and the McKnight Foundation. There is also an inter-donor learning alliance in Peru that brings together various partners and ministries, including SwissContact, CTB, GTZ, SNV, CIAT, CIP, ITDG, Care, CRS, IICA, the Ministry of Production, and the Ministry of Agriculture.

---

53 Exploiting Andean microbial diversity through sustainable intensification of potato-based farming systems.
3. **DESCRIPTION**

3.1. **Objectives**

*General objective*

To contribute to improving food security for the vulnerable rural populations and poorest sectors in the Andean region, seeking to achieve the first MDG.

*Specific objective*

To strengthen pro-poor agricultural innovation for food security at different territorial levels (local, national, and regional) within the Andean region to respond to the needs of the most vulnerable rural groups.

3.2. **Expected results and main activities**

Project activities will focus primarily on capacity building for technological innovation (e.g., improving crop management, seed systems, adaptation to climate change, post-harvest technology, and market access) in prioritised zones of the Andean sub-region (central highlands in Bolivia, Central Sierra in Ecuador, and the Andean Trapezoid region of the southern highlands in Peru), where potato-based systems predominate and are associated with rural poverty. The project will concentrate its activities on potato-based systems. The commodities associated with the potato crop in these systems vary depending on the agro-ecological zone. In the green Andes of Ecuador, potato is usually associated with milk production as a strategy to adapt to extreme conditions (and lately to climate change). In the Andean highlands of Bolivia and Peru, potatoes are associated with the production of quinoa, fava beans, barley, and fodder for livestock production, diversification of food production, and conservation of the natural resource base. On the basis of this production-system perspective, the project will employ a set of participatory methods and work with multi-stakeholder platforms to strengthen the capacity of local innovation systems to respond to farmers’ technological demands and improve the production and marketing of their commodities. In Venezuela and Colombia, the project will also concentrate on actions in areas with a high poverty rate — for example, where the Peace Laboratories are working in Colombia. The project will strengthen regional response by sharing technological knowledge and experiences among the countries and by coordinating the project with other regions and international research networks.

In each country, activities will be implemented at local or territorial level, where coordination groups or platforms will be organised with the participation of public and private actors, NGOs, and social and producer organisations, taking advantage of existing partner networks.

The project will build on CIP’s experiences with innovation platforms to promote interaction, social learning, social capital formation, and collective activities involving diverse actors in innovation processes in the region. Innovation platforms will be implemented at different levels:

- Local platforms will facilitate interactions among potato producers, local authorities, and service providers, and will empower small farmers, reduce marketing costs, increase efficiency in service delivery, and disseminate technical and commercial information.
Market chain platforms will bring farmers’ associations together with traders, processors, supermarkets, researchers, extension agents, chefs, and others to foster pro-poor innovation.

In some cases, platforms will serve as representative bodies for interaction with policy makers in order to address complex policy issues such as the sustainable use of biodiversity and the preparation and enforcement of technical norms for sustainable and socially responsible production and marketing of Andean crops.

At regional level, the project will function as a platform for knowledge sharing, collective learning, and documentation of experiences.

**Result 1. Participatory technological and institutional innovation processes promoted** in each prioritised territory, in alliance with public and private actors and with potential for replication.

**Main activities**

1.1. Creating and strengthening stakeholder platforms for innovation through the application and adaptation of participatory methods, facilitating exchanges between territories with similar contexts.

1.2. Implementing applied and adaptive research on selected demand-based, cross-cutting themes by scientific, technical, and producer teams in alliance with national and regional actors.

**Result 2. Innovation capacity of research and development partners strengthened** through mechanisms for interaction, knowledge sharing, and coordination at different territorial levels.

**Main activities**

2.1. Organising participatory strategic planning events for scientific-technological innovation with national research and development entities to respond to the demand for innovation raised at stakeholder platform level.

2.2. Implementing collective learning events such as courses, workshops, and teleconferences on methodological themes and processes to generate technological innovation.

**Result 3. Scientific knowledge and information** (methodological and technical) on prioritised themes generated, adapted, and shared throughout the Andean region.

**Main activities**

3.1. Training and support for regional reflection groups (consisting of national partners and regional or international specialists) to manage demands related to prioritised cross-cutting themes with national research entities and to facilitate an exchange of experiences between national partners and international entities.

3.2. Investigation, systematisation, and documentation of methodologies and experiences to produce international public goods relating to cross-cutting themes (section 3.4) and to processes for linking research and development.
Result 4. Public awareness raised and national and local policies influenced, so as to support pro-poor innovation for food security at the different territorial levels, taking advantage of project results and other experiences.

Main activities

4.1. Development of an agenda of prioritised themes based on evidence of technological innovation in conjunction with relevant bodies (e.g. National Potato Council in Ecuador, the Multisectoral Potato Commission in Peru) or the platform of inter-donor learning alliances in Peru.

4.2. Organisation of virtual and face-to-face forums for political decision makers and other actors (e.g. representatives of market chains, NGOs, cooking schools, private enterprises), and promotion of publications on key issues of technological innovation for food security based on existing evidence.

3.3. Risks and assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks and assumptions</th>
<th>Mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incompatibility between the different national food security/food sovereignty policies and strategies in the Andean region.</td>
<td>Identify areas of common interest and strategic approaches that can reinforce the countries' capacities for innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergence of public/private actors’ visions reduces interest in participating in innovation platforms.</td>
<td>Develop a joint vision among actors with participatory methodologies for developing a strategic vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional instability in national entities affects harmonisation of the objectives of technological innovation and food security.</td>
<td>Strengthen public-private alliances for advocacy, taking advantage of platforms for innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of coordination between public and private actors for working with the most vulnerable groups in the rural population.</td>
<td>Raise awareness among actors as to the benefits to be gained from the project to improve their capacity for innovation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4. Cross-cutting issues

Technological innovation in each territory depends on (1) the presence of producers and their groups in consumer markets, (2) inclusive and unified territorial development, and (3) cross-cutting themes, as mentioned in several of the previous sections. One such cross-cutting theme relates to the management of natural resources, including biodiversity and its use (promotion of native potatoes in dynamic markets) as well as actions to adapt to climate change (reintroduction of varieties lost because of frost). The project will develop and validate sustainable technologies and expand access to decision support systems to reduce factors limiting productivity and competitiveness. Research will be carried out on integrated pest and disease management, soil and water management, and seed quality and access to quality planting materials. The second cross-cutting theme concerns innovation system approaches and the promotion of public-private partnerships (e.g. stakeholder platforms). The third cross-cutting theme covers gender equity and the empowerment of indigenous groups and includes training in native languages, day care for children during events, access to credit,
promoting women’s contributions, and taking advantage of indigenous peoples’ ancestral knowledge/expertise and systematisation of this knowledge.

3.5. Stakeholders

The direct project beneficiaries are local and national actors in research, development, and agri-food systems. The Andean region has been prioritised because potato-based production and marketing systems are highly correlated with widespread and severe poverty, malnutrition, and maternal and child mortality. Accordingly:

1. In Bolivia, work will be implemented in collaboration with INIAF (National Institute for Agricultural and Forestry Innovation), the PROINPA Foundation (Research and Promotion of Andean Products), and local platforms bringing together institutional and private actors and producer organisations such as the Ecological Producers’ Association, Aroma.
2. In Ecuador, the project will be implemented with INIAP (National Autonomous Agricultural Research Institute), MAGAP (Ministry of Agriculture) through its potato programme, local NGOs (Marco Foundation), municipalities, and CONPAPA (Consortium of Potato Farmers).
3. In Peru, activities will be implemented with the CAPAC platform (Quality Productive Agricultural Chains), INIA (National Institute for Agricultural Innovation), MINAG (Ministry of Agriculture), and regional platforms with the participation of local actors and producer organisations.
4. In Colombia, project implementation will be coordinated with the Peace Laboratories and CISAN (Inter-Sectoral Commission on Nutrition and Food Security) and other interested entities such as CORPOICA (Corporación Colombiana de Investigación Agropecuaria).
5. In Venezuela with INIA.
6. The project will also coordinate activities with other regional stakeholders such as CONDESAN (Consorcio para el Desarrollo Sostenible de la Ecorregión Andina), RIMISP (Centro latinoamericano para el desarrollo rural), and FONTAGRO (Regional Fund for Agricultural Technology), and with regional research and development initiatives supported by other donors, including SDC, NZAID and DFID.

The ultimate project beneficiaries will be the social groups most vulnerable to food insecurity in the territories described in section 3.2, with special attention to women, indigenous communities, and Afro-descendants.

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Method of implementation

Joint management through the signature of an agreement with an international organisation: the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). A contribution agreement will be signed for fund disbursement. IFAD was chosen on account of its ongoing relationship and experience with the EU and the CGIAR, and its working experience in the Andean region and with CIP.
CIP was selected as the implementing partner because of its valuable experiences in pro-poor innovation and policy advocacy work in the Andean region. CIP has a long experience of working with national partners in the Andean region and supports the development of
institutional networks at different levels in the five Andean countries. Its regional programme, Papa Andina, has strategic and operational partners in Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru and through alliances with other projects (Alianza Cambio Andino and CONDESAN). It collaborates with research and development institutions in Colombia and Venezuela, which will ensure the project’s regional approach. Taking into account CIP’s previous experiences, the regional dimension of the project can add significant value to national research and development efforts and to international research programmes by: (1) developing and introducing new concepts and approaches to link research and development; (2) providing opportunities for reflection, exchanging experiences, and building social knowledge; and (3) supporting local experimentation with new ways for researchers to work with others in technical and institutional innovation and linking local problems with international research programmes.

CIP will operate through its own offices or those of allied institutions present in each country in order to guarantee the decentralised and efficient management of activities.

At regional level, a scientific coordination group or platform will be set up to bring together experts on specific themes, regional scientific organisations (CONDESAN, RIMISP), and international scientific organisations (Global Mountain Forum, CGIAR, FORAGRO). This consultative and interactive group will review and discuss the project’s regional institutional and scientific strategies and will advise the project’s management unit.

National-level platforms will be set up in each country to link the project team with researchers possessing diverse biological and social-science expertise, development professionals, small farmers, market chain actors, and policy makers. The project will have a liaison organisation in each country to coordinate the activities of the national platform.

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 calendar

The indicative budget for the project is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Results/activities</th>
<th>EC contribution (€)</th>
<th>CIP contribution (€)</th>
<th>TOTAL (€)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R1: Participatory technological and institutional innovation processes promoted</td>
<td>2000000</td>
<td>75000</td>
<td>2075000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating and strengthening stakeholder platforms for innovation</td>
<td>600000</td>
<td>25000</td>
<td>625000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementing applied and adaptive research on selected demand-based, cross-cutting themes</td>
<td>1400000</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>1450000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>R2: Innovation capacities of research and development partners strengthened</td>
<td>600000</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>650000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organising participatory strategic planning events</td>
<td>300000</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>320000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Implementing collective learning events</td>
<td>300000</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>330000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R3: Scientific knowledge and information on prioritised themes generated, adapted, and shared</td>
<td>1050000</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>1150000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Training and support for regional reflection groups</td>
<td>500000</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>540000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Investigation, systematisation, and documentation of methodologies and experiences</td>
<td>550000</td>
<td>60000</td>
<td>610000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Development of an agenda of prioritised themes based on evidence of technological innovation in conjunction with relevant bodies</td>
<td>400000</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>415000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Organisation of virtual and face-to-face forums and promotion of publications</td>
<td>250000</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>260000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Audits/evaluation/monitoring</td>
<td>150000</td>
<td>150000</td>
<td>150000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Visibility and communication</td>
<td>200000</td>
<td>200000</td>
<td>200000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Administrative expenses</td>
<td>250000</td>
<td>250000</td>
<td>250000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>4900000</td>
<td>250000</td>
<td>5150000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Indirect costs (2 %)</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>100000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>General total</td>
<td>5000000</td>
<td>2500000</td>
<td>5250000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The operational duration of the project is 42 months from the date on which the financial agreement is signed.

4.4. Performance monitoring

The project will be monitored in accordance with the contribution agreement. Personnel from the Delegation of the EU in Lima will carry out joint monitoring with IFAD and CIP. External monitoring missions are considered to be complementary activities.

The project will apply the internal follow-up methodology used by CIP, which includes a monitoring format for activities and an annual evaluation and planning meeting. The ‘Horizontal Evaluation’ methodology will also be used for a participatory review of experiences in implementing the project approaches.

4.5. Evaluation and audit

CIP is audited on an annual basis and audit reports are sent to the European Commission. Moreover, ad hoc audits are also carried out by the European Commission or by IFAD or in cooperation with IFAD internal controls. IFAD will receive regular reports from CIP.

4.6. Communication and visibility

CIP will be asked to make visible the EU contribution through its communication in reports, presentations, brochures, websites, and so on.

The information, communication, and visibility strategy is formulated by CIP for communicating results, for contributing to the general project objective and for public advocacy.
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 THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME

STRATEGIC PRIORITY 2: LINKING INFORMATION AND DECISION-MAKING TO IMPROVE THE FOOD SECURITY RESPONSE STRATEGY

‘WORLD FOOD CRISIS: SUPPORT FOR FOOD SECURITY MONITORING AND ANALYSIS FOR APPROPRIATE POLICY RESPONSES’

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>World food crisis: Support for food security monitoring and analysis for appropriate policy responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>EU contribution: €1 800 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method / Method of implementation</td>
<td>Project approach — joint management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cris No:</td>
<td>2010 / 236-345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC-code</td>
<td>52010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Food Security and Food Aid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

The drastic rise in food prices over the past couple of years has raised serious concerns about food and nutrition security across the world. The food crisis, along with the recovery from it, has been further aggravated by the financial crisis engulfing poor countries. The combination of different crises — fuel, food, and financial — continue to push more people into food insecurity and malnutrition. While a coordinated response is urgently needed at global level, the way countries respond continues to be critical to overcoming the crises and preventing future ones. Coherent action is needed to help vulnerable populations cope with rising food prices, to assist developing-country farmers in swiftly responding to the opportunity presented by the rising demand for their products, and to provide information on evidence-based macroeconomic policies. Since the consequences of high and volatile food prices have differed radically across countries and population groups, the appropriate policy responses, as well as their scale, prioritisation, and sequencing, must be developed and adapted to country-specific needs and conditions.

Since the beginning of the food crisis, it has become evident that information for policy making is not readily available at country level. This lack of access to good information often results in inadequate and ineffective policy responses, which not only exacerbate the effects of the food crisis, but are also detrimental to long-term food security in developing countries. Such policies have resulted in further volatility in food prices due to panic purchases by food-deficit countries at higher prices and restricted food exports from food-surplus countries.

It is clear that many national leaders require tools to assess the impact of the global food crisis on their country, economy, and vulnerable population groups, as well as to design and implement national policies and programmes to address the risks and opportunities presented by such crises. Consequently, consultative processes, such as in-country policy dialogues and
learning from key regional initiatives, will significantly contribute to improving capacity to identify, design, and implement appropriate policy actions to mitigate the risks of the food crisis and take advantage of the opportunities presented.

The food crisis has also very clearly demonstrated the great need for cross-country learning and dialogue. Country-level policy responses and the impact of these responses on poor people need to be analysed in order to implement effective and appropriate food security policies in the future.

Improved food security monitoring and analysis for appropriate policy responses is advocated as part of the global governance of food security, for example in the July 2008 UN Comprehensive Framework for Action on the global food crisis, the L’Aquila Joint Statement on Global Food Security released in July 2009, and the recent World Food Summit in November 2009. This issue is addressed by Strategic Priority 2 of the Food Security Thematic Programme, which encourages research, information distribution, and capacity strengthening through innovative activities and partnership development.

2.2. Lessons learnt

IFPRI’s evidence-based research has shown that food crises, and policies designed to respond to them, have effects at global, national, household, and levels. IFPRI’s research over the past three decades has also shown that addressing food-related crises requires solid information and analytical bases at country level. The IFPRI report on ‘Global Food Crises: Monitoring and Assessing Impact to Inform Policy Responses’ gathers together evidence from such studies (including Dawe 2008; Delgado, Minot, and Tiongco 2005; Ivanic and Martin 2008; and Syrovatka and Lechanova 2005) and describes the information needed to thoroughly understand the impact of food crises at country level in the short and long term. Such information and data needs are identified by IFPRI during and after food crises to provide a relatively consistently set of information and analytical tools to systematically guide policymaking at country level.

First, national decision makers and policy analysts must understand the degree to which their country and population groups are exposed to the negative effects of rising food prices or are able to exploit new opportunities offered by the higher prices. This understanding requires information on:

- global market developments;
- the characteristics of their country with regard to international trade in food;
- trends in local wages, food and agricultural prices, and energy prices;
- the composition of income and expenditure among different population groups in the country; and
- the responses of producers, consumers, and the government to rising food prices.

At national level, the actual effects of a global food crisis depend on the net trade position (exporter or importer) in agricultural commodities relative to the size of the economy. An understanding of such trade positions will help in the further analysis of:

• the degree to which changes in global prices are transmitted to local markets;
• the sensitivity of government revenue and expenditure to rising food prices; and
• the political and fiscal capacity of the government to respond to the crisis.

At more local levels, the effects of a crisis will differ among communities and from household to household depending on:
• a household’s net sales (or net purchases) of food relative to household income;
• the level of a household’s income and assets, which influences
• its food security and vulnerability to shocks; and
• the existence and effectiveness of government programmes and policies to protect vulnerable households in a community.

Within households, members are likely to be affected by a crisis to varying degrees, with the nutritionally vulnerable members — women of child-bearing age and young children — being most at risk.

As policy makers assess the effects of a global food crisis on their country and on various population groups, the main sources of data include nationally representative household surveys, food price series from important commodity marketplaces in a country, and trade statistics. Where such data are missing for a country, policy makers must rely on qualitative or indicative, rather than representative, data to make short-run assessments. However, a more thorough assessment of the impact of a global food crisis on a country and its citizens, and the best course of action to follow in response, requires detailed data and relatively sophisticated analytical capacity for investigating some of the national issues associated with global food crises.

2.3. Complementary actions

IFPRI is currently implementing a project entitled Security Monitoring and Analysis for Policy Responses (FSMAPR), which started in 2008 for a period of 4 years. The action proposed here will co-finance a number of activities under the FSMAPR project. The overall goal of this initiative by IFPRI is to develop a global platform not only for closely monitoring food security information at country level, but also for improving the capacity to analyse the impact of food crises and food policies implemented. Enhancing such monitoring systems and participation of different food policy stakeholders will make countries more resilient to future security crises.

Further, the proposed project will also incorporate the conclusions drawn from an important EC-funded multi-stakeholder meeting in Central Asia on ‘Appropriate Policy Responses to the Global Food Crisis.’ The meeting took place in early February 2010 in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan. Key policy makers and food security experts from Central Asian countries and Afghanistan will be participating at the meeting. Based on the deliberations of this meeting, an agreed outcome will be a proposal to develop food security information systems in these countries.

The present project complements the many initiatives and projects for food security and related information systems currently financed by the EU, the EU Member States (EU MS) and other donors in a large number of countries.
At global level, the EU is currently supporting a project implemented by FAO to improve assessment methodologies, establish internationally agreed food security-related thresholds and benchmarks and strengthen food security analysis methods.

At continental and regional level, organisations like the Africa Union, CILSS and SADC and other regional bodies like SICA in Central America are also being supported through capacity building actions, in line with the overall objective of the European Union to promote regionalisation processes by supporting regional food security information systems.

At country level, early warning and information systems are being supported in a number of countries (Somalia, Sudan, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Southern African countries, occupied Palestinian territory, Afghanistan, and Nicaragua). Burkina Faso, Malawi, Mali and Niger are countries, among others, where food security information systems have been heavily supported by the EU under a long-term perspective.

In Asia, the proposed project further enhances projects implemented by the European Commission. For example, the European Commission-FAO Food Security Information for Action Programme, covering Kyrgyzstan, Laos PDR, Cambodia, and Tajikistan, among others, aims to ‘forge even closer links between food security information and decision-making processes’. Other projects for improving food security information include the ASEAN Food Security Information System (AFSIS), which aims to strengthen regional food security through human resource development and information network development.

With the present project, these efforts will be further strengthened by building the capacity of policy makers in 21 countries to identify food security challenges in their respective countries, collect the right kind of information needed to analyse the situation, conduct thorough analysis of the issues, and formulate effective and appropriate policies for sustainable long-term solutions to food security challenges. The project will bring together knowledge on different ways to analyse food security using existing techniques such as Nutritional Status Assessment and Analysis, Livelihoods Status Assessment and Analysis, Availability Assessment and Analysis, and Baseline Food Security Assessments.

The proposed initiative will include the creation of an internet-based information portal to strengthen the ability of policy makers to obtain the information they require to respond quickly to dynamic developments in world food markets. This portal would not duplicate useful websites operated by the FAO, the World Bank, or the institutions of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), but would add specific value.

Several new elements developed for this portal will make it an interactive and dynamic tool for in-country information and knowledge management, capacity strengthening, and policy analysis:

- The portal is being designed to facilitate both easy entry and use of information in an open Wikipedia fashion. This is a unique feature of the portal, as it enhances the tracking of policies and their impacts at national, household, and individual level. Policy makers can benefit not only from greater access to information in their own country, but also from the lessons learnt in other countries.
- The portal will not only present information in a unique way, but will also facilitate the effective and appropriate use and interpretation of this information. State-of-the-art tools for policy analysis will be provided in an easily accessible manner.
• The portal offers a collaborative space for country-based food security researchers, policy makers, and members of civil society, the private sector and other interested stakeholders to enter the latest food security information from their countries, hold discussion forums and capacity building exercises, and network with key food security experts from other countries.
• Virtual discussion forums and policy dialogues will involve governmental, non-governmental, and civil society organisations as well as the private sector. Through these policy dialogues, the collaborative space on the portal will help identify knowledge gaps, which the proposed action will aim to fill by building, as much as possible, on existing knowledge and studies.
• Besides country-by-country information on specific policy responses, the portal pools data on different indicators to give a holistic picture of food security in a given country.
• In addition, real-time, up-to-date information allows for continuous monitoring of food security news across the world and the identification of global hunger hotspots.

2.4. Donor coordination
Staff of the EU delegations in the participating countries will be invited to take part in the project activities to ensure coherence with other activities in the field of food security which the EU supports in the participating countries. Additional donor contributions from other sources are also likely to be sought in order to further strengthen and effectively achieve the objectives of the project at individual country level. In addition, the following approaches will be pursued to ensure coordination among donors in the project countries.

• The project will make concerted efforts to identify areas of mutual interest for different donors in the project countries and align their country efforts with the food security objectives of this project and the countries in question.
• Staff of donor organisations working in the project countries will be consulted before, during, and after the national policy dialogue consultations proposed under this project.
• The project will also collaborate with the national food security taskforces to help harmonise the efforts of donors with the national government.
• The project management will convene a bi-annual virtual meeting of the consortium of donors involved in the project.
• The project will focus on working with donors to identify future opportunities for food security-related interventions based upon the information gained and lessons learnt during implementation of the project.

3. Description

3.1. Objectives
The overall goal of the proposed action is to improve food security for the poor in developing countries in the current food crisis and increase the resilience of their food systems to cope with future crises.
The specific objective is to initiate and/or strengthen a process to develop a food security network for effective national food policy responses in 21 countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean. This will be achieved by contributing to information generation and interpretation, enhancing cross-country learning, developing capacity for long-term food security strategy development, and facilitating structured national food security dialogues.

In order to ensure maximum impact, a number of criteria were considered to select countries to be included in the project:

- Countries have been selected in those regions where hunger remains significantly high, such as South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa, as described by IFPRI’s 2009 Global Hunger Index. These countries remain vulnerable to global food crises and continue to face chronic food insecurity.

- Countries that are currently in or emerging out of conflict have been selected, as the food security of vulnerable populations there remains at serious risk.

- The social unrest caused by the food crisis, such as street riots, have also influenced the choice of project countries in order to gain a better understanding of the types of information to feed into food policy decision-making.

- Countries where even small improvements in organised evidence-based decision-making will have a major impact on global and regional food security have been given due attention. Examples of such countries include the Democratic Republic of Congo in Africa, and India and Bangladesh in South Asia.

- In order to enhance cross-country learning, countries that offer case studies for specific policy responses such as social protection and price stability have also been chosen. Sri Lanka and China represent such examples.

The indicative list of countries in which the action will be implemented will be confirmed in the inception report and is as follows:

**Asia (and Oceania):** Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, East Timor, India, Indonesia, Laos PDR, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Vietnam, and Papua New Guinea

**Africa:** Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Madagascar, Niger, and Sierra Leone

**Latin America and the Caribbean:** Colombia, Peru, and Haiti

The proposed project will focus on three components:

- **Information strengthening and monitoring:** Access to comprehensive and detailed information on a timely basis is vital to influence and inform policy responses. In too many instances, available information tends to be outdated, spotty in coverage, and insufficiently disaggregated to local levels. This project will facilitate and extend the Food Security Portal for the 21 project countries with a database that will capture and transparently present information at different levels (e.g. country, sector, institution) on all aspects of the food crisis, including formal and informal responses to the crisis. A major contribution of this part of the project will be opportunities for real-time
analysis and interpretation of food security data for the project countries to feed into the decision-making process.

As an important new feature, the portal will include a food security policy analysis ‘toolbox’ to help users become proficient with various analytical tools, along with country-by-country food policy information, news reports related to food policy, links to key players in the international community, key research findings, and user forums. Because the portal will be designed in an open Wikipedia-type fashion, access to the portal both to obtain and to add information and tools will be open to the wider public as an international public good.

- **Advisory services for policy actions:** The second component of the project will expand its advisory actions beyond information strengthening and monitoring. To assess the effects of high and volatile food prices in countries and thereby contribute to more relevant and appropriate national policy responses, the project will examine the transmission of world to domestic prices, macroeconomic and fiscal implications, and market, trade, and food aid policies. Based on the assessment of these impacts, country-specific risks and vulnerabilities will be identified and country-level responses will be suggested. The implementation of these responses will be carefully monitored to enable the project to assess the extent to which these responses actually made a difference for the food insecure and the poor.

- **Overcoming specific information gaps that limit responses:** In the third component of the project for some specific countries, country-level analyses will be carried out to facilitate the implementation of appropriate policy actions. These analyses and policy actions will be developed through consultative processes and local capacity building among in-country policy makers. The main goal is to strengthen the capacity of national decision makers so that they can adequately and effectively identify, analyse, and respond to the challenges that arise in a constantly changing national and global food system. Capacity strengthening activities will include learning about the organisation and management of food security institutions and departments to respond to food crises. The project will also build individual capacity through face-to-face training and e-learning based on the results of studies conducted through other projects, such as the Security Monitoring and Analysis for Policy Responses (FSMAPR) Programme at IFPRI.

### 3.2. Expected results and main activities

To achieve the objectives, the activities and deliverables will be as follows:

- **Information and monitoring are strengthened**

  **Main activity:** The proposed project will promote, strengthen, and continually update and maintain the internet-based information portal, focusing on the food security situation in the 21 target countries. The portal will draw on existing food security databases and use state-of-the-art techniques to bring all the information together. The latest findings on policy responses to the food crisis and relevant knowledge related to food security can be accessed in the portal. The portal will also show how policy responses have had an impact at household level. Further, it will contain information and decision-support tools that will strengthen the ability of policy makers, food policy experts, and
researchers to respond quickly to dynamic developments in the world food system.

Deliverable (D1): A Food Security Portal containing up-to-date food security information on the 21 target countries.

- **Specific advice for policy actions identified and delivered through consultative processes**

  Main activity: Development of a basic set of data/information that will be required for all participating countries; two-way communication with stakeholders (national policy dialogues, workshops) to strengthen capacity for food policy analysis in the 21 target countries.

  Deliverable (D2): Number of country-level assessments of risks and vulnerabilities; number of reports and discussion papers on the food security situation in the proposed countries; number of national policy dialogues initiated.

- **National capacity for policy analysis is strengthened and long-term strategy developed**

  Ý **Targeted assessments**

    Main activity: Develop capacity for assessment of the transmission of world food prices to domestic market prices in selected countries; macro-economic and fiscal implications — market, trade, and food policies — in selected countries.

    Deliverable (D3.1): Number of collaborative research reports for the Food Security Portal and, as consultative advice, for participating countries; strengthening of local capacity to conduct similar studies in the future; number of long-term strategies developed.

  Ý **Impacts of the food crisis on women**

    Main activity: Collaborative studies conducted in selected countries on impacts of food crises on women, developed and implemented through consultative processes with in-country food security organisation.

    Deliverable (D3.2): Joint research reports and presentation of results in workshops held in selected project countries to develop the local capacity of individual and institutions.

  Ý **Supply response and promotion of agricultural growth**

    Main activity: Studies conducted in synergy with specific countries on the nature, distribution, and severity of supply response and production constraints, which could be targeted by crop and livestock improvements.

    Deliverable (D3.3): Collaborative research reports and presentation of results in workshops and policy consultations.

  Ý **Moving from emergency response to social protection**

    Main activity: Studies conducted in coordination with selected countries on moving from emergency response to social protection. Specific advice will be developed in direct consultation and collaboration with decision-makers within project countries. Focus will be on enabling policymakers to use evidence-based information for long-term food security planning.
Deliverable (3.4): Joint research reports and presentation of results in workshops held in selected project countries and build local capacity to conduct related studies.

3.3. Risks and assumptions

- Sufficient funds will be mobilised to carry out the intended activities in a timely fashion;
- Key actors and stakeholders from selected countries, including those representing the poorest, will be identified and will agree to participate and interact;
- Qualified people are available to undertake and present innovative research;
- Sufficient credible and comprehensive data are available to measure, guide, and monitor policy making in countries affected by the global food crisis; and
- Policy makers and decision makers will be receptive to new ideas and have the capacity to implement, adjust, and/or scale up needed strategies and actions.

3.4. Cross-cutting issues

The project will address several cross-cutting food security topics. Specifically, the proposed work will give special attention to the following food security related issues: specific advice for policy actions identified and delivered through consultative processes; targeted assessments for analysing the macro-economic and fiscal implications, supply response and promotion of agricultural growth; and moving from emergency response to social protection. Interrelationships between food security, nutrition, agriculture, and climate change will be explored through this project. It will give special attention to the of recognising and understanding linkages between cross-cutting issues, on the basis that fostering one issue while neglecting another will inevitably lead to failure in the long run.

3.5. Stakeholders

It is envisaged that the proposed work will involve a wide variety of key stakeholder groups, including:

- politicians, policy makers, and policy advisors;
- bilateral and multilateral development agencies;
- non-governmental organisations;
- civil society organisations, including farmers’ organisations;
- research and academic institutions;
- the private sector; and
- global and regional institutions and networks.

This action has been developed on the basis of numerous consultations with stakeholders currently participating in the Food Security Monitoring and Analysis for Policy Responses (FSMAPR) project. These consultations took place in several forms, including National Food Security Policy Dialogues where stakeholders from government, non-governmental organisations, civil society, academic and research institutions participated. During these consultations, research, food policy information, and capacity needs were identified. The
project continues to evolve and adjust to these needs as they arise, especially given its focus on appropriate food policy responses at country level. The proposed action will make every effort to ensure that stakeholders remain fully part of the project. Annex 1 contains a list of organisations currently collaborating under the FSMAPR project. They play a key role in the organisation of the national food policy dialogues and other activities, such as information gathering, in the countries concerned.

Further, these stakeholders will play a key role in shaping the project and ensuring the long-term sustainability and effectiveness of the action to be taken under this project in the following ways:

- The food policy networks formed with the participation of a broad range of stakeholder groups in each of the countries will guide the identification of priority areas for research and capacity-strengthening activities at country level.
- The proposed action will involve the above stakeholder groups in identifying key food security information and monitoring gaps.
- The national food security taskforces (already present in most of the participating countries) will be engaged and encouraged to obtain constant policy and information feedback for policy making. Regular consultations will be held with the members of the taskforces to assess the policy needs of government decision makers and also to identify opportunities to guide them in their decision making.
- Engaging key collaborative institutions to conduct joint studies and assist in running the efforts on the ground will ensure the continuing sustainability of these efforts.
- Most importantly, effort will focus on providing mechanisms, such as the Food Security Portal and policy dialogues, to allow for sustained information monitoring and assessment beyond the project duration.

To ensure full participation at national and international level, both National and International High-Level Advisory Committees will be established. At national level, at least five senior persons concerned with food security issues in that country will be part of the committee. Members of the National Advisory Committees will be drawn from a wide variety of organisations and professions, and may include policy makers, representatives from small and medium-sized enterprises, farmer organisations, and civil society organisations. The Chairs of the National Committees will together constitute the International Advisory Committee. The terms of reference of these committees will be to provide strategic guidance and ensure that the proposed project addresses issues that are relevant to achieving long-term food security goals.

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Method of implementation

Joint management through the signature of an agreement with an international organisation. A contribution agreement will be signed with IFPRI, which will be responsible for the implementation of the project.
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 calendar

The duration of the project will be three years. The indicative budget breakdown is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>TOTAL (EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>648046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field costs (21 countries)</td>
<td>762418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel (airfare and per diem)</td>
<td>85457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service centre charges</td>
<td>187282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs (7%)*</td>
<td>116797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 800 000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The audited institutional indirect costs for IFPRI were 15.9% for fiscal year 2008. For 2009, the Provisional Board-approved rate is 16.7%. For the purposes of this proposal, in order to comply with EC guidelines and the 7% cap, eligible personnel support costs included in the institutional indirect rate have been classified as direct.

4.4. Performance monitoring

The project will be assessed in accordance with the European Commission's results-oriented monitoring system framework. Regular assessments to ensure that the project is on target to meet its intended results will be conducted. Implementation will be 'according to plan' as mentioned under EC guidelines. Regular progress reports giving an overall assessment will be submitted on a regular basis. ([http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/ensuring-quality/monitoring-projects/index_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/ensuring-quality/monitoring-projects/index_en.htm))

IFPRI has taken an impact-oriented approach in the FSMAPR project, and will continue to do so in this project. This approach entails careful monitoring of activities, outputs, outcomes, influence, and impact. The project team will assess the outcomes and impact of the proposed work as follows:

- **Objective 1** — Information and monitoring are strengthened: The project team will ensure that the progress in building and strengthening the portal matches the work plan. The portal coordinator will also constantly provide updates to the project team.

- **Objective 2** — Specific advice for policy actions identified and delivered through consultative processes: A work plan describing a list of activities expected in each country will be drawn up, and best efforts will be made to implement all the activities on ground in consultation with collaborating partners.

- **Objective 3** — National capacity for policy analysis is strengthened and a long-term strategy is developed: Research will be divided into various thematic components, and researchers in the various components will document and keep the project team informed about progress, challenges, and milestones to ensure that research studies are delivered in time.

In order to ensure the progress of activities, IFPRI will put a monitoring system in place, to include:
• Careful monitoring of the collaborative contracts and work plans concluded with key collaborators to ensure that the progress of the project remains on track.

• Bi-annual progress reports will be submitted to the Director of the Knowledge, Capacity and Innovations Division, who is also a member of IFPRI’s Senior Management Team.

• The progress of the project will also be reported in IFPRI’s Internal Programme Review.

• The project management will convene a bi-annual virtual meeting of the international and national advisory committees.

• For all progress reporting, the work of the project will be matched with the indicators described in the logical framework.

4.5. Evaluation and audit

The project will have a mid-term review and a final evaluation at the end.

All IFPRI’s activities are audited by external auditors.

4.6. Communication and visibility

Communication activities will be organised to effectively reach and inform the relevant groups of actors and stakeholders with the aim of strengthening capacity for effective and appropriate response to food security issues. These activities will include the following:

• IFPRI and the European Commission will work together to ensure appropriate visibility for the EU. Standards regarding visibility will be derived from the ‘EU visibility guidelines for external actions’ (http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/index_en.html).
• Announcement of the meeting on the Food Security Portal developed by IFPRI to monitor and provide up-to-date knowledge on key food security policy issues (www.foodsecurityportal.org);
• Background papers, policy briefs, and meeting proceedings; and
• Follow-up strategic briefings in Brussels.

Throughout the project, efforts will be made to ensure that actions to address the food crisis and response strategies for improved food security are high on national, regional, and global policy agendas.
### Annex 1: Organisations currently collaborating under the Food Security Monitoring and Analysis for Policy Analysis project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Collaborating organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Saharan Africa</strong></td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Community Of West African States (ECOWAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Commission for Africa (NEPAD)New Partnership for Africa’s Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asia</strong></td>
<td>Asian Development Bank (ADB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latin America and Caribbean</strong></td>
<td>Regional Unit of Technical Assistance (RUTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mercado Común del Sur (MERCOSUR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Countries</th>
<th>Collaborating Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Saharan Africa:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Ministère du Développement Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>Institut National pour l’Étude et la Recherche Agronomiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Animal Diseases Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Kenya Agricultural Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>University of Liberia, College of Agriculture and Forestry (CAF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Centre National de la Recherche Appliquée au Développement Rural (FOFIFA )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Bunda College of Agriculture, University of Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Institute of Agrarian Research in Mozambique (IIAM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources (Economic and Social Research Foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>(CESS)Centre of Economic and Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Pakistan Institute of Development Economics (PIDE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Department of Agricultural and Rural Development Policy, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latin America and Caribbean</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Centre for Advanced Studies on Applied Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Universidad de los Anfes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Centre de la Recherche et Documentation Agronomique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Instituto de Investigación y Desarrollo, NITLAPAN-UCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Group of Analysis for Development (GRADE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LOGICAL FRAMEWORK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective statement</th>
<th>Verifiable indicators</th>
<th>Sources of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Goal:** Improved food security for the poor in developing countries in the current food crisis and increased resilience of their food systems to cope with future crises | 1. Food security of the poor in affected countries is improved — measured by the Global Hunger Index  
2. Resilience of affected countries is improved, measured by reduced impact of future food crisis shocks at food system level (production, markets, and households) | 1. Global Hunger Index, which is a composite index measuring the undernourished population (as monitored by UN), the proportion of malnourished children (tracked by UNICEF), and the infant mortality rate (tracked by WHO)  
2. Levels of technology adoption, agricultural investment, crop production, and production patterns; increased local market access and global integration; vulnerability prevention mechanisms such as safety nets and social protection programmes | 1. Governments and policymakers are receptive and adaptive to new policy innovation and a changing food policy environment  
2. Private sector and civil society organisations are responsive to policy, technological, and institutional incentives |
| **Purpose:** To strengthen food policy information and monitoring, enhance cross-country learning, develop capacity for long-term food security strategy development, and facilitate network-based, structured national food policy dialogues for effective responses to food security challenges | 1. Strengthened national food policy information systems  
2. Increased cross-country dialogue and sharing of | 1. Improved quality and quantity of outputs from food policy information and decision-making systems  
2. Number of discussion forums, regional meetings, and | 1. Presence of basic structures, units, and institutions dealing with food security information and monitoring  
2. Countries have similar contexts, capacities, and |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>information, as measured by discussion forums, both virtual and face-to-face, among countries and regions (Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean)</th>
<th>collaborative outputs from information-sharing</th>
<th>resource bases to adopt programmes and policies from one another</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Number of policy responses to food security challenges in the form of programmes and interventions at country level</td>
<td>3. Documented information as observed in published sources, news media, and international organisations</td>
<td>3. Public sector, private sector, and civil society organisations are sensitive and responsive to food security challenges in a country; the political economy, policy processes, and the governance of food policy systems allow for such responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Number of in-country food policy consultations in response to food security challenges among key networks of policy makers, development partners, researchers, civil society, the private sector, farmers, and consumers</td>
<td>4. Documented outputs of policy forums, dialogues, and national meetings; media coverage of such events</td>
<td>4. Presence of internal structures and facilitative mechanisms both within and outside government for organising dialogues and consultations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome:**

<p>| Result 1: Comprehensive and detailed information on the food | 1.1 Key policy makers, development partners and consumers | 1.1 Improved understanding of the food crisis, leading to | 1.1 Key actors have a basic commitment to address the |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 2: Specific advice for policy actions identified and delivered through consultative processes</th>
<th><strong>1.2</strong> Quality of the Portal's information assessed by cross-referencing formal and informal media (weblogs, NGO sites, print media, etc.)</th>
<th><strong>1.2</strong> Documented enhanced policy discussions within the countries on the Portal and outside</th>
<th><strong>1.2</strong> Data needed for sound decision-making but held outside project institutions, are available for inclusion on the Portal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3</strong> Analytical and capacity strengthening tools on the Portal are used by representatives from at least 20 countries</td>
<td><strong>1.3</strong> Documented policy decisions are taken on programmes and interventions to increase resilience of the food system</td>
<td><strong>1.3</strong> Intended users have technical access to the internet or to the information otherwise provided and utilise the information presented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 At least one dialogue a year (in person or in virtual form) with representatives of the case study countries (either bilaterally or as part of a multilateral consultation) and at least 1 workshop (virtual) held to identify emerging issues and</td>
<td>2.1 Documented outputs of the consultation in the form of policy briefs, meeting minutes, synthesis of discussions, and proposals for future research and analysis based on the documentation</td>
<td>21 The policy process can be impacted by the project consultations, and is sufficiently conducive to food policy action related to the issues/themes identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 3: Strengthening national capacity for policy analysis and developing long-term strategies</td>
<td>3.1 Country-specific research results developed for all project countries through collaborative capacity strengthening of</td>
<td>3.1 Documented research and analysis output developed through capacity strengthening and</td>
<td>31 Country has the basic capacity to collaborate on policy analysis studies that contribute to long-term food security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Targeted assessments of food security policies and programmes carried out on at least one relevant topic area in all participating countries and made available through traditional communication methods, on the Portal, and in interim and final project documents, and shared in workshops

2.3 Country-level assessments on food security conducted in at least five case study countries, with results shared in virtual meetings, in workshops, on the Portal, and in interim and final project documents

2.2 Results from the addressed issues/themes used by policymakers and other stakeholders to make faster and better decisions to deal with food security challenges as reflected in the programmes and policies implemented by the public and private sector and by civil society organisations

2.3 Documented outputs of the assessments and their use as inputs into policy and programme interventions

2.2 Collaborators are available with adequate capacity to conduct research and analysis on emerging food security challenges

2.3 Policymakers are receptive to results obtained from country-level assessments and opportunities to influence various policy windows through these assessments

challenges. Results shared in interim and final project reports
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities for Result 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Current information on food prices, production, consumption, stocks, markets and trade and on poverty and food security publicly available on the Food Security Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Development of a capacity strengthening and analytical toolbox for food security analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Development of collaborative spaces on the Food Security Portal to allow for discussion forums on emerging food security issues and the collection of up-to-date data and information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| policy researchers and analysts; sharing of results in targeted meetings, at regional workshops, on the Portal, and in interim and final project documents over the project period so as to contribute to long-term food security strategy development |

| collaborative research activities |

| 3.2 The study results yield learning materials (such as user guides) that are tested and shared with partners and used as global public goods for both participating and non-participating countries |

| 3.2 Number of learning materials based on country-specific knowledge of food security challenges that need to be addressed by policy makers when implementing policies to achieve food security in their country |

| 3.2 Policy makers work in close collaboration with policy analysts and are committed to developing and implementing appropriate food policy responses in their country |
**Activities for Result 2**

2.1 Dialogues, workshops, and two-way communication activities with key stakeholders to be identified and advisory needs formulated
2.2 Development of a basic set of data/information required for all participating countries
2.3 Identified needs (cf. 2.1) to lead to targeted assessments of the various food security challenges
2.4 Based on an assessment of the impacts of high food prices and other food security issues, country-specific risks and vulnerabilities to be determined

**Activities for Result 3**

3.1 Study and analysis results in specific countries to be finalised and shared widely with relevant country stakeholders
3.2 Research on various thematic issues, including the impact of crises on women, supply response, promotion of agricultural growth, and moving from emergency response to social protection
3.2 Courses and training workshops on emerging food security issues for building national capacity to respond effectively to food security challenges
ANNEX 7

ACTION FICHE FOR FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME COMPONENT 2: LINKING INFORMATION AND DECISION MAKING TO IMPROVE FOOD SECURITY RESPONSE STRATEGIES

‘REGIONAL PROGRAMME OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS IN FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION IN CENTRAL AMERICA’

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Regional Programme of Information Systems in Food Security and Nutrition in Central America Phase II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>EU contribution: € 2 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method /Management mode</td>
<td>Joint management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC-code</td>
<td>52010 Sector Food Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

This action is phase II of the PRESISAN programme, which had to be divided into two since funding was limited under the AAP 2008. PRESISAN was originally designed for a 5 million euro budget: the first 3 million were approved last year and the remaining 2 come under this action.

The Regional Programme of Information Systems in Food and Nutrition Security is based on the new Food Security Thematic Programme — FSTP, component two: ‘Linking information and decision-making to improve food security response strategies’, and contributes to the first Millennium Development Goal — MDG 1 — which aims to halve the number of people in hunger and extreme poverty by 2015 compared with 1990. To this end, it is proposed to improve aid effectiveness and devote financial resources to developing and improving specialised information systems for food and nutrition security / early warning systems to provide decision makers at local, national and regional levels in Central America with better tools to strengthen and develop more effective strategies and public policies to fight poverty and food insecurity.

At regional, national and local levels, specialised information systems in food and nutrition security (FNS) in Central America are still at the conceptual and developmental stage. Although isolated efforts have been undertaken, an integral strategy has not yet been developed.
A number of ongoing efforts have paved the way for the development of the FNS Information System (SIRSAN) by the General Secretariat of the Central American Integration System–(SG-SICA) and the European Commission, together with the Institute of Nutrition for Central America and Panama (INCAP) and regional organisations within the Regional Consultative Committee for the Promotion of FNS (CCR-SAN), currently comprising SISCA, (Secretariat for Central American Social Integration), CEPREDEMAC (Coordination Center for Disaster Prevention in Central America), CRRH (Regional Committee on Water Resources), S-CAC (General Secretary of the Agricultural Central American Council), BCIE (Central American Bank for Economic Integration), INCAP, S-CSUCA (Secretariat of the Central American Higher University Council), SG-CECC (General Secretariat of the Central American Education and Culture Council), SE-CCAD (Central American Environment and Development Council), OSPESCA (Organization of the Central American Isthmus Fishing and Aquiculture Sectors), SIECA and FEMICA, with INCAP (Federation of Central American Isthmus Municipalities) holding the technical secretariat. This model constitutes a pioneer undertaking, which has already been accepted and endorsed by different stakeholders. Although SIRSAN encompasses different stages, financial constraints have limited its implementation to an initial stage. The aim is to strengthen information generation at national level, to develop FNS information systems at municipal level, and to improve FNS information analysis in order to enhance decision-making in the development of FNS policies, plans, programmes and projects.

2.2. Lessons learnt

During implementation of the Regional Programme for Food and Nutrition Security for Central America — PRESANCA — a number of reflections emerged from external evaluation and monitoring activities and from internal analyses — looking at future interventions — undertaken by the EU Regional Delegation. In particular, the Mid-Term Evaluation of PRESANCA, conducted in September-October 2007, yielded some important recommendations, such as:

- The programme duration must be carefully assessed because regional programmes, due to longer consultation and consensus-reaching processes, also have longer implementation cycles as compared to national and local programmes.

- The implementation of FNS regional policies requires the region to be considered as a whole, otherwise their dialogue potential and impact will decrease. Policies may go from regional to national and local levels or vice versa.

- Specialised scholarship/work programmes in FNS to train human resources involved in decision-making is a new, highly recommended strategy; it contributes directly to capacity building and FNS policy endorsement at local level. This model, focusing on information systems, should be replicated at national and regional levels.

- It is important to have an improved intervention strategy differentiated by country in order to strengthen information gathering, analysis and processing at regional, national and local levels, because needs differ throughout the Central American region. Accordingly, FNS information systems should be considered the final result of work and analyses done by the participating beneficiaries in gradually identifying the potential of the information systems. It is up to the beneficiaries to promote the systems. In these initiatives, ‘promotion’ due to the ‘need’ of the donor has been identified as one of the most important causes of failure. The ‘need’ must originate within the beneficiaries in order to be sustainable, and, for this to happen, it is imperative to facilitate the ‘discovery’ process through a complete FNS programme.
2.3. Complementary actions

The present regional programme is related to other actions under the European Commission/FAO multi-country programme for linking information and decision-making to improve food security, which is funded under the present Annual Action Programme. Accordingly, a Memorandum of Understanding is to be established between the two programmes so as to exchange information and best practices with a view to aligning methodologies and allowing appropriate comparisons of food insecurity in all its aspects (ranging from production deficits to the need for imports, data on nutrition, assessment of livelihoods, etc.), on the basis of quality information systems developed in Central America and those developed in other parts of the world, namely Africa, Middle East and Asia.

Moreover, there are various FNS initiatives in some Central American countries which attempt to improve FNS from different perspectives and which contain limited information system components. The European Commission is supporting, among others, the following initiatives: in Guatemala, ‘Management and Education for Food Security and Nutrition in the Huista Community’, implemented by the NGO Action Against Hunger; in Honduras, the budget support programme ‘Programme Enhancing Food Security’ (PASAH); and in Nicaragua, the ‘Programme for Local Development and Food Security’ (PRODELSA). Other ongoing regional initiatives concerned with the development and strengthening of FNS information systems are:

i. Mesoamerican Food Security Early Warning System (MFEWS, USAID)
ii. Food aid programmes in emergency situations (WFP, USDA, ONG)
iii. Humanitarian aid programmes managed by ECHO and DIPECHO
iv. Programme supporting regional integration in Central America (EC — PAIRCA II)
v. PRÉSISAN
vi. PRESANCA

In relation to PRESANCA, it is worth mentioning that the current phase has been successfully concluded and a new phase is going to start. The main focus has been on four Central American countries: El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua. At regional level, the programme is linked to specialised regional institutions, in particular those forming part of the CCR-SAN, which also represents political and sectoral areas concerned with FNS. It aims to help improve food and nutrition security in Central America, targeting those areas with the most vulnerable populations, especially in El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua. It also contributes to the Central American regional integration process and the establishment of a coordinated regional agenda for food and nutrition security.

These goals are to be achieved through the following four expected results:

1. Reinforced FNS regional guidelines and national and local policies.
2. Analysis and follow-up capabilities developed to address non-FNS situations.
3. FNS` information systems established and strengthened at regional, national and local levels.
4. Food crises mitigated through financing of URD interventions.

A Mid-Term Evaluation carried out in 2007 highlighted that outcomes under result 3 were poor and that there was a need to invest more resources and effort in food and nutrition security information systems. SG-SICA and its Directorate for Information Systems have thus taken the first steps towards developing a FNS regional information system, which nevertheless requires further strengthening. The European Commission has provided
additional support through the Programme for Strengthening Central American Integration – PAIRCA — to SG-SICA and the Central American Economic Integration System — SIECA — in order to strengthen their information and technology areas. These mainly economic systems may be expected to provide analysis input for the FNS regional system.

2.4. Donor coordination

At the end of 2007, the European Commission proposed setting up a donor roundtable for regional cooperation to enable participants to discuss solutions to various sector problems, especially those requiring a coordinated approach, in order to increase impact and ensure consistency and harmonisation among donor strategies. Coordination at regional level is still in its infancy, but a forum was held in Tegucigalpa at the end of 2008 and a road map is being prepared by a technical group. Food safety will be a priority.

3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectives

Overall objective: To improve food security for the poorest and most vulnerable and to assist countries with a regional vision in achieving MDG 1, by effectively linking food security to decision-making.

Specific objective: To contribute to improving FNS decision-making at regional, national, and local levels (in prioritised areas) in Central America, through analysis, development/reinforcement and utilisation of information systems for the development of risk prevention and mitigation actions to address food and nutrition crises. These systems will be based on evidence of the determining factors and effects of food and nutrition insecurity and will support timely and relevant FNS intervention according to the vulnerability of Central American populations (promotion, prevention, mitigation and emergency response).

This programme continues actions under phase I of PRESISAN, as it shares the main objectives and activities, but also includes relevant new activities that complement those supported by phase I.

3.2. Stakeholders

The following beneficiaries have been identified: Central American organisations involved in this sector (SG-SICA and CCR-SAN56 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 concerned with FNS.

3.3. Expected results and main activities

As mentioned before, the expected results of this programme are the same as those for PRESISAN I, but the planned activities had to be distributed between the two programmes.

56 The CCR-SAN (Regional FNS Consultative Committee) is a regional inter-institutional/multisectoral coordinating mechanism for Central American integration. It has an Inter-Agency Forum and a Coordination Committee, currently representing SISCA, CEPREDENAC, CRRH, S-CAC, BCIE, INCAP, S-CSUCA, SG-CECC, SE-CCAD, OSPESCA, SIECA and FEMICA. It is also open to other regional organisations working in the same field.
The follow-up to the successful FNS actions supported by the European Commission in the Central American region calls for further implementation and strengthening of the intervention model developed by PRESANCA, while prioritising and strengthening key aspects for the generation of quantitative and qualitative FNS information and its analysis at regional, national and local levels, with the goal of enhancing decision-making processes.

The expected results, related activities and indicators are as follows:

**Expected result 1:** Analytical and follow-up capabilities to address food and nutrition security using specialised FNS information systems are strengthened.

**Main activities:**

1. Developing/strengthening sentinel areas and height-census methodologies to identify and monitor vulnerable groups in terms of FNS.
2. Development/implementation of sentinel areas in the region, to collect, follow up and analyse FNS and its determinants for monitoring and policy purposes, and to update the regional chronic malnutrition (stunting) map.
3. Developing and implementing a social communication and information plan for FNS issues to support social commitment and participation as well as resource mobilisation.
4. Developing mechanisms to strengthen, consolidate and extend the experiences of specialised forums (climate, epidemiological, financial-economic crisis, among others)

**Indicators:**

1.1 Strengthened role of the FNS Observatories (to be developed by PRESISAN I) in developing applied methodologies for the chronic malnutrition map (height census — stunting) and sentinel sites (territorial units in Central America) in order to follow up and analyse biological, climatic and socioeconomic determinants as well as the FNS effects of policies and programmes targeting vulnerable groups in Central America.

1.2 Establishment of mechanisms to develop FNS information, communication and education processes in order to strengthen FNS public policy decision-making at regional, national and local levels.

**Expected result 2:** FNS information systems for FNS decision-making at regional, national and local level are technically and technologically enhanced or reinforced.

**Main activities:**

2.1 Development of a linking mechanism to create a virtual community among participating regional, national and regional intuitions.

2.2 Implementation of information systems in other PRESANCA municipalities and ‘mancomunidades’ (PRESANCA II is increasing the number of municipalities it works with from 24 to around 55), based on the experiences with PRESISAN.
2.3 Development of mechanisms to conduct meta-analysis with information provided by different institutions and regional actors working on FNS initiatives.

**Indicators:**

2.1 Strengthened FNS information system at regional and local level, linked with other information providers at regional, national and local level.

2.2 Implementation of an FNS information system at municipal level in at least 60% of the municipalities where PRESANCA II operates.

2.3 Development/promotion of a linking mechanism to create a virtual community among regional and municipal institutions and countries working on FNS in different initiatives in the region.

**Expected result 3:** Human resources specialised in FNS with an emphasis on information systems at regional, national, and local levels.

**Main activities:**

3.1 Introduction of methodologies and training for FNS information systems in the curricula of at least six Central American universities.

3.2 Use of virtual education methods and holding of courses/seminars relating to FNS information generation, analysis and use for policy making.

**Indicators:**

3.1 The curricula of at least six Central American universities are revised and include FNS information system topics.

3.2 At least 200 technicians and programme managers have been trained in methodologies and technologies to generate, process, analyse and use information for public FNS policies.

**3.4. Implementation method**

On the basis of a Contribution Agreement between the United Nations Development Programme — UNDP — and the European Commission, the UNDP will in turn conclude a contract for implementation of the programme with SG-SICA and other specialised institutions. An ad-hoc technical team, under UNDP and associated with SG-SICA, will implement the programme on the basis of Annual Work Plans, which will be presented to and approved by the Delegation of the European Commission. A Follow-up Technical Committee to monitor the project will be established by UNDP, SG-SICA, PRESANCA and DEC.

**3.5. 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 levels.
• Different FNS approaches and views in the region regarding the use of information systems for decision-making purposes. This programme aims to harmonise and respect all FNS views in order to improve decision-making through the use of technological tools.

• The region and its governments take up the challenge of improving FNS as an instrument to combat poverty and hunger.

• Advances in Central American regional integration at sector level.

• Successful completion of PRESISAN I.

3.6. Cross-cutting issues

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

4. Implementation issues

4.1. Implementation method

Contribution agreement with an international organisation: the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

4.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

All contracts must be awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standards established and published by the international organisation involved.
### 4.3. Budget and calendar

Indicative budget for the programme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/activities</th>
<th>€</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Expected result: Analytical and follow-up capabilities to address food and nutrition security using specialised FNS information systems are strengthened.</strong></td>
<td>490 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Developing/strengthening sentinel areas and height-census methodologies to identify and monitor vulnerable groups in terms of FNS</td>
<td>230 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Developing and implementing a social communication and information plan for FNS issues to support social commitment and participation as well as resource mobilisation</td>
<td>170 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Developing mechanisms to strengthened, consolidate and extend the experiences of the FNS Observatories and specialised forums (climate, epidemiological, financial-economic crisis, among others)</td>
<td>90 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Expected result: FNS information systems for FNS decision-making at regional, national and local level are technically and technologically enhanced or reinforced</strong></td>
<td>400 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Development of a linking mechanism to create a virtual community among participating regional, national and regional institutions</td>
<td>120 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Implementation of information systems in other PRESANCA municipalities and ‘mancomunidades’ based on the experiences with PRESISAN</td>
<td>180 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Development of mechanisms to conduct meta-analysis with information provided by different institutions and regional actors working on FNS initiatives</td>
<td>100 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Expected result: Human resources specialised in FNS with an emphasis on information systems at regional, national, and local levels.</strong></td>
<td>190 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Introduction of methodologies and training for FNS information systems in the curricula of at least six Central American universities.</td>
<td>100 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Use of virtual education methods and holding of courses/seminars relating to FNS information generation, analysis and use for policy making</td>
<td>90 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Technical Assistance</strong></td>
<td>567 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Visibility and communication *</td>
<td>59 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Direct Costs UNDP</td>
<td>60 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1 766 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Indirect Costs UNDP (7 %)</strong></td>
<td>123 645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**8. Contingencies *****</td>
<td>30 005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL (Budget UNDP)</strong></td>
<td>1 920 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. EU Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>80 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2 000 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project (PRESISAN I + PRESISAN II) will be implemented over a period of **five years**.

Note: Regarding the remainder of the budget approved for PRESISAN, see Annex I (AF PRESISAN — AAP 2008)
4.4. **Performance monitoring**

The project will be closely monitored by the staff of the Nicaragua Delegation, via field trips and participation in different events. The key indicators will be 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. UNDP will implement additional monitoring systems to assess the progress of implementation.

4.5. **Evaluation and audit**

The programme will undergo a mid-term and a final evaluation. Audits will be carried out by UNDP. Moreover, verification missions may be conducted by the European Commission.

4.6. **Communication and visibility**

A strategy regarding information, communication and visibility will be prepared, both to submit results and to contribute to the general objective of the Programme.

Standards regarding visibility will be derived from the ‘EU visibility guidelines for external actions’ ([http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/visibility/index_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/visibility/index_en.htm)).
ANNEX I

ACTION FICHE FOR FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
COMPONENT 2: LINKING INFORMATION AND DECISION MAKING TO IMPROVE FOOD SECURITY RESPONSE STRATEGIES
‘REGIONAL PROGRAMME OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS IN FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION IN CENTRAL AMERICA’

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Regional Programme of Information Systems in Food Security and Nutrition in Central America DCI-FOOD 2008 / 149642</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>ECEU contribution: €3 000 000 Institute of Nutrition of Central America and Panama — INCAP — and other regional institutions associated with CCR-SAN: €300000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method /Management mode</td>
<td>Joint management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC-code</td>
<td>52010 Sector Food Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

The Regional Programme of Information Systems in Food and Nutrition Security is based on component two of the new Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP): ‘Linking information and decision-making to improve food security response strategies’ and contributes to the first Millennium Development Goal — MDG 1 — which aims to halve hunger and extreme poverty by 2015. To this end, it is proposed to improve aid effectiveness and devote financial resources to developing and improving specialised information systems for food and nutrition security / early warning systems to provide decision makers at local, national and regional levels in Central America with better tools in strengthen and develop more effective strategies and public policies to fight poverty and food insecurity.

At the regional, national and local levels, specialised information systems for food and nutrition security (FNS) in Central America are still at the conceptual and developmental stage. Thus, there is little useful information available to back the work of decision makers in the FNS sector (planning, health, agriculture, education, and water). Although isolated efforts have been undertaken, a complete strategy has so far not been developed, i.e. one truly capable of producing and analysing FNS data so as to enable a quick response to food security crises as well to prevent them. Consequently, the development and implementation of complete intervention policies and strategies would reduce the high chronic malnutrition rates affecting the Central American region.

Thanks to a number of ongoing efforts, the General Secretariat of the Central American Integration System — SG-SICA57 — and the European Commission, together with the

57 The Central American Integration System (SICA) is the institutional framework for Regional Central American Integration. It was established by Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, and Belize. The Dominican Republic is an associate member (see: http://www.sica.int/sica).
Institute of Nutrition for Central America and Panama (INCAP\textsuperscript{58}) and regional organisations within the Regional Consultative Committee for the Promotion of FNS (CCR-SAN), currently comprising SISCA\textsuperscript{59}, CEPREDENAC\textsuperscript{60}, CRRH\textsuperscript{61}, S-CAC\textsuperscript{62}, BCJE\textsuperscript{63}, INCAP, S-CSUCA\textsuperscript{64}, SG-CECC\textsuperscript{65}, SE-CCAD\textsuperscript{66}, OSPESCA\textsuperscript{67}, SIECA and FEMICA\textsuperscript{68}, with INCAP holding the technical secretariat, have been able to develop a Regional FNS Information System (SIRSAN) model, a pioneer undertaking that already has been accepted and endorsed by different stakeholders\textsuperscript{69}. Although SIRSAN encompasses different stages, financial constraints have limited its implementation to an initial stage. The aim is to strengthen information generation at national level, to develop FNS information systems at municipal level, and to improve FNS information analysis in order to enhance decision-making in the development of FNS policies, plans, programmes and projects.

2.2. Lessons learnt

During implementation of the Regional Programme of Food and Nutrition Security for Central America — PRESANCA\textsuperscript{60} — a number of reflections emerged from external evaluation and monitoring activities and from internal analyses — looking at future interventions — undertaken by the EURegional Delegation. In particular the Mid-Term Evaluation of PRESANCA, conducted in September-October 2007, yielded some important recommendations, such as:

- The programme duration must be carefully assessed because regional programmes, due to longer consultation and consensus-reaching processes, also have longer implementation cycles as compared to national and local programmes.

- The implementation of FNS regional policies requires the region to be considered as a whole, otherwise their dialogue potential and impact will decrease. Policies may go from regional to national and local levels or vice versa.

- Specialised scholarship/work programmes in FNS to train human resources involved in decision-making is a new, highly recommended strategy; it contributes directly to capacity building and FNS policy endorsement at local level. This model, focusing on information systems, should be replicated at national and regional levels.

- Although the FAO is the point of reference for global food and nutrition issues, INCAP should be considered the official organisation concerned with FNS public policies within the Central American region. Furthermore, INCAP is a recognised food and nutrition institution at regional and international level.

- It is important to have an improved intervention strategy differentiated by country in order to strengthen information gathering, analysis and processing at regional, national and local levels, because needs differ throughout the Central American region. Accordingly, FNS information systems should be considered the final result of work and analyses done by the participating beneficiaries in gradually identifying the potential of the information systems.

\textsuperscript{58} The Institute of Nutrition of Central America and Panama — INCAP — is the food and nutrition agency of the Pan-American Health Organisation PAHO/WHO and an institution of the Central American Integration System. It was founded in September 1949. Its Member States are Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, and the Dominican Republic (see: http://www.sica.int/incap).

\textsuperscript{59} Secretariat for Central American Social Integration.

\textsuperscript{60} Coordination Centre for Disaster Prevention in Central America.

\textsuperscript{61} Regional Committee on Water Resources.

\textsuperscript{62} General Secretary of the Agricultural Central American Council.

\textsuperscript{63} Central American Bank for Economic Integration.

\textsuperscript{64} Secretariat of the Central American Higher University Council.

\textsuperscript{65} General Secretariat of the Central American Education and Culture Council.

\textsuperscript{66} Central American Environment and Development Council.

\textsuperscript{67} Organisation of the Central American Isthmus Fishing and Aquiculture Sectors.

\textsuperscript{68} Federation of Central American Isthmus Municipalities.

\textsuperscript{69} INCAP and CCR-SAN.

PRESANCA emerged from the interest expressed by political and technical, national and regional bodies, and the experiences acquired 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 ).
It is up to the beneficiaries to promote the systems. In these initiatives, ‘promotion’ due to the ‘need’ of the donor has been identified as one of the most important causes of failure. The ‘need’ must originate within the beneficiaries in order to be sustainable, and, for this to happen, it is imperative to facilitate the ‘discovery’ process through a complete FNS programme.

2.3. Complementary actions

The present regional programme complements other actions under the European Commission/FAO multi-country programme for linking information and decision-making to improve food security, which is funded under the present Annual Action Programme. Accordingly, a Memorandum of Understanding will be established between the two programmes so as to exchange information and best practices with a view to aligning methodologies and allowing appropriate comparisons of food insecurity in all its aspects (ranging from production deficits to the need for imports, data on nutrition, assessment of livelihoods, etc.), on the basis of quality information systems developed in Central America and those developed in other parts of the world, namely Africa, Middle East and Asia.

Moreover, there are various FNS initiatives in some Central American countries which attempt to improve FNS from different perspectives and which contain limited information system components. The European Commission is supporting, among others, the following initiatives: in Guatemala, ‘Management and Education for Food Security and Nutrition in the Huista Community’, implemented by the NGO Action Against Hunger; in Honduras, the budget support programme ‘Programme Enhancing Food Security’ (PASAH); and in Nicaragua, the ‘Programme for Local Development and Food Security’ (PRODELSA). Other ongoing regional initiatives concerned with the development and strengthening of FNS information systems are:

- Mesoamerican Food Security Early Warning System (MFEWS, USAID)
- Food aid programmes in emergency situations (WFP, USDA, ONG)
- Humanitarian aid programmes managed by ECHO and DIPECHO
- Programme supporting regional integration in Central America (EC — PAIRCA)
- FNS surveillance, monitoring and assessment programme, INCAP.

At present, a Central American Regional FNS Programme — PRESANCA — is being successfully implemented with a special focus on four Central American countries, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua. At regional level, this programme is linked to INCAP and CCR-SAN, which also represent regional political and technical institutions. It aims to help improve food and nutrition security among the most vulnerable populations of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua. It also contributes to the Central American regional integration process and the establishment of a coordinated regional agenda for food and nutrition security.

These goals are to be achieved through the following four outcomes:

5. Reinforced FNS regional guidelines and national and local policies.
6. Analysis and follow-up capabilities developed to address non-FNS situations.
7. FNS information systems established and strengthened at regional, national and local levels.
8. Food crises mitigated through financing of URD interventions.

The Mid-Term Evaluation carried out in 2007 highlighted that results under outcome 3 were poor and that there was a need to invest more resources and effort in food and nutrition security information systems. The new programme would use a methodology led by INCAP. For this reason, and at PRESANCA’s request, INCAP, together with SG-SICA and its Directorate for Information Systems, have taken the first steps towards developing a regional FNS information system, which nevertheless requires further strengthening. This has been possible thanks to the European Commission, which provided additional support through the Programme for Strengthening Central American Integration — PAIRCA — to SG-SICA and the Central American Economic Integration System — SIECA — in order to strengthen their information and technology areas. These mainly economic systems may be expected to provide analysis input for the FNS regional system.

---
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2.4. Donor coordination

The EC’s cooperation with the region currently spans the RSP 2002-2006 and the RSP 2007-2013. It encompasses various topics, enabling a continuous dialogue with the integration bodies that make up SICA. Timely communication facilitates the efficient and effective management of different thematic priorities.

At the end of 2007, the European Commission proposed setting up a donor roundtable for regional cooperation to enable participants to discuss solutions to various sector problems, especially those requiring a coordinated approach in order to increase impact and ensure consistency and harmonisation among donor strategies.

3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectives

**Overall objective:** To improve food security for the poorest and most vulnerable and to assist countries with a regional vision in achieving MDG 1, by effectively linking food security to decision-making.

**Specific objective:** To contribute to improving FNS decision-making at regional, national, and local levels (in prioritised areas) in Central America, through analysis, development/reinforcement, and utilisation of information systems for the development of risk prevention and mitigation actions to address food and nutrition crises. These systems will be based on evidence of the determining factors and effects of food and nutrition insecurity and will support timely and relevant FNS interventions according to the vulnerability of the Central American populations (promotion, prevention, mitigation and emergency response).

3.2. Stakeholders

The following beneficiaries have been identified: Central American organisations involved in this sector (SG-SICA, INCAP, and CCR-SAN 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 concerned with FNS.

3.3. Expected results and main activities

The follow-up to the successful FNS actions supported by the European Commission in the Central American Region calls for further implementation and strengthening of the intervention model developed by PRESANCA, while prioritising and strengthening key aspects for the generation of quantitative and qualitative FNS information and its analysis at regional, national, and local levels, with the goal of enhancing decision-making processes.

The expected results, related activities and indicators are as follows:

**Outcome 1:** Analytical and follow-up capabilities to address food and nutrition security using specialised FNS information systems are strengthened.

**Main activities:**

i. Setting up regional, national, and local FNS observatories and promoting the exchange of successful experiences, through technical assistance, capacity building and training.

ii. Using methodologies and techniques to generate, manage, analyse and disseminate FNS indicators through training and sharing of experiences.

**Indicators:**

72 CCR-SAN (Regional FNS Consultative Committee) is a regional inter-institutional/multisectoral coordinating mechanism for Central American integration. It has an Inter-Agency Forum and a Coordination Committee, currently representing 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.
i. One Central America Observatory for FNS and four related national forums on specific aspects are set up. At least eight local observatories are strengthened.

ii. At least six FNS regional institutions (CCR-SAN), four SICA-country statistical and planning offices and twenty members of municipality planning units and decision makers develop capabilities to use FNS information.

Outcome 2: FNS information systems for FNS decision-making at regional, national and local level are technically and technologically enhanced or reinforced.

Main activities:

i. Development and establishment of an integrated FNS information system through technical assistance, capacity building and training.

ii. Technical capacity building to process, analyse and disseminate FNS indicator information.

Indicators:

i. A regional FNS information system based on the current Regional Information System (SIRSAN) is strengthened.

ii. Eight border municipalities in SICA member countries have access to information system mechanisms and to information via virtual means.

iii. Development/promotion of software and technological and methodological tools to generate, process, analyse and disseminate FNS information. One regional and four national units equipped with hardware, if necessary.

Outcome 3: Human resources specialised in FNS with an emphasis on information systems at regional, national, and local levels.

Main activities:

i. Design and implementation of specialised FNS programmes on information systems at technical and post-graduate levels (work-study programme).

ii. Development of human resources training programmes, with special emphasis on methodologies and technologies.

Indicators:

i. At least eight professionals have completed a specialised degree in FNS and Local Development.

ii. At least sixteen municipal technicians have completed specialised studies on FNS and Local Development.

iii. At least twenty policy makers, managers, professionals and technicians at regional, national and local levels have been trained in methodologies and technologies to generate, process, analyse, and use information for the development of public FNS policies.

3.4. Implementation method

On the basis of a Contribution Agreement between the United Nations Development Programme — UNDP — and the European Commission, the UNDP will in turn conclude a contract for implementation of the programme with INCAP and other specialised institutions, and with SG-SICA as the body with political responsibility. An ad-hoc technical team, under UNDP and associated with INCAP and SG-SICA, will implement the programme on the basis of Annual Work Plans, which will be presented to and approved by the Delegation of the European Commission. A Follow-up Technical Committee to monitor the project will be established by UNDP, INCAP, SG-SICA, PRESANCA and DEC.

3.5. 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 levels.

- Different FNS approaches and views in the region regarding the use of information systems for decision-making purposes. This programme aims to harmonise and respect all FNS views in order to improve decision-making through the use of technological tools.

- The region and its governments take up the challenge of improving FNS as an instrument to combat poverty.
• Advances in Central American regional integration at sector level.

3.6. Cross-cutting issues

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

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Implementation method

Joint management through the signature of an agreement with an international organisation, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

4.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

All contracts must be awarded and implemented in agreement with the procedures and standard established and published by the international organisation involved.

4.3. Budget and calendar

Indicative budget for the programme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/activities</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>Local Cont.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1:</strong> Analytical and follow-up capabilities, regarding food and nutrition security on the basis of specialized FNS information systems, are strengthened.</td>
<td>€ 400,000</td>
<td>€ 100,000</td>
<td>€ 500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Set up regional, national, and local FNS observatories and promote the exchange of successful experiences, through technical assistance, capacity building and training.</td>
<td>€ 250,000</td>
<td>€ 250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the use of methodologies and techniques to generate, manage, analyze and disseminate FNS indicators by training and sharing of experiences.</td>
<td>€ 150,000</td>
<td>€ 150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 2:</strong> FNS information systems for FNS decision making purposes at regional, national and local level are technically and technologically enhanced or reinforced</td>
<td>€ 750,000</td>
<td>€ 750,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Development and establishment of an integrated FNS information system through technical assistance, capacity building and training.</td>
<td>€ 500,000</td>
<td>€ 500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Technical capacity building to process, analyze and disseminate FNS indicator information.</td>
<td>€ 250,000</td>
<td>€ 250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 3:</strong> Human resources specialized in FNS with emphasis on information systems at regional, national, and local levels.</td>
<td>€ 600,000</td>
<td>€ 100,000</td>
<td>€ 700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Design and implementation of specialized FNS programmes on information systems at technical and post-graduate levels (work-study programme).</td>
<td>€ 500,000</td>
<td>€ 500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Development of a human resources training programmes, with special emphasis on</td>
<td>€ 100,000</td>
<td>€ 100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Assistance</strong></td>
<td>€ 100,000</td>
<td>€ 100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Coordination Unit</strong></td>
<td>€ 640,000</td>
<td>€ 100,000</td>
<td>€ 740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auditories</strong></td>
<td>€ 30,000</td>
<td>€ 30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visibility and Communication</strong></td>
<td>€ 90,000</td>
<td>€ 90,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>€ 2,810,000</td>
<td>€ 2,810,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Costs UNDP (7%)</strong></td>
<td>€ 182,700</td>
<td>€ 182,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluations and Audit UE</strong></td>
<td>€ 150,000</td>
<td>€ 150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contingencies</strong>*</td>
<td>€ 57,300</td>
<td>€ 57,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>€ 3,000,000</td>
<td>€ 300,000</td>
<td>€ 3,300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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 three years, starting from the date of signature of the Financing Agreement.

4.4. Performance monitoring

The project will be closely monitored by the staff of the Nicaragua Delegation, via field trips and participation in different events. The key indicators will be 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. UNDP will implement additional monitoring systems to assess the progress of implementation.

4.5. Evaluation and audit
The programme will undergo a mid-term and a final evaluation. Audits will be carried out by UNDP. Moreover, verification missions may be conducted by the European Commission.

4.6. Communication and visibility
A strategy regarding information, communication and visibility will be prepared, both to submit results and to contribute to the general objective of the Programme.

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 THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
COMPONENT 2: LINKING INFORMATION AND DECISION MAKING TO IMPROVE FOOD SECURITY RESPONSE STRATEGIES

SUPPORT FOR STRENGTHENING OF THE NATIONAL FOOD SECURITY INFORMATION SYSTEM IN TAJIKISTAN’

1. IDENTIFICATION

| Title/Number | Support for Strengthening of the National Food Security Information System in Tajikistan  
DCI-FOOD/2009/021-856 |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Total cost  | Total cost of the project: €2,000,000  
EU contribution: €2,000,000 | |
| Aid method / Method of implementation | Project approach — centralised direct/joint management with the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) |
| DAC-code   | 52010 | Sector | Food Security |

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

Food is the principal item (62% on average) in the consumption basket for the majority of households in Tajikistan, particularly for the poorest. National food and nutrition surveys indicate consistently high food insecurity rates among the population and access to food rather than availability remains the main issue characterising the food security situation in Tajikistan. The country depends to a large extent on food imports to cover its needs in grain, flour and other basic items. Rising world food and fuel prices in 2007 led to higher transportation and food costs across the country. Unfavourable weather conditions, including droughts, the cold spell in 2007–2008 and other types of natural calamities, affect the ability of many poor households to gain food security. The experience of past decades demonstrates that household food security is highly vulnerable to global food price fluctuations and to natural and man-made calamities (drought, flooding, desertification), which are tending to intensify due to climate change.

Tajik agriculture is characterised by low levels of productivity. It had long been oriented to a cotton monoculture, with the government exercising profound interference in the sector, including setting targets for allocating land under cotton for private producers in the recent past. With support from the donor community, the government now seems resolved to change the current state of affairs in agriculture by creating a functioning land market and favourable conditions for the development of private farms. Six high-level working groups, including
representatives of donor agencies, were created in July 2009 to work on key parameters of agrarian reform. This is seen as a window of opportunity to restructure agriculture towards enhancing food security in the country and at the same time creating gainful employment in sectors of agriculture other than cotton. One of the key needs of the farming community is access to timely and reliable market information and trade development support.

The policy framework for food security at national level in Tajikistan consists of the following main documents:

- Poverty Reduction Strategy of the Republic of Tajikistan for the period 2007-2009;
- National Development Strategy of the Republic of Tajikistan for the period up to 2015;
- Food Security Programme for the period up to 2015.

In 2006, the government established a food security working group (FSWG) consisting of middle-level officials representing various government ministries and agencies. The FSWG is chaired by the Minister of Economy and Trade and its main functions are: collection and coordination of information related to food security; preparation and development of legislation and food security programmes; developing mechanisms and monitoring the food security programme. Despite the existence of the FSWG, Tajikistan lacks a coherent system for coordinating, monitoring and evaluating the food and nutrition security situation in the country. This stems from unclear mandates, differences in priorities among the FSWG members, system rigidities, lack of communication among the various government sectors involved, and insufficient human and financial resources.

A Food Security Bulletin is published quarterly by the State Statistics Committee (SSC), which participates in the FSWG. Despite the large volume of data and information provided, the publication lacks overall coherence, does not analyse causes of food insecurity and does not provide policy recommendations. The Committee, the Ministry of Agriculture and other agencies involved in data collection use outdated techniques and methodologies.

The experience with the harsh winter of 2007-2008 in Tajikistan and the difficulties and delays in obtaining adequate situation assessments point to the need to improve early warning, monitoring and information systems for food security in Tajikistan. While the country remains vulnerable to global food price fluctuations, emergencies and disasters, there are serious difficulties in assessing domestic food production capacity and market development.

In recent years, the international community has conducted a number of ad hoc crop assessments, as well as surveys on food security and nutrition, in order to partly fill the existing information gaps. Most organisations involved in agricultural and food security interventions maintain small-scale databases and have set up data collection mechanisms for specific programme sectors and areas. However, an information system based on national institutions could provide regular and reliable data on food production and market development so that problems of access to food and nutrition can be better and more quickly identified. Such an information system should complement and feed into the general statistical data for which the State Statistics Committee is responsible.

This project is intended to support the relevant national bodies in meeting the needs of key users, such as all levels of the government, farmers, traders, development agencies, for timely and reliable information and analyses on agricultural production, and for market information on agricultural products and inputs. In the context of the ongoing reforms and diversification
in agriculture, the 32000+ private farms are in need of real-time and reliable information on prices and trends in domestic markets. The government and the international community will benefit from more reliable information, forecasting and analysis on agricultural production and other key parameters of food security. The project will also strengthen the link between the FSIS and policy making through support for relevant national institutions, including the FSWG and other stakeholders.

2.2. Lessons learnt

Initial steps to develop an FSIS were taken in 2006 by FAO through the ‘food security information for action’ facility (European Commission/FAO Food Security programme Phase II ‘Food Security Information for Action’ — €300000). The project’s overall objective was to strengthen national capacity for the collection, analysis and dissemination of food security information for policy formulation. The programme partly achieved its objectives, but further support was required to institutionalise the system within the relevant government departments. However, since the end of the project (2007), no additional funding has been provided by the government or development partners. Lessons learned from this and other projects (including EU experience in developing FSIS systems in the ACP countries) include:

1. Importance of an effective coordination mechanism to ensure consensus between stakeholders (not only national institutions but also international partners) on the analysis of the food security situation AND on actions to be take to address the problems.

2. Financial sustainability: A food security information system is quite expensive to set up (the development phase is generally financed by donors), but also quite expensive to run. The budget for such a system (capital investment and current expenditure) should be carefully designed. Agreement from the Ministry of Finance to allocate additional resources to run the system would be a prerequisite before starting to set up the system. As far as possible, the FSIS must be embedded in already existing structures.

3. Technical sustainability: The development of questionnaires, data collection, processing and analysis require technical skills that in most cases need to be developed. An FSIS must be accompanied by a ‘Support for Capacity Development Programme’, starting with a thorough institutional capacity assessment.

4. Ownership supported by demand: Both the public and the private sectors should have a direct interest in such a system. If there is no demand for the information and analysis generated by the system, the system will not be sustainable. Therefore, a thorough ‘client’ consultation process defining what type of information and analysis, who for and what for should be integrated in the development phase of the system.

5. Confidence and trust: The information and analysis generated by the system should be accurate and reliable. In many FSIS, data collection and data analysis are carried out by different agencies or institutions. It is recommended that the analysis part of the system should be undertaken by independent bodies such as research institutes and/or think tanks.

6. Flexibility and responsiveness: A ‘market’-oriented FSIS should be developed in order to respond quickly to demand, whether from the public sector (policy decisions) or from the private sector (market decisions).
Last but not least: both horizontal linkages and vertical linkages are important, in particular between institutions that run information systems and decision-makers (information needs to feed effectively into decision-making processes).

2.3. Complementary actions

AAP 2009: Private Sector Development (PSD)

Support for PSD is one of the three priority sectors supported by the EU Delegation in Tajikistan. In the AAP 2009, EU support for PSD will consist in: (1) improving the business-enabling environment by enhancing the strategic, legal and regulatory framework for PSD as well as the government’s capacity to implement reforms; (2) enhancing private sector capacity to advocate reform and to access adequate financial products and business development services for SMEs; and (3) increasing the competitiveness of the agro-processing sector to ensure comparative business advantages and good potential for poverty reduction.

In this regard, the FSIS with its Market Information System component as proposed here will play an instrumental role in achieving objective three of the EU Support for PSD programme.

TACIS 2006: SENAS (Support for the Establishment of a National Agricultural Advisory Service)

The purpose of this project is to launch an agricultural advisory system in Tajikistan through a bottom-up development process. The participation of these extension service units in the FSIS/MIS will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the system and strengthen links between farmers, the agri-business community and policy makers.

FSP 2006: Food Security Budget Support Programme

One of the conditions set in the programme was the publication by the State Statistics Committee (SSC) of a quarterly bulletin on food security and poverty-related data. The SSC has met this condition by publishing a bulletin comprising 70 pages organised around the three aspects of food security — availability, access and food use. This bulletin will be improved under the proposed FSIS.

WFP — Quarterly Food Security Bulletin

Once per quarter, WFP publishes a food security bulletin outlining the food security situation in the country in terms of access, availability and nutrition. In practice, the WFP and SSC bulletins duplicate each other and there are data discrepancies between them. The project will integrate best practices from both and will build consensus on situation assessment among these and other actors.

EU — Joint Research Centre, Agriculture, Rural Development and Fisheries

In collaboration with WFP, a Joint Research Centre mission visited Tajikistan in September 2009 in order to carry out an ‘IPC survey’. IPC (Integrated Food Security Phase Classification) is a standardised scale describing the food security situation in a given country according to 5 levels: 1 - generally food-secure, 2 - moderate/borderline food-insecure, 3 - acute food and livelihood crisis, 4 - humanitarian emergency, 5 - famine/humanitarian
catastrophe. This process will be continued in order to arrive at criteria and classification mechanisms agreed by various stakeholders.

2.4. Donor coordination

Since food security is broad and multidimensional, coordination among donors and the government has been primarily through the process of preparing the NDS (2006-2015) and PRSP (2007-2009). The Donor Coordination Council created in December 2005 has communicated donor concerns and inputs to the government. The EU has played a proactive role in this process, providing input to a number of discussion topics, including land reform and the cotton debt crisis. Discussion on pressing issues of food security is also ongoing in the course of preparing the Joint Country Support Strategy by the government and 13 donor organisations working in Tajikistan.

A number of UN agencies and international NGOs cooperate within the ‘Food Security Cluster’ to coordinate assessment and responses to food security challenges. Nevertheless, current interventions in the area of FSIS remain scattered or uncoordinated and do not respond to medium- or long-term needs in terms of food security. Most activities are linked closely to the need to respond effectively to short-term emergency needs of affected communities.

The project, through its stakeholders and technical assistance, will establish systematic links with other food security initiatives. Particularly relevant, as regards overall EU intervention to support food security in Tajikistan, are:

1. Other EU-funded food security initiatives implemented by both government and non-government agencies;

2. Food security interventions by other donor agencies in the country, notably the DFID, EBRD, USAID, WFP, UNDP and similar initiatives for ensuring food security, especially those with a long-term development perspective. Synergies will be established with WFP’s Food Security Monitoring System and UNDP’s Disaster Risk Management Programme.

3. The FAO Food Security Information for Action Programme, based in Rome, will pilot and test a series of food security tools that could be utilised by the project and mainstreamed within the institutions participating in the project. This will include the GIEWS Workstation (an internet geographic information system mapping tool for food security and early warning data management), the Crop Monitoring Box (an automated software suite that analyses weather data to assess their impact on crop production), and Country STAT (a system for organising and disseminating statistical data and metadata on food and agriculture). Furthermore, the project will provide technical assistance to promote, in particular, a platform for food security policy dialogue based on the information generated by the project.

4. Technical and financial support from the Global Monitoring for Food Security (GMFS), a consortium of 12 companies sponsored by the European Space Agency, could also be considered. GMFS is part of a wider initiative entitled Global Monitoring of Environmental Systems (GMES), which aims to provide services for improving the accessibility of environment-related information and products.
3. **DESCRIPTION**

3.1. **Objectives**

The **overall objective** of this project is to contribute to alleviating poverty and improving the living standards of the people of Tajikistan in line with the objectives and priorities of the National Development Strategy 2007-2015 and the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper 2007-2009.

**The specific objectives of the project are:** 1) to establish and strengthen information systems for food security in order to improve the quality of food security and relief interventions and to assist the government of Tajikistan and its international development partners to effectively respond to the short-, medium- and long-term food security needs of the population; 2) to improve market information systems and services to promote the development of private-sector agriculture and trade.

3.2. **Expected results and main activities**

**Expected result 1:** A suitable methodology for evaluating crop extent is defined. This methodology will be documented with guidelines specifying actions required for estimating with sufficient accuracy the extent of the cultivated land. The proposed methods for crop/agricultural land estimates are listed below:

1. Field surveys carried out using traditional methods.

2. GPS-assisted field surveys. This method will define suitable survey schemes using GPS (e.g. area frame sampling). Sample data will be collected at regular distance intervals. Each GPS point will be associated with data on types of land use. In the case of cultivated land, the crops grown will be listed. Where necessary, this activity could be further supported/complemented by the analysis of high-resolution satellite data (i.e. SPOT 5), which can be used to verify the appropriateness of the sample intervals and the accuracy of the information reported for each sample.

3. High- and medium-resolution data from selected remote sensing systems. Different remote-sensed images (optical and radar) at a relatively high resolution (between 1 and 20 m) will be provided by GMFS and other sources for estimating crop extent for selected samples. These estimates will be validated by field surveys carried out through other means (points 1 and 2). The estimates of sample areas will then be used to calibrate and validate the estimates derived from the analysis of remote sensing data (optical and radar) extended to areas of the country not surveyed by other methods. Most of the image processing tasks will be carried out by GMFS, which will also provide software tools and adequate training in techniques and methodologies for deriving crop extent maps.

In order to optimise time and resources, the implementation of methods 1, 2 and 3 will be carried out in such a way as to ensure that the data collected through one method can be used for implementing the other methods. At the end of this initial phase, the results will be compared and reviewed by the stakeholders and technical assistance providers. Modifications and improvements to the methods will be decided as appropriate (e.g. increase in the number of sample sites; higher density of points collected by GPS; etc.) and surveying/processing will be carried out accordingly. A series of consultative meetings/workshops will be held to agree
on implementation strategies to estimate crop acreage. The agreed methodologies will be
implemented during the second year of the project. Better coordination between SSC and
MoA will be facilitated in order to reach agreement on a common methodology for crop area
estimates. Improved capacity in the use of the proposed technologies can assist the data
producers in obtaining more accurate estimates.

Activities:

1.1 Collect baseline information on crop calendar, topography, etc.
1.2 Select sample sites for crop area estimates
1.3 Acquire images (c/o GMFS)
1.4 Have full survey of selected sample sites carried out by SSC and MoA staff
1.5 Process collected data/satellite images and generate crop area estimates
1.6 Compare results with outcomes generated by other methods
1.7 Hold consultations to agree on most suitable methods to maximise use of
resources for crop acreage estimates
1.8 Operationalise the approved methodology and apply to larger parts of the
country.

Expected result 2: Improved agro-meteorological data management and crop yield forecasts.

The project will provide inputs to improve on current data computerisation, management and
sharing. This will be implemented by establishing an adequate Data Base Management
System (DBMS), creating a suitable database and providing inputs for compilation of the
required data. Training will be provided to the technical staff to ensure efficient management
and use of the data. Remote sensing data for yield forecasts will be introduced and national
staff will be trained in their use. Tools for analysis of the data will be introduced as
appropriate.

Activities:

2.1 Review current procedures for data collection, entry and processing
2.2 Purchase relevant hardware and software, as required
2.3 Introduce and set up tools and methodologies for processing remote sensing and
ground station data at the National Hydrometeorology office
2.4 Make proper arrangements for computerisation of the required data
2.5 Train national staff in the use of the database and yield forecasts through on-the-
job training and national workshops.

Expected result 3: Standardised food security and early warning data and definitions are
made available through adequate information systems.

Activities:

3.1 Install the computer, databases and information systems, where necessary, e.g.
the GIEWS Workstation and Country STAT
3.2 Assist national staff in implementing the information systems
3.3 Adapt the GIEWS Workstation and Country STAT to national needs
3.4 Define and adopt data standards to facilitate the sharing of data among
stakeholders
3.5 Train national staff in the use of the software tools
**Expected result 4:** Improved capacity to analyse food security information and formulate effective response policies and strategies to prevent food crises and reduce chronic food insecurity.

A national institution (to be) mandated by the government to analyse food security information and formulate policy recommendations will be identified together with the relevant government agencies. This institution should be independent from agencies collecting data and should have the mandate and authority to influence policy making. The institution’s capacity to use the tools mentioned above and to analyse information will be strengthened. The project will advise the government on the appropriate set-up to link food security analysis with policy making, with the emphasis on integration with key national development strategies such as PRSP rather than creating separate strategies for food security alone. This is based on the understanding shared by the majority of stakeholders that tackling poverty is the key to ensuring food security in Tajikistan.

**Expected result 5:** Improved communication and collaboration among national and international stakeholders.

Activities:

5.1 Organisation of workshops to discuss possible solutions for implementing a national data infrastructure (i.e. selection of tools, database schema and management system, communication systems, means and rules for distributing/sharing data, etc.)

5.2 Facilitate meetings and seminars for periodically reviewing the state of activities, achievements and results

**Expected result 6:** Improved access to timely market prices for key commodities through a better collection and dissemination system. This system will be made operational, during year 1, in selected branch offices in order to catalyse information collected by SSC and MoA.

This output is complementary to EU-funded activities in the area of private sector development, as it will provide farmers and traders with access to timely market information for effective marketing.

Activities:

6.1 Establish/strengthen communication facilities in selected branch offices (mainly telephone and internet) to allow electronic data transmission to the SSC HQs.

6.2 Establish a technical working group consisting of representatives of the SSC and MoA and other relevant stakeholders. The working group will:
   a) Define tools and methodologies for data collection and transmission to the branch offices (distribution and size of the sample to be collected and processed; frequency of the survey; modalities and timeline for the transmission of information);
   b) State commodities to be monitored on a regular basis;
   c) Define pre-processing activities to be undertaken at the branch offices (i.e. data quality control);
   d) Determine frequency of data transmission to SSC HQs;
   e) Establish format and content of the database.

6.3 Provide support to the SSC for improving the existing database and setting up a new database where necessary, together with its applications.
6.4 Assist SSC and MoA and other relevant stakeholders in data analysis for food security and market developments
6.5 Provide tools and technical advice on dissemination systems such as electronic bulletins, websites and publications to efficiently convey data and results of analyses to stakeholders, including farmers and traders.

**Expected result 7: Increased understanding of emerging food security, agriculture and related issues such as market trends in new initiatives, such as the Productive and Social Safety Net Programmes**

The extent and depth of poverty and food insecurity in Tajikistan calls for more systematic studies to improve national capacity in the formulation of food security policies and actions. This project therefore aims to increase the understanding of food security, agriculture and related issues in current government policies and strategies such as the National Development Strategy, the Poverty Reduction Strategy and the Agrarian Policy Concept, which aim to tackle food security problems in a longer-term perspective.

To this end, the project will provide resources to undertake detailed studies on food security matters. The scope of the studies will have to be consistent with the themes covered by the project and will be decided by stakeholder representatives with the support of technical assistance provided by the project. One of the subjects of interest could be studying the economic viability and prospects of cultivating certain common crops (cost-benefit analysis) such as wheat, taking into account the regional context, i.e. production and trade with neighbouring countries.

Activities:

7.1 Undertake detailed studies on specific food security, agriculture and related issues identified in the course of the project.

The project approach is based on a number of principles, in particular: a) the promotion of a multi-stakeholder approach to food security data generation and analysis; b) ownership by national and local institutions over the process of data generation and analysis through systematic capacity building and institution development efforts; c) the search for innovative approaches to ensure the sustainability of different ways of data generation, processing and analysis, while addressing existing methodological, institutional and organisational shortcomings; d) stronger linkages between project activities and other related initiatives undertaken by other stakeholders as well as with the wider policy context for poverty reduction. This will require a flexible, transparent and open-ended approach to project implementation under the guidance of the multi-stakeholder group and specific technical assistance providers.

*Particular attention will be given to ensuring that food security information and analysis are shared in a more comprehensive, systematic and regular manner among concerned stakeholders for effective policy/strategy responses.*

The project intends to build or consolidate the data sharing infrastructure by creating the conditions for an institutional and collaborative framework as the cohesive substratum for information flow. The standardisation of methods, data formats and tools is one of the essential elements for establishing a data sharing network. Key institutions in the country
concerned with food security analysis will be involved in the selection, installation and use of tools and databases. Food security-related tools such as the GIEWS Workstation and Country STAT will be introduced in order to best address the country’s analytical and data management needs. The tools will be adapted as needed to better reflect the data management and analytical requirements of the country. Extensive training at different levels of the decision-making process (i.e. technicians, analysts, decision makers, etc.) will be provided on the use of tools, databases and methodologies for data collection and processing.

*Regional dimension*

In addition, the project will link with similar efforts in neighbouring countries, e.g. Kyrgyzstan and Afghanistan, with the strategic aim of strengthening information sharing at regional level. Possibilities will be explored for regular exchanges of data on production and markets to promote food security and cross-border trade at regional level.

Activities to be implemented under the project will be refined and detailed during the inception phase — the first three months — based on a thorough capacity and needs assessment.

### 3.3. Risks and assumptions

The risks include possible disagreements and conflicts of interest among the main data-generating institutions. This may hinder the smooth implementation of activities, causing delays and some disruptions. Another risk is the continuing lack of financial resources allocated to the Ministry of Agriculture and other government agencies to carry out their core functions. This may call into question the uptake and effective utilisation of the capacities to be acquired in the course of the project. Engagement with government institutions should be based on a broad consensus between key stakeholders and on a shared understanding of objectives and implementation methods. In designing capacity building activities for government agencies, care should be taken to ensure that financial resources are available to maintain processes initiated with project support.

The government identifies food security as one of its national priorities, along with energy security and breaking from transport isolation. This commitment at the highest level does not necessarily translate into the same level of commitment and ownership at the middle and local levels of government. The project will need continued support at political level as well as a well-thought-out approach to engage mid-level officials and government technical experts.

Mitigation measures will include a careful institutional analysis, a detailed information user needs assessment and identification with stakeholders of an acceptable FSIS architecture to ensure that the project responds to real needs. The project will build as much as possible on existing structures and processes to minimise associated financial risks. Dialogue at policy level will be maintained to ensure continued political support.

Coordination will be a major challenge given the number and diversity of stakeholders involved. Appropriate coordination mechanisms will be developed to ensure synergies with other initiatives and the effectiveness of interventions.

### 3.4. Cross-cutting issues

The project will support the environmental sustainability of Tajik agriculture by promoting integrated watershed management and organic cultivation approaches when and where feasible, but also by promoting dialogue and cooperation on the broad topic of food security. The close links between food security, natural resource management, climate change and
livelihoods will be emphasised and awareness will be raised at every opportunity. The key message will be to highlight the impossibility of reaching the national goal of food security without reversing the ongoing degradation of natural resources in Tajikistan, including soils, natural vegetation and water sources. The capacity- and institution-building components of the project will promote better governance practices with the accent on information sharing and cooperation.

A positive impact can be expected on gender and children, as the ability of the government and its partners to respond to immediate, medium- and long-term food security needs will be strengthened. Currently, children are negatively affected by insufficient access to food and micronutrients: stunting and wasting rates are among the highest in the region. Better and more reliable data and information sharing will help implement informed policies and social programmes.

Tajikistan was one of the countries that adopted the Rome Declaration on World Food Security and the World Food Summit Plan of Action in 1996. At this summit, Tajikistan reaffirmed the right of everyone to have access to safe and nutritious food, consistent with the fundamental right of everyone to be free from hunger. Implementation of this right nevertheless lags behind the proclaimed commitment. The project will help improve the information and analytical basis needed for action, and will enhance the accountability of the state for guaranteeing access to adequate and nutritious food for every individual.

3.5. Stakeholders

During stakeholder consultations, representatives of government ministries and agencies expressed their support for the project and readiness to actively participate in it. They include the inter-agency Food Security Working Group (FSWG), the Ministry of Agriculture, the State Statistics Committee, the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade and others. There is a shared understanding that the government-operated FSIS is currently fragmented and does not meet the demands of diverse users.

The FSWG, chaired by the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, is responsible for the overall coordination of policy and programme development for food security. It will be natural for the FSWG to take the lead in coordinating project activities with government agencies and international partners. This has been provisionally agreed with the FSWG and will be formalised through the signing of a Financing Agreement with the government of Tajikistan. The FSWG will receive benefits in the form of coherent, reliable and timely information for food security analysis and policy making.

A number of stakeholders are currently involved in data collection processing and analysis as well as utilisation. They will be the principal stakeholders in the project. These include the State Statistical Committee (SSC) with its key role in data collection and processing. The Ministry of Agriculture will be closely involved at both local and central levels because of its actual and potential role in agricultural data collection and use. The National Hydrometeorology Agency will also be supported given its actual and potential role in the generation of agro-meteorological data for early warning and crop yield estimates. Furthermore, the Committee on Emergency Situations and Civil Defence is expected to play a role as a user of the data and information generated. The Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, FSWG and other agencies designated by the government will benefit from capacity building in food security analysis and policy formulation.
The Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, the Ministry of Agriculture and SSC will be the key stakeholders in developing the market information system to provide support in specific technical areas and institutionalise new processes. Similarly, active participation by representatives of farming groups and the private sector will be essential for data collection and dissemination as well as for the appropriate use of available information to improve the market information system (provision of inputs and supplies and access for farmers to market their products) and enhance agricultural productivity, profitability and marketing. The SSC’s mandate includes the provision of market information, (e.g. prices) for selected markets and specific agricultural commodities such as pulses and oil seeds. The MoA will play an important role in collecting regular prices on major agriculture inputs and supplies around the country by utilising its large number of field staff. It is expected that local authorities will also be involved in MIS dissemination.

International food security stakeholders (e.g. UNICEF, USAID, SIDA, DFID as well as FAO and WFP) are willing to participate in the project. This will enhance synergies, reduce duplication, increase coordination and improve the relevance of the information generated to the needs of the different users. Other international stakeholders (IOs and INGOs) will also be involved in the project as users of the information and analyses generated but also in providing external guidance, through ad hoc technical task forces and technical assistance to ensure the overall relevance of project activities as well as their linkages with other relevant initiatives.

The project will ensure close collaboration with existing interventions (WFP-Food Security Monitoring System, UNDP-Disaster Risk Management, REACT and other agencies involved in such mechanisms) to maximise available resources, while avoiding duplication and overlap. The project will strive to establish a single framework for the coordination and management of food security interventions by the government and international partners.

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Method of implementation

Joint management through the signature of a Standard Contribution Agreement with the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (UNFAO) as per the FAFA Agreement (EC/FAO Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement). FAO has the necessary expertise and experience in implementing similar actions around the world. FAO has established good working relationships with key stakeholders, including MoA and SSC.

A Financing Agreement (FA) will be signed with the government of Tajikistan to ensure that it takes the lead and owns this initiative.

A Project Steering Committee will be established for the project. It will meet regularly to review work progress, to approve work plans and reports and to direct activities and ensure their continuous relevance to the evolving context, based on flexibility, transparency and accountability principles, and their coordination with other food security initiatives. The Project Steering Committee (SC) will consist of key national institutions and will include FAO (secretariat), WFP and the European Commission.

A specific technical Task Force (TF) will also be formed for the three main project components (crop acreage, MIS and agro-meteorology) with a view to creating synergies and ensuring cross-fertilisation and methodological consistency with other similar initiatives. TF members will include experts working in mandated national institutions as well as in international agencies. The existing governmental Food Security Working Group and the SSC
could provide a basis for such consultative work, intensively supported by the project staff and the TF members. Specific terms of reference will be developed at a later stage for the task force by the project in close consultation with all stakeholders (national and international).

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 calendar

The total budget of the project is EUR 2000000, of which the EU contribution will be EUR 2000000. The expected duration of the project is 36 months from the date of signature of the Contribution Agreement.

The budget breakdown for this project is as follows (all amounts in EUR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>EU (EUR)</th>
<th>Total (EUR)</th>
<th>Contracting/Paying Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Joint management with UNFAO</td>
<td>2000000</td>
<td>2000000</td>
<td>EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Euro)</td>
<td>2000000</td>
<td>2000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The budget for the joint management agreement will include sufficient provision for information and visibility, which will be in accordance with a communication plan to be approved by the EU Delegation. UNFAO will also be responsible for making arrangements and ensuring internal and external monitoring and evaluation.

4.4 Performance monitoring

Regular monitoring will be a continuous process as part of the EU’s responsibilities. The relevant EU programme manager will be in continuous contact with all stakeholders and will undertake periodic monitoring based on progress reports and site visits. External monitoring (ROM) might be also carried out by independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission in accordance with EU rules and procedures under specifically established terms of reference.

4.5 Evaluation and audit

Evaluation and audit will be carried out by internal and external consultants recruited directly by the FAO in accordance with its rules and procedures under specifically established terms of reference. There will be at least a mid-term and a final evaluation during the project lifetime. These evaluations are expected to recommend appropriate measures for national stakeholders to ensure the sustainability of investment under the project.

4.6 Communication and visibility

The project will ensure that the visibility of the project and the donor is guaranteed in accordance with the EU’s visibility guidelines. Under the Contribution Agreement, FAO will be required to develop a communication plan. Modern communication and visibility tools
will be used. The EU Delegation will closely monitor the implementation of the 
communication plan and will be actively engaged in visibility actions. EU logos will be 
included in all project signage, publications, press releases, and materials. The same will be 
the case for seminars, conferences, and events. Signage, flags, and handouts will include an 
EU acknowledgement. For major events, the Head of the EU Delegation will be invited to 
speak.
ACTION FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
COMPONENT 2: LINKING INFORMATION AND DECISION MAKING TO IMPROVE FOOD SECURITY RESPONSE STRATEGIES

‘Improvement of the Food Security Information System in the Kyrgyz Republic’

1. IDENTIFICATION

| Title/Number | Improvement of the Food Security Information System in the Kyrgyz Republic  
DCI-FOOD/2010/021863 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>EUR 2 000 000 (EU contribution)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Aid method / Method of implementation | Project approach — *Joint management with UN organisations*  
— *Centralised direct management through service contracts for audit and evaluation* |
| DAC-code     | 52010  
Sector Food Security |

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

34% of the population in the Kyrgyz Republic is long-term food-insecure with levels of above 50% in two of the seven oblasts. At national level, per capita calorie, protein and fat intake showed a minor decrease in 2007 compared to 2006. In fact, kilocalories per capita were lower than the official requirements for Kyrgyzstan, and the gap widened for kilocalories and protein between 2006 and 2007. A particular problem is the lack of high quality proteins, vitamins and minerals.

Kyrgyzstan lacks adequate self-sufficiency in basic foodstuffs. This means a high reliance on world food markets and on the policies of food exporting countries. Unfavourable weather conditions, such as droughts and spring frosts, add further uncertainty to domestic agricultural production. Overall, the Kyrgyz food market situation can be described as fragile due to inadequate self-sufficiency and also potential constraints on food imports. However, the main obstacle to achieving food security remains access to food rather than availability. Today, the country’s agricultural sector has low productivity, low efficiency and low adaptability to changes in the market situation. Although reforms in the agricultural sector have addressed private property issues, they have failed to develop major market institutions and infrastructure, which are preconditions for increasing productivity and efficiency.

Specific territorial food markets are not sufficiently protected from monopolisation and price collusion (cartel agreements), which inevitably leads to unreasonably high food prices. State bodies lack the capacity to obtain full information on competition levels and to prevent monopolisation and cartel agreements. The state has been ineffectual in reducing the high intermediary costs of delivering foodstuffs to consumers. As a result, food is often very much overpriced.
At present, the country does not monitor world and domestic food markets closely enough to have a functioning early warning system. The existing material resources management system fails to satisfy the country’s demand for foodstuffs, not only in quantity but also in variety and quality. Existing stocks of bread grain in the state reserves can meet the needs of the population for only 30 days in a crisis situation, which is inadequate to cope with the vagaries of the world food markets. Economic entities operating in the food market are practically 100% privately owned. The state lacks developed market instruments as levers to control prices and has little information about levels of food insecurity across the country. Information about food shortages arrives late and often in an incomprehensible format for political decision-makers, significantly delaying food security interventions.

The relevant national agencies are not able to adequately meet the needs of key users, such as all levels of the government, farmers, traders, development agencies, for timely and reliable information and analyses on agricultural production, and for market information on agricultural products and inputs.

In preparing the quarterly Food Security and Poverty Bulletin, the National Statistics Committee (NSC) uses, to a large extent, existing data sources. However, the Bulletin only has a very limited print run, so is not widely distributed, particularly in the regions. The NSC cooperates only to a limited extent with other stakeholders in the existing Food Security Information System (FSIS), such as the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Labour and the State Agency for Social Development.

Other shortcomings in the current food security information system include:

- lack of regular and comprehensive price information, including domestic and international prices and trends;
- missing links between different sources of information, such as the Kyrgyz Agricultural Market Information System (Kamis) for agricultural price information and household survey data, which could be used to determine levels of food insecurity and their distribution;
- inconsistent integration of food security indicators;
- no integration of nutritional information;
- lack of an early warning information system.

2.2. Lessons learnt

Generally, the European Commission has extensive experience in developing FSIS systems, primarily in the ACP countries, and several lessons can be drawn from these programmes:

1. Financial sustainability: a food security information system is quite expensive to set up and run. Agreement from the Ministry of Finance to allocate additional resources to run the system would be a prerequisite for the financial sustainability of the system. As far as possible, the FSIS must be embedded in already existing structures.

2. To ensure technical sustainability of the system, the technical skills for the development of questionnaires, data collection, processing and analysis need to be ensured and/or developed following a thorough institutional capacity assessment.
3. **Ownership supported by demand:** both the public and the private sectors should have a direct interest in the information and analysis generated by the system. Therefore, a thorough ‘client’ consultation process defining what type of information and analysis, who for and what for should be integrated in the development phase of the system.

4. **Confidence and trust:** The information and analysis generated by the system should be accurate and reliable. In many FSIS, data collection and data analysis are carried out by different agencies or institutions. It is recommended that the analysis part of the system should be undertaken by independent bodies such as research institutes and/or think tanks.

5. **Flexibility and responsiveness:** A ‘market’-oriented FSIS should be developed in order to respond quickly to demand, whether from the public sector (policy decisions) or from the private sector (market decisions).

More specifically for food security strategy and monitoring in the Kyrgyz Republic, Kyrgyz officials have acknowledged that the food crisis of 2007/2008 and its impact on the population revealed a number of important shortcomings, most notably:

- The Kyrgyz Government did not have early warning systems in place to forecast the occurrence of such situations nor did it have an agreed plan to counteract their impact.
- There was no clear policy for bread market development.
- Agricultural production and marketing was inefficient.
- There was insufficient information available to determine the impact of the crisis on household-level food security to allow for timely and effective response.

Furthermore, the evaluation of the food security monitoring component of the EU Food Security Programme in Kyrgyzstan from 1996 to 2006 yielded the following findings. The present system evidently does not provide regular, consistent, reliable and timely data on food security to allow the government and other stakeholders to make decisions on the design and implementation of timely and targeted food security interventions. While the government has the capacity for data collection, and carries out a large-scale household food security survey 4 times a year, the information too often comes too late, is not analysed according to specific livelihood groups, and is not disaggregated below the oblast level. Also lacking are specific and feasible recommendations for action that can be taken by the government and other stakeholders. In particular, timely information about household-level food access, seasonal food gaps, nutritional status and the impact of shocks on the poorest and most food insecure is not provided by the current monitoring system. This information is critical for the government and other assistance providers in order to better anticipate food security problems and target social safety net, relief and other food security-related programmes.

### 2.3. Policy framework

The proposed project is fully coherent with the Country Development Strategy 2009-2011 and its priority of improving quality of life though strengthening the country’s poverty reduction capacity in rural areas.

Recognising the shortcomings of the existing food security monitoring framework, the Government approved on 3 March 2009 Resolution No 138 ‘Regulations on monitoring and
indicators of food security in the Kyrgyz Republic. This states that proper food security management in the country and regions is a prerequisite for maintaining the sovereignty and independence of the country, and for ensuring economic and social stability. Its aim is thus to ensure that food security is monitored in accordance with Article 6 of the law of the Kyrgyz Republic on food security.

The new regulations provide for the monitoring of food security at both national and regional levels, with due consideration of such factors as the potential physical availability of food, economic access to food for all social groups of the population, including vulnerable groups, and the consumption of food.

A food security monitoring system, a list of indicators, and mechanisms for data collection and the processing and analysis of information will be put in place. Monitoring will be aligned with the strategic and tactical development plans for the Kyrgyz economy and with the state reporting system. It will assess the following key indicators:

- level of food security in Kyrgyzstan;
- production of basic food products to assess regional food security;
- food consumption at both national and regional level;
- capacity of the internal food market and level of local production and imports;
- level of support for agricultural producers;
- household food expenditure.

Resolution No 138 also designates the agencies in charge of data collection, including the National Statistical Committee, the Ministry of Agriculture, Water Resources and Processing Industry, the Ministry of Labour and Social Development, the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, the Ministry of Health, and the Oblast State Administrations.74

2.4. Complementary actions

The Kyrgyz National Food Security Information System dates back to 2000, when the process of formulating the national food security policy highlighted the need for speedy, accurate and consistent data across all areas covered by the policy. The EU-funded Food Security Programme thus promoted, and supported with TA, the establishment of a Food Security Information System within the NSC, to collect and process data on food supply and consumption and to present the data in a quarterly Food Security Bulletin (later renamed Food Security and Poverty Bulletin, FSPB). The quarterly publication of this FSPB is one of the actions retained in the performance matrix of the current EU Sector Policy Support Programme (SPSP) for Social Protection and the PFM 2007-2009 (sector budget support).

Under the EU Global Food Facility (approved in December 2008), an amount of EUR 7 m has been granted to improve food security by supporting animal health and production. This intervention will be implemented through a trust fund with the World Bank (WB), as part of the WB Agricultural Investment and Service Project. From the special fund set up under the 2008 Food Security Thematic Programme in response to soaring food prices, EUR 5 m has been allocated to top up social safety nets.

74 After the government reform in October 2009, some functions have been transferred: Processing Industry has been transferred to the Ministry of Economic Regulation, Water Resources have been transferred to the Ministry of Natural Resources, and the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade has lost some functions to the newly created Central Agency for Development and Innovation.
The ongoing EU-financed project ‘Support for Civil Service Reform’ (TACIS AP 2006) will support implementation of the project by providing functional analyses of the Ministry of Agriculture and the Agency for Social Protection.

The WB plans to reinforce the existing Market Information System (Kamis) under the ongoing Agribusiness and Marketing Project.

Several NGOs, such as ACTED, the Aga Khan’s Mountainous Regions Development Programme and Mercy Corps, are collecting household-level food security data.

Under the ongoing Health SWAp, the Ministry of Health is disseminating nutrition information for vulnerable households through local health committees.

The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) and the United Nations World Food Programme (WFP) opened country offices in Kyrgyzstan in the second half of 2009, one of the main objectives being to support the UN’s role in disaster preparedness with a special focus on food security.

The project will be implemented in close coordination with other donor projects and will establish systematic links with other food security initiatives. Particularly relevant in this context are links to:

- Ongoing and planned WFP food security programmes; the WFP is currently providing relief food assistance to vulnerable groups and is in the process of drafting a two-year Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (2010-2011);
- Food security and agricultural programmes included in the planned UN One Programme (2010-2011), in particular under FAO’s responsibility;
- USAID food security programmes;
- The World Bank food security and agricultural projects already mentioned;

Particular attention will be paid to food security-related programmes under the planned Food Facility of the Islamic Development Bank.

In addition, the project will link with similar efforts in neighbouring countries, with the strategic aim of strengthening information sharing at regional level. Possibilities will be explored for regular exchanges of data on production and markets to promote food security and cross-border trade at regional level.

2.5. Donor coordination

The overall coordination of development support for Kyrgyzstan is addressed in the Joint Country Support Strategy (JCSS)\(^5\), and is fully in line with the Country Development Strategy formulated by the Government of Kyrgyzstan. A Joint Donor Coordination Council has been established and holds regular meetings to monitor programme implementation. This forum will support the coordination of this EU-funded project with other donor initiatives.

\(^5\) JCSS members are UN, WB, ADB, IMF, DFID, Germany, SDC, and EC.
Donor coordination meetings at different levels (Donor Coordination Council and Agricultural Donor Coordination Group) will be used to exchange information on projects/programmes to ensure proper coordination of the EU-funded project with other related donor activities.

3. **DESCRIPTION**

3.1. **Objectives**

The **overall objective** of this project is to contribute to reducing food insecurity in the Kyrgyz Republic.

**Purpose:** to strengthen food security information systems in the Kyrgyz Republic (collection, analysis and dissemination of food security-related data), in order to assist the GoK and its international development partners to effectively respond to short-, medium- and long-term threats to the food security of vulnerable households.

In particular, the project will address issues related to physical and economic access to food as well as issues raised in CDS analyses of the food security situation.

3.2. **Expected results and main activities**

Considering the complexity of food security issues, the project will be divided into two components: the supply side and the demand side of a food security information system.

**Component 1: Food Security Information System — supply side**

**Expected result 1.1:** Improved collection, analysis and communication of food security information on the supply side.

It is expected that by the end of the project the national and regional agencies (the National Statistical Committee, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Agency for Social Protection, the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Economic Regulation, the Ministry of Health, Hydromet, and the oblast, rayon and ayl okmotu (community) state administrations) and the Food Security Council will be capable of providing accurate, reliable and timely information to the required standard (including the required government indicators) for planning and implementing food security policies.

The following activities will be undertaken:

- Support for the establishment of a Technical Working Group consisting of representatives of the NSC, the Agency for Social Protection, the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Economic Regulation, the Ministry of Health, Hydromet, KAMIS, MoA, Agricultural and Food Corporation, and other relevant stakeholders.
- Workshops to discuss possible solutions for implementing a national data infrastructure and providing support to the NSC and other relevant stakeholders to improve the existing database or set up a new database where necessary, together with its applications.
- Assistance to strengthen communication facilities in selected branch offices to allow electronic data transmission to NSC HQs.
- Provision of tools and methodology to MoA and NSC for crop and food supply assessments and assistance with such assessments.
• Training for NSC and MoA and other relevant stakeholders in data analysis on food security and market developments to formulate effective response policies and strategies to prevent food crises and reduce chronic food insecurity.
• Provision of tools and technical advice on dissemination systems such as electronic bulletins, websites and publications to efficiently convey data and results of analyses to stakeholders, including farmers and traders.
• Design of a practice-oriented training programme based on an assessment of institutional capacity and the weaknesses and gaps to be addressed.

Furthermore, the GoK working group on food security will be strengthened through capacity building and training according to needs.

**Expected result 1.2:** Improved agro-meteorological data management and crop yield forecasts.

The project will provide inputs to improve current data computerisation, management and sharing. This will be done through support for the establishment of an adequate Data Base Management System (DBMS), the creation of a suitable database, and the provision of inputs for compilation of the required data in the Ministry of Agriculture, the National Statistical Office and Hydromet. Training will be provided to technical staff to enable efficient management and use of the data. Remote sensing data for yield forecasts will be introduced and national staff will be trained in their use. Tools for analysis of the data will be introduced as appropriate.

**Activities:**
- Support for reviewing current procedures for data collection, entry and processing.
- Supply of modern equipment for a number of meteorological stations based on a needs assessment.
- Help with introducing and setting up tools and methodologies for the processing of remote sensing and ground station data in the National Hydrometeorology office.
- Appropriate arrangements for computerisation of the required data.
- Training of national staff in the use of the database and yield forecasts, through on-the-job training and national workshops.

**Expected result 1.3:** A functioning, government-owned early warning system and a commodity outlook to facilitate the management of food security policies and programmes.

The primary aim is to develop an early warning system to prevent or at least mitigate the effects of food insecurity, while building the capacity to undertake this work.

The early warning system will be able to monitor agricultural production indicators during the cropping and livestock seasons as well as other essential foodstuffs, which in turn will provide timely information on domestic food supply. Regularly reporting is essential and may require daily, weekly, monthly or quarterly reporting, depending on the type of information being collected. A system of alerts will be considered.
Activities:

- Definition of information system needs and development of adequate systems.
- Installation of computer, database and information systems, such as the GIEWS Workstation and Country STAT.
- Assistance for national staff in implementing the information systems.
- Adapting of the GIEWS Workstation and Country STAT to better respond to national needs.
- Data standards to be defined and adopted to facilitate the sharing of data among stakeholders.
- Training for national staff in the use of the software tools.
- Training for political decision-makers in interpreting the data.

For some of the project activities, in particular training in rural areas, local and international NGOs might be employed. Close coordination is necessary to harmonise the methods used for collecting and analysing information. Both FAO and WFP will be responsible for coordination.

Component 2: Food Security Information System — demand side (Lead: WFP)

Expected result 2.1: Improved targeting of food security interventions

This result will be pursued through the design of a food security monitoring system (FSMS), that complements the existing large-scale household survey, enhancing it with a focus on the most vulnerable areas (below the oblast level), with identification of the most vulnerable livelihood groups and integration of nutritional information as far as possible. This information will help to improve the design and targeting of food security interventions. The proposed system will build on the government’s existing food security monitoring activities and become an integral part of the overall food security monitoring system in the Kyrgyz Republic. Aside from integrating existing information, it will carry out primary data collection to provide information that is currently not available (shocks and coping strategies, migration and remittances, agricultural stocks, assets stocks, etc.).

Main activities:

- Design of survey/data collection instruments (questionnaires, sampling methodology, analysis and reporting methodology) and pre-testing together with GoK and NGO partners.
- Support for regular data collection, analysis, and FS report/bulletin writing.
- Advice on how to link study findings to decision-making policy recommendations.
- Design of a communication strategy for information distribution and advocacy.
- Hand-over of implementation to GoK.

Expected result 2.2: Increased understanding of the underlying causes of food and nutrition insecurity among all stakeholders in order to develop strategies to address them.
On the basis of the various outputs from the project, WFP will undertake an in-depth analysis to profile food insecurity in Kyrgyzstan.

Activities:
- Assistance with in-depth analysis of data on food security and identification of particular beneficiary profiles.
- Assistance with geographical mapping of food insecurity on the basis of food security information produced by the project.

3.3. Risks and assumptions

Assumptions:
- Commitment of the Kyrgyz Republic to poverty alleviation and food security objectives remains high and effective;
- All stakeholders, in particular national and regional agencies, are fully involved and able to provide necessary support to project operations.

Risks and their mitigation:
- Political instability in the Kyrgyz Republic may adversely affect project implementation, e.g.
  a conflict of interest between the main data generating institutions could lead to the reallocation of tasks and a lack of financial resources for government institutions in charge of the food security information system. Thus, the engagement with government institutions should be based on a broad consensus between key stakeholders and on a shared understanding of objectives and implementation methods. In designing capacity building activities for government agencies, care should be taken to ensure that financial resources are available to maintain processes initiated with project support.
- High staff turnover at central and regional level may lead to discontinuity in project implementation. Ensuring ownership at all levels can mitigate the risk of staff turnover.
- Coordination will be a challenge given the number and diversity of stakeholders involved. Existing coordination mechanisms will be used and, if necessary, additional mechanisms developed to ensure synergies with other initiatives.

3.4. Cross-cutting issues

The functioning of the existing food security information system has been hampered by the lack of capacity and poor coordination between the government bodies involved. Governance has to be improved in order to establish a better information system and improve the distribution of food aid, which might also involve the fight against corruptive practices. Climate change will affect all four dimensions of food security: food availability, food accessibility, food utilisation and food system stability. It will have an impact on human health, livelihood assets, food production and distribution channels, and will change purchasing power and market flows. Its impacts will be both short-term, due to more frequent and more intense extreme weather events, and long-term, as a result of changing temperatures and precipitation patterns.

Global warming is likely to reduce agricultural production in the region. FSIS could help farmers adapt to a changing climate by encouraging agronomic research, providing irrigation or increasing its efficiency, maintaining or improving flood control, and facilitating human migration. Despite recent advances in analysing the economic impacts of global warming, however, information about climatic threats to food security in developing countries is still
extremely limited. Institution and capacity building activities for Kyrgyz Hydromet will thus promote better adaptation to climate change with the accent on information sharing and cooperation.

A positive impact can be expected on gender and children, as the ability of the government and its partners to respond to food security needs will be strengthened. Currently, children are negatively affected by insufficient access to food, high-value proteins and micronutrients as a result of important components missing in the food basket such as fruits and vegetables.

3.5. Stakeholders

State and local authorities: The National Statistical Committee, given its mandate, will be the principal stakeholder of the project. Nonetheless, in line with the project approach, a number of other stakeholders will be involved in data collection, processing and analysis as well as utilisation. This will enhance synergies, reduce duplication, increase coordination and improve the relevance of the information generated to the needs of the different users and decision makers. The Ministry of Agriculture is also expected to play a key role at both local and central levels because of its actual and potential role in agricultural data collection and use. The National Hydrometeorology Agency will also be supported given its actual and potential role in the generation of agro-meteorological data for early warning and crops yield estimates. Furthermore, the recently created Food Security Council, the Agricultural and Food Corporation, the Committee for Emergency Situations and Civil Defence are expected to play a role as users of the data and information generated and as beneficiaries of the capacity building activities.

Rural communities: The rural poor will be the ultimate beneficiaries of the project. Improved food security information systems will help to better plan and target food interventions. Local health committees and health workers could link food security information to the health status of rural inhabitants. Pasture management committees are currently being established in each Aïyl Okmotu with support from the WB Agricultural Investment and Service Project. These may be able to provide agricultural information, particularly in relation to livestock and forage.

Other stakeholders are the UN system (in particular FAO and WFP, while UNICEF and WHO can also be indirectly involved), other international organisations funding food security actions (WB, IDB, USAID) and NGOs on the ground, who are better able to respond to the emergency needs of the target population.

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Method of implementation

A Financing Agreement (FA) will be signed with the beneficiary government.

The method of implementation will be joint management, through the signature of Contribution Agreements with both UNFAO and UNWFP, following the signature of the FA, and direct centralised management through service contracts for audit and evaluation. Both UN agencies opened country offices in Kyrgyzstan in the second half of 2009 to respond to the looming food crisis in the country. As both agencies are planning complementary food

---

The following stakeholders have been consulted in the course of preparing the Action Sheet: WB, WFP, UNDP, Ministry of Agriculture, Water Resources and Processing Industry, National Statistical Committee, Ministry of Health, ACTED, Mercy Corps, and Aka Khan Development Network.
security monitoring activities to support the government, there is an added value in ensuring that EU and UN support is aligned in order to avoid duplication and competing initiatives developed for the same purpose.

FAO will focus on strengthening national and regional food security monitoring, with a particular emphasis on information on food prices, production, and weather hazards. WFP will focus mainly on the demand side, by strengthening the monitoring of household-level food security information and the integration, wherever possible, of nutrition information. For some areas or activities, their implementing plans will also involve other actors, in particular:

- Other UN Agencies, such as WHO and UNICEF, which could be involved in the food security monitoring system and the establishment of an early warning system.

- Civil society organisations, particularly given that they can play a critical role in data collection, providing inputs for reports and early warning information, in particular at local and community level.

A Project Steering Committee will be established for the project. It will meet regularly to review work progress, to approve work plans and reports and to direct activities and ensure their continuous relevance to the evolving context, based on flexibility, transparency and accountability principles, and their coordination with other food security initiatives. The Project Steering Committee will consist of the following voting members: the National Statistical Agency, the Ministry of Agriculture (which will chair the committee since it provides the secretariat of the Food Security Council), the Central Agency for Development and Innovation (as the donor coordination institution in the country), the Ministry of Finance, and the Delegation of the European Commission in Kyrgyzstan. WFP and FAO (secretariat) will be represented as implementing organisations without voting rights. Key NGOs, international organisations, and other relevant stakeholders will be invited as observers. Decisions have to be approved unanimously by the voting members. The Project Steering Committee will coordinate activities and develop a common implementation framework to ensure the coordination of activities and approaches.

4.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

For joint management, 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 organisations concerned.

For direct centralised management (services), all contracts 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 of the launch of the procedure in question.

4.3. Budget and calendar

The total budget for the project is EUR 2000000, of which the EU contribution will be EUR 2000000. The expected duration of the project is 36 months as from the signature of the Financing Agreement.

The budget breakdown is as follows (all amounts in EUR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative budget</th>
<th>EU contribution</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>TA/CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


The budget for the joint management agreement will include sufficient provision for information and visibility, which will be in accordance with a communication plan to be approved by the EU Delegation. FAO and UNWFP will also be responsible for making arrangements for and administering internal and external monitoring and evaluation.

### 4.4. Performance monitoring

The EU Delegation and the Project Steering Committee (see 4.1) will ensure regular monitoring on the basis of the key indicators established in the Logical Framework (Annex 1). The key indicators for performance monitoring will be:

- FSIS information is timely and reliable;
- GoK and development partners are using FSIS information and analysis to improve the food security situation in the country.

Specific baseline indicators will be established at the beginning of the project to assess progress towards achievement of the objectives. The project progress reports will contain the results of the performance monitoring, with contributions from the implementing agencies.

External monitoring (ROM) might be also carried out annually by independent consultants recruited directly by the EU under specifically established terms of reference.

### 4.5. Evaluation and audit

Evaluation and audit will be carried out by internal and external consultants recruited directly by FAO and WFP in accordance with their rules and procedures under specifically established terms of reference agreed with the European Commission.

There will be at least a mid-term and a final evaluation during the project lifetime. These evaluations will be expected to recommend appropriate measures for national stakeholders to ensure the sustainability of investment under the project.

### 4.6. Communication and visibility

The project will ensure that visibility of the project and the donor is guaranteed in accordance with the EU’s visibility guidelines. Under the Contribution Agreement, FAO and WFP will be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>breakdown</th>
<th>contribution</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Joint Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1800000</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Contribution Agreement with FAO</td>
<td>1400000</td>
<td>1400000</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Contribution Agreement with WFP</td>
<td>400000</td>
<td>400000</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200000</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Evaluation</td>
<td>150000</td>
<td>150000</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Audit</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2000000</td>
<td>2000000</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
required to develop a communication plan. Modern communication and visibility tools will be used. The EU Delegation will closely monitor the implementation of the communication plan and will remain actively engaged in communication and visibility actions.

ACTION FICHE FOR FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME

COMPONENT 3: EXPLOITING THE POTENTIAL OF CONTINENTAL AND REGIONAL APPROACHES TO IMPROVE FOOD SECURITY –

"TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FACILITY FOR THE AFRICAN AGRICULTURE EQUITY FUND"

1. **IDENTIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>The Technical Assistance Facility (TAF) of the African Agriculture Equity Fund (AAF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>EU contribution: €10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint co-financing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAF contribution : €686,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Project : €10,686,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aid method / Method of implementation</th>
<th>Project approach – Joint management through the signature of a standard contribution agreement with IFAD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC-code</td>
<td>52010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **RATIONALE**

2.1. **Sector context**

The poorest of the poor in Africa were severely affected by the food price crisis in 2008 and the agricultural yield potential in the continent is impaired by inefficient commercial organization, dependence on rainwater irrigation, and sub-scale operations. Moreover, improvements in agriculture production in Africa are inhibited by an extreme lack of capital, especially in rural areas. Many African agricultural entrepreneurs do not have access to financing because they are caught in the so-called “missing middle” between rural microfinance and large commercial financing providers. Furthermore, most of the established African investment funds are generalists (invest in all sectors) and therefore do not have the specialized investment professions necessary to assess the viability of a potential smallholder farmer or an agribusiness small and medium enterprise (SME) venture. Consequently, the provision of equity financing for the implementation of investment programmes with the right targets, piloted with a focus on specific food supply chains and protecting the comparative advantages of agricultural models, will have considerable impact on productivity gains and product development.

In addition to the lack of private capital and of specific market-based financial mechanisms, the development of the African small-holders farming and of the agricultural SMEs needs to get access to technical assistance to bridge a specific capacity gap in order to qualify for an investment in their core business.
To address these issues a group of institutions have begun to work together in 2008 to form the African Agriculture Fund (“AAF”). The Fund is being promoted by the Agence Française de Développement (“AFD”), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (“IFAD”), the African Development Bank (“AfDB”), the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (“AGRA”), and the West African Development Bank (“BOAD”). The AAF will be raising up to US$ 150 million for its first closing (November 2009) \(^{77}\), with a final size of US$ 500 million (target).

Since at least 20% of the AAF resources will be invested in SMEs and rural finance, IFAD has actively promoted the Technical Assistance Facility (TAF) within the AAF in order to amplify the AAF’s development impact by i) linking equity investments on small-scale companies with small-scale farmers, cooperatives and poor rural workers in Africa (including women and youth) and ii) enabling SMEs to qualify for AAF equity investments.

The TAF funds will be managed by the AAF’s fund manager, but will be held and accounted for separately from the AAF Funds according to a set of pre-determined guidelines. The implementation arrangements of having the grant resources of the TAF and the investment resources of the AAF operationally managed by the same Fund Manager is a strategic choice to assure a coherent, concrete and efficient linkage between the TAF resources and the equity investments of the AAF.

### 2.2. Lessons learnt

Prior lessons learnt utilized in the design of this project include i) the joint evaluation by the AfDB and IFAD for “The Changing Context and Prospects for Agricultural and Rural Development in Africa” and ii) the “Special Evaluation Study on Private Equity Funds (PEFs) Operations” carried out in July 2008 by the Operations Evaluation Department of the Asian Development Bank.

### 2.3. Complementary actions

The TAF will develop synergies and complementarities with the following projects:

a) the EC-funded PIP2 (€ 33 million - 10\(^{th}\) FED), implemented by COLEACP (an inter-professional network gathering ACP producers/exporters and EU importers of fruits and vegetables and other companies and partners operating in this sector) which supports ACP enterprises and smallholders groups of the fruits & vegetables sector to comply with EU regulations and market requirements;

b) the different but complementary financial mechanisms provided by (i) the African Enterprise Challenge Fund (AECF) managed by AGRA and promoted by DFID (matching grants); (ii) the African Out-grower Development Fund promoted by the German KfW-DEG (soft loans), and (iii) with the Rabo Sustainable Agriculture Guarantee Fund (SAGF) managed and promoted by the Dutch Rabobank (credit guarantee);

---

\(^{77}\) The current state of play in the AAF constitution is as follows: BOAD: USD 5 M (already approved by the Board); AFD: US$ 30 M (already approved by the Board); AfDB: US $ 40 M; KfW /DEG : US $ 10 M (pledged); PROPARCO: US$ 10 M (pledged); DBSA: US$ 20 M (pledged).
c) the AgriVie Fund (which mainly focuses on processing and other value added businesses): co-investments are possible as long as food is concerned and if Agri-Vie accepts lower returns than what it targets at present;

d) the IFAD project portfolio in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) and in North Africa – mainly through its value chain component- will be a coherent network platform of SMEs, farmers organizations, producers associations, etc.

e) the EU-funded "All ACP Agricultural Commodities Programme" (€45 million under the EDF), implemented by several international organisations with the aim of enhancing vertical integration, in particular between producers and processors/exporters and making value-chain stakeholders of beneficiary countries more productive, more competitive, better organised and structured;

f) the EU-funded (€5 million under the FSTP AAP 2008) "Support to farmers organisations and policy processes in Africa" and implemented by IFAD with the aim of strengthening the capacity of small farmers’ organisations in African countries, and their regional networks, to represent the interests of their members and to influence policies and support programmes affecting agriculture, rural development and food security.

2.4. Donor coordination

The TAF of the AAF was initially promoted by IFAD and is now developing synergies with other donors-supported initiatives as mentioned above. The TAF will also articulate its operations under the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), which is operated by the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), and the ongoing exercise of coordination managed by the High Level Task Force (HLTF) on Agriculture and Food Security, the Rome-based hub of which is hosted in IFAD.

3. DESCRIPTION

The TAF will provide grant funding to eligible AAF investment targets to enable these entities to access AAF capital and further strengthen the capabilities of SMEs and rural communities in Africa. It promotes the entry and sustainable participation of small farmers and small business operators in the food industry value chain by developing transaction-based mechanisms and viable business solutions to fill gaps along the value chain. It will focus on creating market access for smallholder farmers and food processors, linking producers with buyers, including agro-industrial processors, retailers (including large-scale ones), restaurant chains and food suppliers. The main approach is the empowerment of smallholder farmers, both by developing greater access to small-scale infrastructures and by providing them with better market information, capacity building, access to a broader range of financial services, etc. thus increasing their competitiveness and helping to overcome the vulnerability of their position in the supply chain.

3.1. Objectives

Overall objective of the TAF: to support the medium-term economic development of SMEs and small farmers operating in the agricultural sector in Africa.
**Project purpose:** to enable small businesses, small-scale farmers, farmers’ organizations and cooperatives to benefit, either directly or indirectly, from investment windows of the AAF.

### 3.2. Expected results and main activities

The expected results of the Technical Assistance Facility of the AAF are: (i) the capacities of small-scale farmers and outgrower associations are strengthened through linkages with the AAF supported small businesses and large scale enterprises; (ii) small agribusinesses’ and farmers organizations’ capabilities and skills are enhanced to better access the Small Investment Window of the AAF; (iii) the rural finance system is enabled to facilitate the linkages between stakeholders of the AAF investment schemes including both, financial service providers and the financial support infrastructure and the demand side of rural financial services.

The support services financed through the TAF will include but are not limited to the following activities, grouped according to three components:

#### 1. Outgrower Component

This component addresses the design of the outgrower system and the support needed by smallholder farmers in outgrower schemes to increase their bargaining power.

- Development of outgrower or contract farming schemes, including design & contractual relationships for outgrowers groups, and proposal development to donors for implementation and extension services.
- Agronomical training and contract work for affiliated smallholder farmers; including extension officer training programmes and development of training material.
- Cooperative-related technical assistance acknowledging the fundamentals of cooperatives/producers associations.
- Establishment costs for farm service schemes: training for farm service providers and development of training materials.

#### 2. SME Component

This component focuses mainly on pre-investment technical assistance, which will build on existing capabilities to bringing the level of skills to reach the requirements of the AAF diligence process.

- Business plans for expansion, including creation of fully articulated core business operations and strategy.
- Audited financial statements and advanced accounting systems, including training for operation of and establishment of auditable accounting systems.
- Training and capacity-building programmes, including managerial and entrepreneurial mentoring in areas such as basic business principles, financial and risk management, etc.
- Assistance with quality certifications also applicable to "processing" in sectors not covered by the EC PIP 2 (Fruits & Vegetables).
- Market linkages between Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) and various other participants along the industry value chain.
- Assistance with other required certifications, assessments, studies or approval processes as required by individual country regulations.
Market research and surveys, including analysis of new regional or international markets for expansion of existing product lines.

3. Rural Finance Component

This component summarizes activities facilitating the linkage between the demand and the supply side of rural financial services (micro level) and to enhance the delivery capacity of the financial support infrastructure (meso level).

- Assessing the smallholder farmers’ and small-scale entrepreneurs demand for financial services (kinds and volumes of financial services) in order to determine the overall size of the rural finance market and provide information to retail finance institutions.
- Mapping of rural finance institutions, delivery channels and types of financial services and disseminate information of market potentials in order to increase rural outreach and deepen financial service delivery to target clients.
- Facilitate training for rural finance institution staff, including credit risk appraisal and management and collateral assessment in the agricultural context.
- Support locally adapted rural finance providers in research & development of rural finance products and services.
- Activities also include monitoring and evaluation of key economic indicators for AAF investees that receive technical assistance from the TAF.

In an effort to attain the above results in a cost-effective and sustainable manner, several key governing principles will be applied in the TAF management:

- TAF funds should not subsidize long-term operating costs of the recipient beneficiaries
- There will be a focus on empowerment by linking up interventions with relevant commercial business development services, infrastructure programmes or research & development programmes
- TAF funds should not pay for or subsidize productive capital expenditure
- TAF funds should only pay for a specified list of approved activities

TAF implementation

The TAF Manager will drive the allocation of the TAF funds within a set of pre-established principles, notably:

1. TA beneficiaries must be engaged in a business that falls within the sectors and geographic regions acceptable for investment by the AAF.
2. TA funds may not be paid directly to the beneficiary, but rather will be channelled to TA service providers.
3. TA beneficiaries must agree to report certain data for the purpose of Monitoring and Evaluation of socio-economic impact.
4. No individual technical assistance project should extend beyond a two year period.
5. TA activities fall within the operational framework of the above mentioned components.

The daily operations of the TAF will be ensured by the Fund Manager with the support of a TA Advisor assisted by a junior advisor and staff responsible for administrative and reporting tasks. The recruitment of the TA Advisors will be subject to approval of the Investment Committee (see further sub-section on governance under 4.1), as well as IFAD.

3.3. Risks and assumptions

The risk of the TAF is that funds are utilized only in regions with more developed economies where a higher number of investment opportunities exist, at the expense of regions where there are high concentrations of very poor people. However, this risk is essentially mitigated by the AAF investment distribution requirements, which have established a minimum and a maximum level of capital investment for North, South, East, and West & Central Africa. Another risk is a potential weak capacity of regional/national market infrastructures as successful investment in agriculture requires robust infrastructures, including transportation, logistic and storage. To mitigate this risk, the market environment where AAF investment opportunities and potential AAF/TAF beneficiaries are identified will be subject to prior comprehensive assessment and the AAF will also have the capacity to invest in ancillary agribusiness sector-related infrastructures, like small-scale transportation, logistic and storage, whenever appropriate.

3.4. Crosscutting Issues

IFAD actively negotiated the development of the TAF concept as key instrument of promoting development objectives and strategies within the AAF: the TAF will focus on achieving economic and social development of the entire agriculture sector in Africa but with a specific focus on smallholder farming as key element of Africa’s development. In doing so the TAF will integrate and will deal with issues such as equity in land tenure, healthy & safety working standards, rigorous environmental and social standards, the encouragement of indigenisation & local ownership, as well as women and youth empowerment.

3.5. Stakeholders

IFAD’s focus, experience and knowledge on small-holders agriculture and its network of small-medium agribusiness enterprises, farmers’ organisations and producers’ associations will ensure a broad and active participation of all the relevant stakeholders to the implementation of the TAF. IFAD will also actively promote and use the resources of the TAF under the operational framework of its regular program of investments to strengthening the capacities of the SMEs mainly in the “value chain development components” of its projects. A key element of IFAD’s projects is the active participation (throughout the project cycle, from the identification/design phase until the final and post-evaluation phase) of all the relevant key stakeholders such as Governmental and Regional Economic Institutions, local communities and institutions, national and regional Farmers and Producers Organizations, CGIAR and non-CGIAR centres, etc. Permanent linkages with potential key stakeholders (policy makers, potential private investors, rural finance institutions, farmers’ organizations, private foundations, agribusiness and the agricultural research community) will be

78 The fund will invest no more than 30% and no less than 20% of its total commitment in any single region.

79 In SSA, IFAD has an on-going investment portfolio of 90 on-going projects in 35 countries valuing US $ 1.3 billion of its own resources
strengthened. The TAF target beneficiaries will be African small – medium scale farmers, farmers’ groups, cooperatives, rural women groups, poor rural workers, as well as staff from rural financial institutions. For each category an ad-hoc strategy will be adopted. Target beneficiaries may also include exporters to developed countries; however commercialisation in the local and African sub-regional markets will be encouraged, as appropriate. As regards the rural-finance services the TAF will be used to strengthen capabilities, mainly through training of lending agents, or design of new financial services for small holders.

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Method of implementation

The method of implementation is joint management through the signature of a Standard Contribution Agreement with IFAD. The main elements of the TAF operating model as described in the present project fiche will be integrally part of the IFAD-EC Contribution Agreement and subsequently reflected into the contractual arrangements between IFAD and the Fund Manager for implementing the TAF.

The TAF governance and IFAD’s role

As the TAF will be one of the incentive mechanisms of the AAF, the governance framework will include the AAF’s Advisory Board (AB) and the Investment Committee (IC).

The Advisory Board will be established to formulate the overall investment strategy, to provide guidance to the AAF and TAF, as well as evaluating and monitoring the overall performance and the relevance of the AAF and TAF. Members of the Advisory Board will include (i) representatives of the Fund’s investors (ii) a representative for each one of the Fund Promoters; (iii) up to three Independent Members. IFAD will participate as Independent Member and Expert Adviser of the AAF Advisory Board assuring the overall coherence and coordination between the investment resources provided by the AAF and the grant resources of the TAF thereby ensuring the achievement of the development objectives. As major donor of the TAF the EC might also participate in the AB as independent member. The AB will meet at least twice a year.

The Fund Manager will nominate the members of the Investment Committee (IC). The IC will take responsibility for making investment, monitoring and value realisation decision of the Fund, as well as for approving requests for technical assistance. The IC will be chaired by the Chief Investment Officer of the Fund Manager; it includes two representatives of the Fund Manager, one independent member and one representative of the Promoters.

Operationally, IFAD will assure the overall guidance and supervision of the TAF in coherence with its main mandate (eradicating rural poverty) and with its specific policies guidelines (gender, environment, land, etc...), as well as with the other donors’ policies and guidelines. IFAD will be also directly responsible for all the technical/financial reporting/auditing requirements vis-à-vis of the European Commission.

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 calendar

The total estimated project cost is €10,686,450. The EU contribution is of EUR 10 millions (93.5%), whilst EUR 686,450 (6.5%) will be provided out of the AAF resources. The final
budget may be subject to adjustments as a function of final discussions with the implementing partner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Total €</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU contribution</td>
<td>9,345,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>654,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total contribution agreement</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAF contribution</td>
<td>686,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,686,450</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The indicative budget breakdown for the whole project is provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget by Component</th>
<th>Total €</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comp 1 – Outgrower Schemes</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp 2 – SME Schemes</td>
<td>5,260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp 3 – Rural Finance</td>
<td>1,027,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E, visibility, communication costs</td>
<td>245,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>654,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,686,450</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others donors have expressed specific interest in providing co-financing to the TAF window and the AAF’s promoters are actively involved in mobilising additional grant resources to the TAF.

The operational duration of the programme is 60 months starting from the signature of the contribution agreement.

4.4. Performance monitoring

A process of continuous monitoring will ensure that the TAF-supported activities are meeting the desired development objectives (i.e. rural poverty reduction with a focus on small-holders farmers). The TAF advisor will review each investee company according to key verifiable indicators to evaluate the impact on a yearly basis. Objectively verifiable indicators are listed in the Logical Framework. Targets will be specified by the Fund/TAF manager and approved by the AB.

The Fund/TAF manager will provide annual reports to IFAD that include a review of economic and social factors pertaining to each investment. The social performance component will report on the incremental change of each of the indicators from the baseline levels at investment or funding inception. The Fund / TAF manager will follow IFAD standard grant procedures for reporting, auditing and request of funds (e.g. submission of
withdrawal authorizations, expense report, audit reports, etc.). In turn ad hoc annual reports on the performances and achievements of the TAF will be prepared by IFAD. The TA Advisor will manage with the reporting unit of the Fund Manager to create and internally audit reports. As IFAD will manage all communications with the European Commission, this organization will be active in reviewing reports before submission to the donor.

4.5. Evaluation and audit

IFAD will provide the European Commission with audited financial statements prepared in accordance to international financial reporting standard and project account will be audited as part of IFAD’s consolidated financial statements in accordance with international standards on auditing.

Regarding the evaluation of the project, IFAD will carry out a mid-term and final evaluation. Coherently with Article 8 of the FAFA General Conditions, representatives of the European Commission will be invited to participate to these evaluations.

4.6. Communication and visibility

All the information, visibility and communication activities related to the overall program of action funded through the TAF’s funds will be jointly developed and implemented by IFAD, the European Commission and the AAF coherently with the provisions reported in the “Visibility” section of the EC-UN Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) and in the Joint Action Plan signed in September 2006. The European Commission, IFAD and the AAF will jointly develop the most adapted tools of communication including the design of a TAF Communication Plan. The elaboration, development and implementation of this Communication Plan will be in line with the provisions reported in the EC visibility guidelines80.

80 http://ec.europa.eu/comm/europeaid/visibility/index_en.htm
Annex 1: Diagram AAF/ TAF Governance

* EC’s membership still to be formally agreed by the Promoters
## Annex 2 – Logical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Narrative Summary</strong></th>
<th><strong>Verifiable Indicators</strong></th>
<th><strong>Means of Verification</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Overall Objective** | To support the medium-term economic development of SMEs and small farmers operating in the agricultural sector in Africa | - Growing number of small businesses in the AAF portfolio supported through technical assistance and linked to AAF investments show improved business indicators  
  - Growing number of small-scale farmers, outgrower associations and cooperatives linked to AAF investments show improved business indicators | Annual financial and technical reports from Phatisa |
| **Project purpose**     | To enable small businesses, small-scale farmers, farmers’ organizations and cooperatives to benefit, either directly or indirectly, from investment windows of the AAF |                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                           |
| **Result 1**           | Capacities of small-scale farmers and outgrower associations are strengthened through linkages with the AAF supported small businesses and large scale enterprises | - Number of small-scale farmers and outgrower associations linked to AAF supported small business and large-scale enterprises  
  - Number of small farmers and organisations benefiting of capacity building services  
  - Increase in market, farming and business knowledge (for farmers and farmers organisations) / degree of application  
  - Number of business linkages established | • Annual financial and technical reports from Phatisa |
| **Activity 1.1:**     | *To design outgrower schemes and create donor proposals for extension services that enable small farmers to supply investees of the AAF with agricultural products* |                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                           |
### Narrative Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 1.2</th>
<th>To build the capacity of affiliated smallholder farmers through the development of extension officer training programmes and training materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.3</td>
<td>To provide technical assistance to cooperatives and producer associations following the core principles of cooperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.4</td>
<td>To develop farm service schemes and training material in order to assist and train farm service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 2</td>
<td>Small agribusinesses’ and farmers organizations’ capabilities and skills are enhanced to better access the Small Investment Window of the AAF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Verifiable Indicators

| Result 2 | - Number of small agribusinesses and farmers organizations received pre-investment technical assistance  
- "customers" satisfaction on assistance and training received / adoption rate  
- Incorporation of assistance received in day to day activities  
- Number of new markets open/reachable to small farmers / farmer organisations |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual financial and technical reports from Phatisa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Means of Verification
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative Summary</th>
<th>Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Activity 2.1**  | To assist small agribusinesses and farmers organizations in becoming viable investment candidates of the AAF through the provision of targeted technical assistance, including:  
  • Business plans for expansion  
  • Audited financial statements and advanced accounting systems  
  • Training or capacity building programmes  
  • Assistance with quality certifications  
  • Market linkages  
  • Assistance with other required certifications, assessments or studies | | |
| **Activity 2.2**  | To conduct market research and surveys, including analyses of new regional and international markets for expansion of existing product lines | | |
| Result 3 | The rural finance system is enabled to facilitate the linkages between stakeholders of the AAF investment schemes including both, financial service providers and the financial support infrastructure and the demand side of rural financial services | - Range of financial products and services in for the targeted beneficiaries of the AAF has broadened  
- Number of rural financial services providers that has increased its geographical outreach and deepened its services to meet the demand of the AAF target beneficiaries  
- Number of financial providers willing/able to participate in training and dissemination process  
- Number of financial providers willing/able to participate in research work  
- Number of demanders sensitised to rural financial services and products | Reports from Phatisa based on results of call for proposals |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.1</td>
<td><em>To assess the</em> gender differentiated <em>demand of smallholder farmers and small-scale entrepreneurs for financial services and determine the overall scope of the rural finance market</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.2</td>
<td><em>To map and disseminate information about rural finance institutions, delivery channels, and the rural finance support infrastructure</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.3</td>
<td><em>To facilitate training for rural finance institution staff, including credit risk appraisal and collateral assessment in the agricultural context</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.4</td>
<td>To support locally adapted rural finance providers in research &amp; development of rural finance products and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 11

FICHE D'ACTION : PROGRAMME THÉMATIQUE EN FAVEUR DE LA SÉCURITÉ ALIMENTAIRE

VOLET 3: EXPLOITER LE POTENTIEL DES APPROCHES CONTINENTALES ET RÉGIONALES POUR AMÉLIORER LA SÉCURITÉ ALIMENTAIRE

«GOVERNANCE, POLITIQUES DE GESTION DES RESSOURCES MARINES ET RÉDUCTION DE LA PAUVRETÉ DANS L’ÉCORÉGION WAMER (MAURITANIE, SÉNÉGAL, GAMBIE, GUINÉE-BISSAU, GUINÉE, SIERRA LÉONE ET CAP-VERT)»

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intitulé/Numéro</th>
<th>Gouvernance, politiques de gestion des ressources marines et réduction de la pauvreté dans l’Écorégion WAMER (Western African Marine Eco-Region: Mauritanie, Sénégal, Gambie, Guinée-Bissau, Guinée, Sierra Léone et Cap-Vert)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Coût total      | Contribution de la CE: €10 millions  
|                 | Cofinancement conjoint:  
|                 | PNUD: €0.5 million  
|                 | Coût total €10.5 millions |
| Méthode d'assistance / Mode de gestion | Approche projet / gestion conjointe avec le PNUD |
| Code CAD        | 52010  
| Secteur         | Sécurité Alimentaire |

2. MOTIF

2.1. Contexte sectoriel

La pêche contribue de façon importante au développement économique et social des pays de l’écorégion WAMER (Western African Marine Eco-Region). En effet, elle joue un rôle capital dans des domaines vitaux tels que la sécurité alimentaire, la création d'emplois et de richesses pour les 35 millions d'habitants des sept pays considérés (Programme régional de conservation de la zone côtière et marine, 2008). La gestion des ressources halieutiques est une problématique majeure pour cette région où la pêche peut représenter jusqu'à 15 à 17 % du PIB national et 25 à 30 % des revenus à l'exportation, emploie environ 7 millions de personnes, et dans certains pays, notamment le Sénégal, procure jusqu'à 75 % des apports en protéines animales de la population locale81, tout en offrant des moyens d’existence durable aux communautés côtières82.

---

81 Ndiaye et Diouf, 2007 ; WorldFish Center, 2005a  
82 Lauzon et al., 2008 ; WorldFish Center, 2005a et b
Les ressources marines et côtières vivantes disponibles, particulièrement les stocks halieutiques, ont fortement diminué dans l’écorégion, en raison d’une pression humaine excessive ou mal contrôlée, rendue possible par une défaillance de la gouvernance de la gestion des ressources naturelles vivantes. Des défis majeurs se posent dans la gestion et la conservation des ressources marines et côtières vivantes de l’écorégion, la lutte contre la pauvreté et la recherche de la sécurité alimentaire, notamment :

- la crise du secteur de la pêche du fait de la surexploitation des ressources et de la dégradation de l’environnement marin et côtier\(^\text{83}\); 

- les défaillances des politiques et des institutions publiques et privées qui se conjuguent douloureusement dans un contexte de raréfaction des ressources\(^\text{84}\); 

- le manque de cohérence entre les politiques des différents secteurs de l’économie des pays qui a quelquefois un impact négatif sur la sécurité alimentaire et les initiatives de réduction de la pauvreté\(^\text{85}\); 

- la pêche illicite exercée par des bateaux nationaux, sous-régiions et des flottilles de pêche lointaines (Europe et Asie surtout). Greenpeace estime que chaque année, du fait de la pêche INN/IIU (Pêche illicite, non déclarée et non réglementée), la Guinée perd 110 millions d’USD, la Sierra Leone 29 millions et le Liberia 10 millions. La pêche IUU, non seulement détruit les ressources halieutiques et l’environnement marin mais compromet également les moyens d’existence des communautés côtières ouest africaines; 

- les faibles capacités de la société civile dont l’impact des actions est encore bien en deçà de son potentiel réel; 

- les menaces que constituent la dégradation et la perte de la biodiversité pour la lutte contre la pauvreté : l’incidence de la pauvreté dans la région est très élevée (50 % en Mauritanie, 55 % au Sénégal, 49 % en Gambie, 54 % en Guinée-Bissau, 52 % en Guinée, 70 % en Sierra Leone et 30 % au Cap-Vert) et les populations pauvres de l’écorégion sont fortement tributaires des ressources marines et côtières; 

- les difficultés pour assurer la sécurité alimentaire et atteindre les OMD à la suite de la dégradation des ressources marines et côtières (surtout des ressources halieutiques); 

- le réseau d’Aires Marines Protégées (AMP) mis en place dans l’écorégion WAMER\(^\text{86}\), afin de reconstituer les stocks halieutiques et de conserver la biodiversité marine et côtière connaît des problèmes liés à l’insuffisance des financements, le manque de ressources humaines bien formées et d’équipement\(^\text{87}\). Les bénéfices environnementaux et socio-économiques tirés de ces AMP par les populations locales, bien que potentiellement très élevés, sont pour le moment faibles.

### 2.2. Enseignements tirés

Le suivi et les évaluations des actions entreprises depuis presque dix ans par le PNUD, le WWF-WAMER et l’ONG APTE (assainissement, pêche, tourisme et environnement) en Afrique de l’Ouest

\(^{83}\) Symposium de Dakar, 2002 ; FAO, 2003 ; PRCM, 2002 et 2008 ; Lauzon et al., 2008 ; Pauly, 2002 ; SIAP, 2003 ; Ndiaye et Diouf, 2007 ; Troadec, 2001 

\(^{84}\) Symposium SIAP, 2002 ; Catanzano et Samb, 2000 

\(^{85}\) Séminaire de ENDA et WWF sur la cohérence des politiques en 2008 

\(^{86}\) Grâce à l’appui du WWF, de l’UICN, de la Fondation internationale pour le Banc d’Arguin et de Wetlands International dans le cadre du Programme régional de conservation de la zone marine et côtière (PRCM) 

\(^{87}\) Diouf, 2008
ont permis de tirer un ensemble de leçons, à savoir: 1) la nécessité d’une participation effective et d’une responsabilisation des communautés locales et des principaux acteurs; 2) l’importance de créer des synergies entre les différents acteurs mais également entre l’Afrique de l’Ouest et l’Europe; 3) le lien entre réduction de la pauvreté et bonne gestion des ressources naturelles; 4) le rôle primordial de la qualité des ressources humaines et de la communication dans la réussite des projets; 5) la nécessité de mettre en place des mécanismes de financement au profit des communautés côtières, qui représente une alternative intéressante de réduction de la pauvreté et de préservation de l’environnement marin; 6) l’importance du rôle que peut jouer une société civile bien organisée et 7) la nécessité de mettre en place des modes de cogestion des ressources.

2.3. **Actions complémentaires**

Ce projet s’intègre dans la deuxième phase du programme régional de conservation de la zone côtière marine (PRCM). Il renforcera les acquis de ce programme en matière de promotion de la pêche durable, de conservation de la biodiversité marine et côtière, d’appui à la gestion des aires marines protégées, de renforcement des capacités de la société civile et de lutte contre la pauvreté. Ce projet contribue aussi à la réalisation du programme de travail sur les aires protégées de la convention sur la biodiversité.


Une collaboration étroite sera assurée avec l’unité de coordination régionale (Regional facilitation Unit) pour l’Afrique de l’ouest, qui doit être établie dans le cadre du programme FISH II financé au

---

88 Financement mobilisé de 3 300 000 USD du Fonds Mondial pour l’Environnement et cofinancement toujours en négociation.
89 Phase préparatoire de 1 425 000 USD financée par le Fonds Mondial pour l’Environnement, la Banque Mondiale par le biais du Programme pour le partenariat de la Banque Néerlandaise et le Fonds de Préparation Japonais.
90 Projet de 5 millions d’euros, financé par l’Agence française de développement pour 5 ans.
91 Depuis la réforme de la politique commune de la pêche (PCP) en 2002 les APP se sont transformés en véritables partenariats en faveur de l’instauration d’une pêche responsable et durable. Leur but est d’aider les pays tiers à définir leur propre politique sectorielle afin de remplir leur objectif de développement économique, tout en protégeant leurs ressources halieutiques.
92 Technical eXperts Overseeing Third country eXpertise.
titre du 9e FED Intra-ACP, de même qu’avec le programme Canary Current Large Marine Ecosystem (CCLME)93 quand celui-ci démarrera.

2.4. Coordination des bailleurs de fonds

Le projet est le fruit d’une longue consultation et d’une interaction avec les différents États de la sous-région et plusieurs partenaires techniques et financiers. Il s’attaque à des priorités qui ont été définies conjointement avec les gouvernements et les bailleurs de fonds. Les États du fait de leur implication dans la conception et l’assurance de leur participation dans la mise en œuvre des activités, se sont approprié le projet (réf. lettres d’appui au projet envoyées par les États). Par ailleurs le cadre du PRCM, qui assure une coordination de l’action de plusieurs bailleurs (en particulier la Coopération néerlandaise, la Fondation MAVA et la Coopération Espagnole) dans la zone marine et côtière de l’Afrique de l’ouest est un outil qui permet d’assurer la cohérence des interventions des bailleurs dans la sous-région. Le comité de pilotage (composition donnée à la section 4) permettra de responsabiliser chaque partenaire, de suivre la mise en œuvre du projet et d’assurer une coordination, une harmonisation des procédures et une bonne gouvernance du projet.

Pour une meilleure coordination des partenaires financiers et une utilisation optimale des ressources disponibles, des réunions des principales institutions et des bailleurs de fonds actifs dans l’environnement et la pêche dans la sous-région seront organisées.

3. DESCRIPTION

Le projet couvrira les sept pays de l’écorégion WAMER, à savoir Mauritanie, Sénégal, Gambie, Guinée-Bissau, Guinée, Sierra Léone et Cap-Vert.

3.1. Objectifs

L’objectif général est de contribuer à la réduction de la pauvreté et au renforcement de la sécurité alimentaire des communautés côtières de l’écorégion WAMER.

L’objectif spécifique est d’améliorer la gouvernance et de promouvoir l’adoption de bonnes pratiques en matière d’utilisation durable des ressources marines et côtières dans l’écorégion WAMER.

3.2. Résultats escomptés et principales activités

Les résultats escomptés et les activités qui permettront d’atteindre les objectifs de l’intervention sont les suivants:

Résultat 1. Les impacts des modes de gouvernance et des politiques de gestion des ressources vivantes marines sur la pauvreté sont connus et des solutions identifiées et appliquées.

Activités:
− 1.1. Mener une étude des impacts sur la pauvreté des modes de gouvernance et des politiques de gestion des ressources vivantes marines et côtières;
− 1.2. élaborer et mettre en œuvre un plan d’action sous-régional permettant de réduire et/ou d’éliminer les impacts négatifs des modes de gouvernance et des politiques de gestion des ressources marines et côtières sur la pauvreté;
− 1.3. mettre en place un comité technique sous régional de suivi de la gouvernance et de la cohérence entre les politiques de gestion des ressources marines et les stratégies de lutte contre la pauvreté.

93 Projet qui sera financé par les États des pays concernés, le FEM et d’éventuels bailleurs. Le budget estimé est de 35 243 000 USD pour une durée de 12 ans.
Résultat 2. Des mécanismes et des initiatives permettant une gestion durable des ressources marines et côtières dans l’écorégion WAMER sont mis en place.

Activités:
- 2.1. Analyser les problèmes institutionnels et les insuffisances des législations des pêches et des AMP dans l’écorégion WAMER et appliquer les solutions identifiées;
- 2.2. appuyer techniquement et financièrement le développement et la mise en œuvre de 6 plans d’aménagement et de gestion de pêcheries surexploitées et/ou d’AMP (Sénégal, Mauritanie, Gambie, Cap Vert, Guinée-Bissau et Sierra Léone);
- 2.3. appuyer et/ou engager des actions visant à lutter contre la pêche illicite;
- 2.4. mettre en place un fonds d’appui aux initiatives innovatrices de gestion des ressources vivantes marines et côtières;
- 2.5. établir et/ou appuyer des mécanismes de financement durable des AMP au Sénégal et en Guinée-Bissau.

Résultat 3. Les capacités de la société civile (ONG, organisations professionnelles, réseaux de journalistes et parlementaires actifs dans la pêche et l’environnement) à influer sur les politiques sont renforcées.

Activités:
- 3.1. Appuyer techniquement et financièrement (en étroite collaboration avec les directions techniques) les réseaux d’ONG, d’organisations professionnelles, de journalistes, de parlementaires actifs dans la pêche et l’environnement (Mauritanie, Sénégal, Gambie, Cap Vert et Guinée-Bissau);
- 3.2. organiser des formations sur l’environnement et la lutte contre la pauvreté, suivies de campagnes médiatiques menées par des groupes d’intérêts au niveau national (Mauritanie, Sénégal, Gambie, Cap Vert et Guinée).

Résultat 4. Les bénéfices environnementaux et socio-économiques que présentent les aires marines protégées sont augmentés.

Activités:
- 4.1. Recenser et mettre en œuvre les mesures nécessaires pour améliorer l’efficacité de la gestion des aires marines protégées appuyées par le projet en Mauritanie, au Sénégal, en Gambie, au Cap Vert et en Guinée-Bissau;
- 4.2. mettre en place et/ou soutenir des initiatives visant à créer des emplois pour les populations locales dans les aires marines protégées appuyées par le projet.

Résultat 5. Des « meilleures pratiques » en matière d’utilisation durable des ressources naturelles par les communautés côtières sont documentées et diffusées et leur application est appuyée.

Activités:
- 5.1. Documenter et vulgariser les meilleures pratiques en matière d’utilisation durable des ressources marines et côtières dans l’écorégion WAMER;
- 5.2. mettre en œuvre les meilleures pratiques documentées dans les 7 pays de l’écorégion WAMER;
- 5.3. appuyer la radio communautaire de Cayar (Sénégal) qui vulgarise les meilleures pratiques de pêche.


Activités:
- 6.1. Créer et/ou appuyer techniquement et financièrement des mutuelles d’épargne et de crédit dans les 7 pays de l’écorégion WAMER en conformité avec les orientations de la CE en matière d’appui à la micro-finance94.

94 AIDCO – Lignes directrices pour l'appui de la CE à la micro-finance (2008); http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/acp/regional-cooperation/microfinance/about/about_en.htm
– 6.2. mener une étude pour identifier les activités génératrices de revenus et/ou de nourriture, rentables et respectueuses de l’environnement dans les 7 pays de l’écorégion WAMER;
– 6.3. Organiser des formations en entreprenariat pour les communautés côtières dans les 7 pays de l’écorégion WAMER;
– 6.4. mettre en place des activités génératrices de revenus et/ou de nourriture respectueuses de l’environnement, et des mécanismes d’encadrement et de financement adaptés dans les 7 pays de l’écorégion WAMER;
– 6.5. instaurer un prix sous-régional des initiatives innovatrices en matière de sécurité alimentaire et de réduction de la pauvreté.

3.3.  Risques et hypothèses

Les principaux risques et hypothèses ainsi que les mesures à prendre ou déjà prises sont les suivantes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothèses/Risques</th>
<th>Probabilité de réalisation</th>
<th>Mesures à prendre ou déjà prises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hypothèse 1: Les États appuient politiquement le projet et interviennent dans la mise en œuvre des activités | Elevée | - La conception du projet a été faite avec les États et en tenant compte de leurs priorités
- Certaines activités du projet visent à renforcer les capacités des administrations des pays de la sous-région
- Tous les pays concernés ont manifesté leur désir d’appuyer le projet |
| Hypothèse 2: Des experts compétents et motivés sont mobilisés pour effectuer les études et faire partie du comité technique sous-régional de suivi | Elevée | - Système rigoureux et transparent de sélection des experts à mettre en place
- Les gouvernements et la commission sous-régionale des pêches coordonnent la mise en place du comité sous-régional |
| Hypothèse 3. Une bonne coordination et une synergie sont établies avec les autres projets et programmes existants | Elevée | - Des négociations sont en cours avec les projets et programmes existants
- Un appui politique et technique a été sollicité auprès des ministères en charge de l’environnement et/ou de la pêche (des lettres d’appui envoyées par les ministres) |
| Risque 1. Risques de différence d’efficacité des actions du projet selon les pays, liée aux différences de capacités des institutions des différents États | Moyenne | - Des actions de renforcement des capacités des institutions étatiques sont prévues par le projet
- Un appui plus important sera apporté aux institutions ayant de faibles capacités |
| Risque 2. La société civile dans certains pays n’est pas assez forte pour influer efficacement sur les politiques | Moyenne | - Le projet prévoit des formations pour la société civile
- Une synergie des différentes composantes de la société civile est recherchée pour augmenter l’impact et l’efficacité de leurs actions |

3.4.  Questions transversales

Les principes qui ont sous-tendu la conception de ce projet et qui vont être les piliers de toute sa mise en œuvre sont la bonne gouvernance, la durabilité environnementale, l’égalité des genres, les droits de l’homme et l’équité sociale.
Plus particulièrement, le résultat attendu 1 contribue directement à l’instauration de la bonne gouvernance, les résultats attendus 2 et 4 améliorent la durabilité environnementale et les résultats attendus 4 et 6 dans leur mise en œuvre vont favoriser l’égalité des genres et les droits de l’homme. Pour le résultat 6, les femmes et les jeunes sont privilégiés dans l’accès aux crédits, la création d’activités génératrices de revenus et la formation en entreprenariat afin d’atténuer les inégalités sociales qui font que ces deux catégories de personnes ont des difficultés d’accès à la propriété et aux crédits en Afrique de l’Ouest.

3.5. Parties prenantes

Les principaux acteurs qui interviendront dans ce projet sont les sept gouvernements de l’écorégion, les ONG, les organisations professionnelles actives dans la pêche et l’environnement, la commission sous-régionale des pêches (CSRP), le PRCM, les communautés côtières, les gestionnaires et les usagers des ressources marines, le secteur privé, les réseaux des journalistes et des parlementaires environnementalistes. Il faut noter que la majorité de ces parties prenantes ont des compétences, des aptitudes et des forces complémentaires et que seul un effort combiné peut assurer une gestion durable des ressources marines et côtières.

Les bénéficiaires-cibles du projet sont :
- Les communautés côtières ainsi que les populations dans leur ensemble (soit 35 millions d’habitants) qui bénéficieront des activités de gestion durable des pêcheries et de génération de revenus et de nourriture;
- les institutions nationales en charge des activités liées à la gestion des ressources marines et côtières et de l’environnement en général dont les capacités seront renforcées;
- les ONG, les organisations professionnelles et les associations de la pêche et de l’environnement marin et côtier, dont les capacités seront également renforcées.

Un processus de consultation avec les gouvernements des pays de l’Écorégion WAMER, le PRCM et ses partenaires (dont la CSRP) a été mené. Les différents pays consultés ont fait connaître leur soutien à l’initiative.

4. QUESTIONS DE MISE EN ŒUVRE

4.1. Mode de gestion

Gestion conjointe via la signature d’un accord de contribution (standard contribution agreement) avec une organisation internationale (PNUD).

Le PNUD jouera un rôle prépondérant dans la coordination du projet au niveau régional. Cette tâche sera facilitée par le fait que le PNUD est représenté dans pratiquement tous les pays impliqués dans le projet et assure la fonction de principale agence d’exécution des projets du Fonds pour l’Environnement Mondial (FEM) en Afrique de l’Ouest. Le PNUD apportera son expertise dans la mise en œuvre des activités relatives à la sécurité alimentaire.

La mise en œuvre du projet impliquera des organismes de la société civile (WWF et l’ONG - Assainissement, Pêche, Tourisme et Environnement - APTE95). Une convention sera signée entre le PNUD, APTE et le WWF. Une unité de mise en œuvre du projet sera créée (UMP). L’UMP sera dirigée par un coordonnateur sous-régional qui sera épaulé par trois chargés de programme, un responsable administratif et financier et un personnel d’appui. Dans chaque pays, une équipe nationale de projet (ENP), regroupant des représentants des différents groupes d’acteurs (étatiques et non-étatiques), sera chargée de la mise en œuvre.

95 ONG locale basée au Sénégal

Le projet sera doté d’un comité de pilotage (CP) chargé de définir et/ou d’approuver les grands axes de la politique du projet et de valider les plans de travail annuels (PTA) et le budget y afférent, ainsi que le rapport d’exécution technique et financier de l’année écoulée. La CE sera représentée au sein du comité comme observateur. Ce comité se réunira une fois par an, mais également selon les besoins.

4.2. 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.

4.3. Budget et calendrier

Le coût total estimé du projet est de 10 500 000 €. Le budget final pourrait être ajusté en fonction des discussions avec le partenaire chargé de la mise en œuvre. La contribution de l’UE est de 10 millions d’euros et le cofinancement apporté par le PNUD s’élève à 500 000 euros. La ventilation budgétaire indicative par rubriques principales est fournie dans le tableau ci-dessous :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITÉS/RUBRIQUES</th>
<th>MONTANT (EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activités de terrain</td>
<td>7 836 940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suivi – Evaluation et audits</td>
<td>194 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibilité/Communication</td>
<td>103 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipements</td>
<td>165 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fonctionnement</td>
<td>1 473 870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUS-TOTAL = Activités + visibilité/communication + Suivi – Evaluation et audits + Equipements+ Fonctionnement</td>
<td>9 773 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frais de gestion (coûts indirects)</td>
<td>677 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation (UE)</td>
<td>50 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJET</td>
<td>10 500 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

La durée opérationnelle du projet est de 48 mois à compter de la signature de l’accord de contribution.

4.4. Suivi de l’exécution

Le suivi des performances se fera à deux niveaux: au niveau de la gestion globale du projet et au niveau de la mise en œuvre technique du projet.

En ce qui concerne la gestion globale du projet, les indicateurs qui seront suivis sont: le taux d'exécution des activités (nombre d'activités réalisées/nombre d'activités planifiées), le taux de réalisation des indicateurs (nombre d'indicateurs atteints/nombre d'indicateurs planifiés), le taux d'exécution financière (montant dépensé/budget planifié), le nombre d'audits annuels satisfaisants.

En ce qui concerne la mise en œuvre technique du projet, le suivi du programme se fera par le biais d'événements formels (évaluations), mais aussi au moyen de méthodes participatives de suivi et d'évaluation.

Suivi et rapport: la coordination présentera des rapports techniques (semestriels) et financiers (trimestriels) faisant l’évaluation du degré de réussite en termes d’atteinte des produits, sur la base des

4.5. Évaluation et audit

Évaluation: Le projet fera l’objet d’au moins deux évaluations externes indépendantes organisées et pilotées par le PNUD, qui permettront notamment d’évaluer les processus et les effets obtenus: une évaluation indépendante à mi-parcours et une évaluation finale effectuée trois mois avant la fin du projet. La Commission européenne se réserve le droit d'effectuer une mission d'évaluation externe additionnelle et un montant spécifique est alloué à cet effet.

Audit: selon les règles du FAFA (EC/UN Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement), le projet sera soumis aux procédures de vérification internes et externes des comptes prévues par le règlement financier, les règles de gestion financière et les directives du PNUD.

4.6. Communication et visibilité

La communication et la visibilité du projet seront organisées autour d’un plan de communication bien couplé aux activités de terrain qui sera développé au début du projet.

## Annexe : Analyse des parties prenantes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acteurs et groupes cibles</th>
<th>Caractéristiques</th>
<th>Intérêts dans le projet</th>
<th>Appuis au projet</th>
<th>Défis auxquels les acteurs et les groupes cibles font face et qui peuvent affecter négativement les résultats du projet</th>
<th>Actions à mener pour renforcer les capacités, renforcer les intérêts des acteurs et des groupes cibles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communautés côtières</td>
<td>- Environ 25 millions de personnes - Pauvreté croissante</td>
<td>- Le projet contribue à l’amélioration des moyens et des conditions d’existence - Le projet aide à mieux gérer les ressources marines et côtières</td>
<td>- Appui politique - Participation à la conception et à la mise en œuvre du projet</td>
<td>- Amélioration des conditions d’existence - Augmentation de leurs capacités d’influencer les décisions en matière de gestion des ressources marines et côtière</td>
<td>- Renforcement des capacités en cogestion - Appui à une meilleure organisation - Création et appui d’activités génératrices de revenus et de nourriture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pêcheurs</td>
<td>- Environ 100 000 pêcheurs - Faible organisation</td>
<td>- Le projet contribue à l’amélioration de leurs revenus - Le projet aide à mieux gérer les ressources marines et côtières</td>
<td>- Appui politique - Participation à la conception et à la mise en œuvre du projet</td>
<td>- Utilisation de méthodes et de pratiques de pêche durables - Capacité à participer à la cogestion des ressources marines</td>
<td>- Organisation de visites d’échange avec des communautés pêchant de manière durable - Renforcement des capacités en cogestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouvernements de l’éco-région (Ministères des pêche, de l’environnement, des finances, de l’hydraulique)</td>
<td>- 7 pays (Sénégal, Mauritanie, Gambie, Guinée-Bissau, Guinée, Cap-Vert) - Très influents, en Afrique de l’Ouest, il est difficile de faire des choses importantes sans le soutien des États</td>
<td>- Le projet intervient sur les priorités nationales en matière d’environnement et de pêche - Le projet appuie les politiques nationales des pêches et de l’environnement - Le projet renforce les capacités des administrations</td>
<td>- Appui politique - Appui technique - Appui financier par l’intermédiaire d’institutions comme le GEF et la Banque Mondiale</td>
<td>- Faible institutionnelle</td>
<td>- Tournée annuelle dans tous les pays de la sous-région pour renforcer la collaboration et développer des projets conjoints - Renforcer les capacités des administrations (formations, appui technique et financier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRCM (Programme régional de conservation des zones marines et côtières de l’Afrique de l’Ouest)</td>
<td>- Coalition d’organisations internationales + gouvernements + ONG locales - Forte influence des pays de la sous-région</td>
<td>- Le projet aborde leurs thèmes prioritaires - Le projet est intégré dans le PRCM</td>
<td>- Appui financier - Appui technique</td>
<td>- Obtenir et maintenir l’appui des États de la sous-région et des bailleurs de fonds</td>
<td>- Visite annuelle au secrétariat du PRCM - Concertation avec les partenaires du PRCM - Intégrer le projet dans le PRCM - effectuer un rapport de qualité et dans les délais requis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRP (Commission sous-régionale des pêches)</td>
<td>- Organisation intergouvernementale - Couvre les 7 pays du projet - En restructuration - Influence potentielle importante</td>
<td>- Le projet aborde leurs thèmes prioritaires relatifs à la pêche - Collaboration avec le projet</td>
<td>- Appui politique - Appui technique</td>
<td>- Se doter de ressources humaines de qualité - Obtenir l’appui technique</td>
<td>- Etablir une collaboration étroite avec la CSRP - Participer au renforcement des capacités de la CSRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONG et organisations professionnelles locales ouest-africaines</td>
<td>- Organisations nationales (plus de 200) - Influence potentielle très grande</td>
<td>- Renforcement de leurs capacités - Organisation de lobbyings conjoints</td>
<td>- Appui technique - Appui politique</td>
<td>- Être suffisamment forts et organisés pour influer sur les décisions des gouvernements en matière de pêche, d’environnement et de sécurité alimentaire</td>
<td>- Renforcement des capacités des ONG et organisations professionnelles actives dans la pêche et l’Environnement - Organisation de lobbyings conjoints sur des sujets relatifs à</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Secteur Privé | - Secteur dynamique  
- Dans la sous-région, peu d'expérience en matière de travail avec les organisations internationales | - Amélioration de leur image  
- Amélioration des processus de production pour les rendre plus respectueux de l'environnement  
- Plus de bénéfices | - Appui financier  
- Appui politique  
- Appui technique | - Produits respectant l'environnement et bien vendus | - Développer une collaboration avec ces institutions et signer des conventions et des protocoles avec elles |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Journalistes environnementalistes | - Cinquantaine de journalistes (presse écrite, télévision, radio)  
- Très influent | - Appui technique  
- Appui politique | - Appui technique  
- Appui financier  
- Appui politique | - Existence des moyens financiers pour assurer le fonctionnement des réseaux de journalistes | - Appuyer les réseaux de journalistes dans l'élaboration de projets et la recherche de financement |
| Parlementaires et élus locaux | - Parlements des 7 pays  
- Forte influence politique | - Obtention d’informations et d’avis  
- Préparation de projets de lois | - Appui politique | - Informations pertinentes sur la pêche, les problèmes d'environnement et la sécurité alimentaire | - Collaboration avec les réseaux des parlementaires du secteur de l'environnement  
- Elaboration de projets de lois relatifs à la pêche et à l'environnement à l'intention des parlementaires |
**CADRE LOGIQUE**

**Titre du projet: Gouvernance, politiques de gestion des ressources marines et réduction de la pauvreté dans l’Ecorégion WAMER (Western African Marine Eco-Region)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectif général</th>
<th>Logique d'intervention</th>
<th>Indicateurs objectivement vérifiables</th>
<th>Sources et moyens de vérification</th>
<th>Hypothèses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                  | Contribuer à la réduction de la pauvreté et au renforcement de la sécurité alimentaire des communautés côtières de l’écorégion WAMER | - Au moins 70 % des personnes sondées appartenant aux groupes vulnérables prennent 3 repas par jour à la fin du projet  
- Au moins 70 % des populations sondées ont constaté une augmentation de leurs revenus à la fin du projet | - Rapport des enquêtes sur l'alimentation des groupes vulnérables  
- Rapport sur les revenus des communautés côtières | **Hypothèse:** Le choix des activités génératrices de revenus et de nourriture et leur accompagnement sont faits de manière adéquate  
**Mesures prises pour la réalisation de l’hypothèse:**  
- Une activité est prévue pour déterminer les activités génératrices de revenus et de nourriture les plus rentables et compatibles avec une gestion durable des ressources marines et côtières  
- Une sélection rigoureuse des experts et des consultants devant assurer l’assistance technique lors de la mise en œuvre des activités génératrices de revenus et de nourriture sera effectuée |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectif spécifique</th>
<th>Améliorer la gouvernance et promouvoir l’adoption de bonnes pratiques en matière d'utilisation durable des ressources marines et côtières dans l'écorégion WAMER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Superficie d’AMP bien gérées accrue de 50 % (par rapport à la situation de référence observée en 2007 par le WWF et ses partenaires, évaluation de l’efficacité de gestion des AMP) à la fin du projet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Le nombre de plans d’aménagement et de gestion des pêcheries est augmenté de 15 % (par rapport à l’année de référence 2008 ; enquêtes sur les plans d’aménagement et de gestion des pêcheries fonctionnels en 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Revenus des populations locales impliquées dans le projet accrus de 25 % (par rapport à l’année de référence 2008) à la fin du projet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Achat et /ou production de nourriture par les populations locales impliquées dans le projet augmenté de 25 % (par rapport à la situation de 2010) à la fin du projet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rapport sur le projet</th>
<th>Rapport de l’évaluation de l’efficacité de la gestion des AMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothèse: Les gouvernements de la sous-région appuient le projet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesures prises pour la réalisation de l’hypothèse: Les gouvernements de la sous-région ont été associés à la conception du projet et vont participer à la mise en œuvre des activités</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mesures prises pour la réalisation de l’hypothèse:**
- Système rigoureux et transparent de sélection des experts
- Les gouvernements et la commission sous-régionale des pêches coordonnent la mise en place du comité sous-régional.


**Mesures prises pour la réalisation de l’hypothèse:**
- Système rigoureux et transparent de sélection des experts
- Implication des administrations nationales et de la CSRP dans l’analyse participative des problèmes liés à l’inadéquation et/ou l’inapplication des lois

- 2 mécanismes de financement durable des AMP mis en place et/ou appuyés avant la fin du projet | Rapports sur la formation
Rapports sur le projet
Rapport sur l’analyse participative des problèmes liés à l’inadéquation et/ou l’inapplication des lois | Rapports sur le projet
Rapports du comité technique sous-régional |
**Résultat 3. Capacités de la société civile (ONG, organisations professionnelles, réseaux de journalistes) et des parlementaires actifs dans la pêche et l’environnement à influer sur les politiques renforcées**

- Le développement et la mise en œuvre avec une approche participative de 6 plans d’aménagement et de gestion de pêcheries surexploitées et d’AMP sont appuyés avant la fin du projet.
- Un fonds d’appui aux initiatives novatrices de gestion durable des ressources marines et côtière est mis en place avant la fin de la 2ème année du projet.

- Au moins 200 membres des organisations de la société civile (dont au moins un tiers est constitué de femmes) bénéficient des activités de renforcement des capacités avant la fin du projet.
- Au moins un tiers des organisations de la société civile impliquées dans le projet ont participé au dialogue politique avec la CE.
- Au moins 5 mesures et/ou politiques favorables à la bonne gouvernance et à la réduction de la pauvreté identifiées par le projet comme prioritaires ont été adoptées grâce à des actions conjointes de la société civile et des parlementaires actifs dans la pêche et l’environnement.

**Rapport sur les formations**

**Rapports sur le projet**

**Documents officiels**

**Hypothèse**: Une bonne coordination des actions de lobbying est mise en place.

**Mesures prises pour la réalisation de l’hypothèse**:

- Des formations en lobbying seront organisées pour la société civile et les parlementaires.
- Un choix participatif des politiques sur lesquelles on cherche à influer sera fait.
- Des cadres de concertation permettant une bonne coordination des actions de lobbying seront mis en place par le projet.
l’environnement avant la fin du projet
| Résultat 4. Bénéfices environnementaux et socio-économiques que présentent les aires marines protégées augmentés | - Au moins 70 % des aires marines protégées appuyées par le projet ont un résultat satisfaisant en ce qui concerne l’évaluation de l’efficacité de leur gestion (méthode WWF et Banque Mondiale) avant la fin de la 4ème année  
- Les avantages économiques tirés par les communautés côtières des aires marines protégées appuyées par le projet ont augmenté d’au moins 25 % à la fin du projet | - Document concernant l'évaluation de l'efficacité des aires marines protégées  
- Rapports sur le projet  
- Visites de terrain  
- Document évaluant les bénéfices économiques tirés des AMP par les communautés côtières | Hypothèse: Les gestionnaires des aires marines protégées et les communautés côtières collaborent au projet  
Mesures prises pour la réalisation de l’hypothèse:  
- L’approche participative a été utilisée dans la planification et constituera la base de la stratégie de mise en œuvre du projet  
- Des activités visant à augmenter durablement les bénéfices tirés par les communautés locales des AMP seront menées dans le cadre du projet |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Résultat 5. Des « meilleures pratiques » en matière d’utilisation durable des ressources naturelles par les communautés côtières sont documentées et diffusées et leur application est appuyée | Un document résumant les meilleures pratiques en matière d’utilisation durable des ressources naturelles dans l’écorégion est disponible avant la fin de la première année du projet; 10 des meilleures pratiques documentées sont appuyées avant la fin du projet | - Document résumant les meilleures pratiques  
- Rapports sur le projet | Hypothèse: Les usagers des ressources naturelles collaborent au projet  
Mesures prises pour la réalisation de l’hypothèse:  
- Des mesures incitatives sont mises en place par le projet |
Résultat 6. Des activités génératrices de revenus et/ou de nourriture et respectueuses de l’environnement et des mécanismes de financement et d’encadrement adaptés appuyés et/ou mis en place

- Un document répertoriant et définissant les activités génératrices de revenus rentables et respectueuses de l’environnement est disponible pour au moins 5 pays avant la fin de la deuxième année
- Au moins 20 activités génératrices de revenus et/ou de nourriture et respectueuses de l’environnement sont mises en place et/ou sont appuyées financièrement et techniquement avant la fin du projet
- Au moins 10 mutuelles d’épargne et de Crédit sont créées et/ou appuyées avant la fin du projet

Hypothèse : Des experts capables d'identifier et d'accompagner des activités rentables sont disponibles

Mesures prises pour la réalisation de l’hypothèse:
Un système rigoureux de sélection des experts est mis en place

Activités à développer

Activité 1.1. Mener une étude des impacts des modes de gouvernance et des politiques de gestion des ressources vivantes marines et côtières sur la pauvreté

Moyens:
3 consultants (francophone, anglophone, lusophone)
Edition de 8 documents
7 voyages

Source d'information sur le déroulement de l’activité:
Rapport d'avancement du projet et rapports des études

Pré-conditions requises: Sélection de consultants expérimentés
Conditions non contrôlables: degré de collaboration des autorités des différents pays
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activité 1.2. Élaborer et mettre en œuvre un plan d’action sous-régional permettant de réduire/et ou d’éliminer les impacts négatifs des modes de gouvernance et des politiques de gestion des ressources marines et côtières sur la pauvreté</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moyens:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 atelier sous-régional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edition d’un document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mise en œuvre du plan d’action sous-régional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source d’information sur le déroulement de l’activité:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rapport d’activités du projet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rapport atelier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Document du plan d’action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pré-conditions requises:</strong> Bonne préparation technique de l’atelier et implication effective des différents pays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditions non contrôlables:</strong> La volonté politique de mettre en œuvre les activités du plan d’action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activité 1.3. Mettre en place un comité technique sous-régional de suivi de la gouvernance et de la cohérence entre les politiques de gestion des ressources marines et les stratégies de lutte contre la pauvreté</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moyens:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Réunions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per diem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billet d’avions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression rapports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source d’information sur le déroulement de l’activité:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapports du comité technique de suivi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pré-conditions requises:</strong> Concertations avec les différentes parties prenantes du projet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditions non contrôlables:</strong> Obtention d’un consensus entre les différentes parties prenantes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activité 2.1. Analyser les problèmes institutionnels et les insuffisances de législations des pêches et des AMP dans l’écorégion WAMER et appliquer les solutions identifiées</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moyens:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 équipes nationales de recherche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 ateliers nationaux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 atelier sous-régional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edition de 8 documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source d’information sur le déroulement de l’activité:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rapports d’activité du projet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rapports d’ateliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rapports des équipes nationales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rapport sous-régional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pré-conditions requises:</strong> De bonnes équipes nationales sont mises en place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditions non contrôlables:</strong> La situation sociopolitique des pays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activité 2.2. Appuyer techniquement et financièrement l’élaboration et la mise en œuvre de 6 plans d’aménagement et de gestion de pêcheries surexploitées et/ou d’AMP (Sénégal, Mauritanie, Gambie, Cap Vert, Guinée-Bissau et Sierra Léone)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moyens:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ateliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edition de 6 documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fonds d’appui à la mise en œuvre des plans d’aménagement et de gestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source d’information sur le déroulement de l’activité:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--- Rapports sur les activités du projet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rapports d’ateliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Documents des plans d’aménagement et de gestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pré-conditions requises:</strong> identification des lacunes des gestionnaires et des usagers des ressources marines et côtières</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditions non contrôlables:</strong> la disponibilité des agents qui ont le plus besoin de ces formations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activité 2.3. Appuyer et/ou engager des actions visant à lutter contre la pêche illicite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activité 2.4. Mettre en place un fonds d’appui aux initiatives innovatrices de gestion des ressources vivantes marines et côtières</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activité 3.1. Appuyer techniquement et financièrement (en étroite collaboration avec les directions techniques) les réseaux d’ONG, d’organisations professionnelles, de journalistes, de parlementaires actifs dans la pêche et l’environnement (Mauritanie, Sénégal, Gambie, Cap Vert et Guinée-Bissau)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activité 3.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organiser des formations sur l'environnement et la lutte contre la pauvreté, suivies de campagnes médiatiques menées par des groupes d’intérêts au niveau national (Mauritanie, Sénégal, Gambie, Cap Vert et Guinée)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditions non contrôlables:</strong> la réaction des autorités par rapport à la campagne de lobbying</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activité 4.1.</th>
<th>Moyens:</th>
<th>Source d'information sur le déroulement de l'activité:</th>
<th>Pré-conditions requises:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifier et mettre en œuvre les mesures nécessaires pour améliorer l’efficacité de la gestion des Aires Marines Protégées appuyées par le projet en Mauritanie, au Sénégal, en Gambie, au Cap Vert et en Guinée-Bissau</td>
<td>1 consultant 5 groupes de travail Impression de document Fonds d’appui à la mise en œuvre des mesures</td>
<td>Rapport d’avancement du projet</td>
<td>obtenir la collaboration des aires marines protégées</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditions non contrôlables:</strong> La volonté politique des pays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activité 4.2.</th>
<th>Moyens:</th>
<th>Source d'information sur le déroulement de l'activité:</th>
<th>Pré-conditions requises:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mettre en place et/ou appuyer des initiatives visant à créer des emplois pour les populations locales dans les aires marines protégées appuyées par le projet</td>
<td>3 consultants 10 micro-projets</td>
<td>Rapport sur les activités du projet Rapport du fonds d’appui</td>
<td>Sélection des AMP qui présentent les meilleurs potentiels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditions non contrôlables:</strong> le degré d'adoption des bonnes pratiques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activité 5.1.</th>
<th>Moyens:</th>
<th>Source d'information sur le déroulement de l'activité:</th>
<th>Pré-conditions requises:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documenter et vulgariser les meilleures pratiques en matière d’utilisation durable des ressources marines et côtières dans l’écorégion WAMER</td>
<td>3 consultants Edition de 3 documents 3 Brochures 7 émissions télé 7 émissions radio 2 Documentaires</td>
<td>Document relatif aux meilleures pratiques, supports de communication</td>
<td>Sélection de consultants expérimentés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditions non contrôlables:</strong> Le degré d'adoption des bonnes pratiques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activité 5.3. Appuyer les radios communautaires de Cayar (Sénégal) qui vulgarisent les meilleures pratiques de pêche</td>
<td>Moyens: Appui technique et financier</td>
<td>Source d'information sur le déroulement de l’activité: Rapport d'avancement du projet</td>
<td>Pré-conditions requises: Concertation avec le comité de gestion de la radio Conditions non contrôlables: la concurrence avec les autres radios au niveau national</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Activité 6.3. Organiser des formations en entreprenariat pour les communautés côtières dans les 7 pays de l’écorégion WAMER

- **Moyens:**
  - 7 consultants
  - 7 ateliers de formation

- **Source d'information sur le déroulement de l’activité:**
  - Rapport sur les formations

- **Pré-conditions requises:** Sélection de consultants expérimentés

- **Conditions non contrôlables:** Le niveau d'instruction des communautés locales

### Activité 6.4. Mettre en place des activités génératrices de revenus et/ou de nourriture respectueuses de l'environnement et des mécanismes d'encadrement et de financement adaptés dans les 7 pays de l’écorégion WAMER

- **Moyens:**
  - 7 Consultants
  - Appui technique et financier

- **Source d'information sur le déroulement de l'activité:**
  - Rapports sur les activités du projet

- **Pré-conditions requises :** Mettre en place un mécanisme d’accompagnement et d’encadrement des populations locales

- **Conditions non contrôlables:** Les impacts imprévisibles du marché international

### Activité 6.5. Instaurer un prix sous-régional des initiatives innovatrices en matière de sécurité alimentaire et de réduction de la pauvreté

- **Moyens:**
  - Comité sous-régional de sélection
  - Prix

- **Source d'information sur le déroulement de l’activité:**
  - Rapport sur les activités du projet

- **Pré-conditions requises:** Bonne communication autour du prix

- **Conditions non contrôlables:** Le nombre d'initiatives soumises
ANNEXE 12

FICHE d’ACTION: PROGRAMME THÉMATIQUE EN FAVEUR DE LA SÉCURITÉ ALIMENTAIRE
VOLET 3: EXPLOITER LE POTENTIEL DES APPROCHES CONTINENTALES ET RÉGIONALES POUR AMÉLIORER LA SÉCURITÉ ALIMENTAIRE

«PROGRAMME RÉGIONAL DE GESTION DURABLE DES TERRES ET D’ADAPTATION AUX CHANGEMENTS CLIMATIQUES AU SAHEL ET EN AFRIQUE DE L’OUEST»

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intitulé/Numéro</th>
<th>Programme régional de gestion durable des terres et d’adaptation aux changements climatiques au Sahel et en Afrique de l’Ouest.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Coût total      | *Contribution de la UE: €10 millions*  
i) Cofinancement conjoint CILSS: €0,493 million  
ii) Cofinancements parallèles:  
CRDI: € 1,7 millions  
FFEM: € 3 millions |
| Méthode d’assistance / Mode de gestion | Approche projet / gestion centralisée directe. |
| Code CAD        | 52010 | Secteur | Sécurité Alimentaire |

2. MOTIF

2.1. Contexte sectoriel

L’Afrique de l’Ouest et le Sahel en particulier sont confrontés depuis plusieurs années à de graves problèmes de dégradation des terres, qui affectent négativement la productivité et la sécurisation des fonctions essentielles des écosystèmes. Cette dégradation des terres est complexe et elle est causée par différents facteurs englobant à la fois la variabilité et le changement climatique ainsi que l’activité humaine.

Au plan socio-économique, la dégradation des terres constitue un obstacle important à la croissance économique de la région, dont l’économie repose essentiellement sur le secteur agricole, qui fournit plus de 40% du PIB pour certains pays. Malheureusement plus de 3 % du PIB agricole en Afrique est perdu annuellement suite à la dégradation des terres, soit une perte estimée à 9 milliards USD par an dans le revenu annuel brut.

La dégradation des terres est aussi à l’origine des mouvements multiples des populations fuyant les zones desséchées, mais aussi de multiples conflits liés à la terre et à son contrôle qui sévissent dans la sous-région ouest-africaine. La situation est d’autant plus complexe que
la population ouest-africaine croît à une moyenne de 2,7% par an. Malgré de nombreuses initiatives engagées depuis plusieurs décennies, la dégradation des terres et des écosystèmes se poursuit et les gains de productivité agricole demeurent toujours faibles. Cette situation constitue un obstacle majeur à la réalisation des objectifs des documents de stratégie pour la réduction de la pauvreté (DSRP) et des objectifs du Millénaire pour le développement (OMD).


En 2006, un protocole d’accord de coopération a été signé instituant officiellement le CILSS (Comité permanent inter-états de lutte contre la sécheresse dans le Sahel) comme le bras technique de la CEDEAO dans les domaines de la sécurité alimentaire et de la gestion des ressources naturelles. Ce projet permettra au CILSS d’assumer pleinement sa mission de bras technique de la CEDEAO dans les domaines de la sécurité alimentaire et de la gestion des ressources naturelles, ainsi que celle de centre de référence du NEPAD pour les piliers 1 et 3 du CAADP.

2.2. Enseignements tirés

La lutte contre la dégradation des terres engagée par le CILSS s’inscrit dans une quête permanente de restauration des équilibres écologiques, socio-économiques et politiques pour une amélioration de la sécurité alimentaire et la lutte contre la pauvreté. Les domaines clés du succès sont les suivants: (i) la coordination et l’harmonisation des politiques nationales en matière de LCD/GRN; (ii) le renforcement des capacités des pays en matière de lutte contre la désertification et d’adaptation à la variabilité et au changement climatique; (iii) la production d’informations et d’outils d’aide à la décision en matière de lutte contre la dégradation des terres; (iv) des programmes d’investissement pour la mise en œuvre de projets de lutte contre la désertification, d’adaptation à la variabilité climatique et de lutte contre la pauvreté au niveau local.


Les actions en matière de GDT ont permis, dans beaucoup de régions sahéliennes, de lutter contre la pauvreté et de restaurer des terroirs entiers. Quelques chiffres peuvent être cités:

- un hectare restauré produit en moyenne 200 kg de céréales en plus, soit la nourriture d’une personne pour un an;
- dans des terroirs comme ceux du sud Niger, la densité d’arbres grâce à la régénération naturelle assistée est 20 fois plus forte qu’il y a 20 ans;
- 600 kg de biomasse par hectare peuvent être obtenus en zone pastorale sur des sols auparavant cuirassés.

Depuis 2000, le CILSS met en place des programmes d’investissements pour lutter contre la désertification et la pauvreté, au moyen de deux programmes majeurs: (i) l’initiative régionale «Environnement mondial et lutte contre la désertification en Afrique sahélienne» (IREM-LCD), (ii) le Fonds Italie-CILSS pour la lutte contre la désertification et la réduction de la
pauvreté au Sahel (FLCD-RPS). Ces deux expériences de gestion directe par les responsables des projets ont permis à des structures de la société civile et des collectivités territoriales décentralisées de mener des actions diverses de GRN-LCD, dont les effets ont été fort appréciés par les différentes parties prenantes.

Comme enseignements majeurs, on retiendra que l’exécution de ces programmes a permis de:

- confirmer la pertinence de telles initiatives menées à l’attention des acteurs locaux au niveau sahélien96;
- confirmer la légitimité d’en confier la mise en œuvre au CILSS en tant qu’institution spécialisée régionale/centre de mobilisation de compétences techniques au service des politiques et des structures d’intégration régionale 97; d’acquérir et de consolider un savoir faire du CILSS dans:
  - le pilotage de fonds régionaux mis à disposition au niveau des États,
  - les moyens de concertation avec les États membres,
  - la capitalisation des expériences en GRN/LCD au niveau régional,
  - les actions pertinentes à promouvoir selon les zones climato-géographiques et les spécificités nationales,
  - l’élaboration d’un dispositif de supervision fondé sur des instruments de suivi et d’évaluation performants,
  - l’élaboration d’un manuel de procédures administratives et financières qui renforce les capacités de gestion et de contrôle interne.

De par son expérience, le CILSS peut affirmer que la dégradation des terres est un processus réversible et que la GDT constitue un outil efficace pour une action structurelle sur la sécurité alimentaire à court, moyen et long terme au Sahel et en Afrique de l’Ouest.

Enfin, dans le souci d’améliorer ses performances, le CILSS s’est doté, en 2009, d’un plan stratégique pour l’horizon 2020, qui définit clairement sa vision et son positionnement stratégique comme centre de référence et d’excellence dans les domaines de la sécurité alimentaire, de la gestion des ressources naturelles et de l’environnement, des changements climatiques dans la zone Sahel et en Afrique de l’Ouest.

### 2.3. Actions complémentaires

Le présent projet se situe dans le prolongement de programmes déjà en cours d’exécution par le CILSS. Il contribuera directement à la mise en œuvre du plan de travail 2009-2013 du CILSS dans lequel s’inscrivent toutes les actions (sécurité alimentaire et gestion des ressources naturelles) de l’ensemble des partenaires techniques et financiers (PTF), notamment celles des coopérations française, italienne, canadienne et américaine. Il sera également en étroite coordination et complémentaire des actions qui seront mises en œuvre au titre (i) du volet 2 du FSTP « Lien entre systèmes d’information et prise de décision pour améliorer la sécurité alimentaire » et (ii) de l’initiative Support to the Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA), financé sur les ressources du 10ème FED Intra-ACP. La GCCA s’implantera dans le même espace géographique que le programme FSTP/GDT (Food Security Thematic Programme). Il s’agira, au cours de l’exécution de ces deux initiatives, de veiller à la complémentarité opérationnelle au niveau des moyens (ressources humaines, équipements, etc.) et des domaines d’intervention. Pour assurer cette complémentarité, le CILSS organiserà une retraite de planification au démarrage, puis deux ateliers tous les ans, à

---

97 Ibid.
savoir un atelier «bilan et planification» et un autre «bilan à mi-parcours» pour le recadrage des activités programmées.

Au niveau sous-régional et continental, le CILSS, en tant que bras technique de la CEDEAO et centre de référence du NEPAD (New Partnership for Africa's Development) pour la GDT, contribuera au moyen de ce projet à la mise en œuvre de la politique agricole (ECOWAP) et environnementale (ECOWEP) de la CEDEAO et des piliers 1 et 3 «Gestion durable des terres et la maîtrise de l’eau- SLWM» du CAADP. Le projet est également en adéquation avec l’initiative «grande muraille verte» au Sahara et au Sahel (GMVSS) ainsi qu'avec les initiatives de l’UEMOA, notamment le programme communautaire d’amélioration de l’environnement et le projet régional relatif à la lutte contre les catastrophes naturelles dans le cadre de la facilité «catastrophes naturelles» pour les pays ACP (Afrique, Caraïbes, Pacifique) établi par l’Union Européenne.

Quelques initiatives concernant, directement ou de façon connexe la GDT et l’adaptation aux changements climatiques sont actuellement menées par des ONG internationales ou des OIG, notamment la gestion des aires fauniques transfrontalières avec l’Union mondiale pour la Nature (UICN), des projets de GRN transfrontaliers avec l'Autorité du Liptako Gourma (ALG), la lutte contre l’ensablement du fleuve Niger sous l'égide de l’ABN, les études et le suivi-évaluation environnemental avec l’OSS, le mécanisme mondial (MM) de l’UNCCD, la gestion régionale durable des terres en Afrique sub-saharienne dans le cadre de l’initiative TerrAfrica de la Banque mondiale et l’intégration de la GDT dans les programmes de développement avec le PNUD/DDC.

Enfin, dans le domaine de la recherche scientifique et technologique, interviennent l’ICRISAT (amélioration des rendements et des variétés agricoles), l’ICRAF (agroforesterie), FARA et le CORAF/WECARD (recherche agricole, transfert de technologies), l’IRD (tests dans le domaine de l’agriculture de conservation). Ces organismes mettent au point des techniques qui doivent être vulgarisées sur le terrain.

2.4. Coordination des bailleurs de fonds

Selon 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 s'effectue dans le cadre du comité des partenaires du CILSS (CPC) et de ses déclinaisons par site, notamment le groupe de Ouagadougou qui se rencontre trimestriellement. 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 (CE/DCEUE, Canada, Italie, France, USAID, FAO) seront représentés au sein du comité de pilotage du projet. Le CILSS œuvrera à assurer une cohérence globale et une complémentarité ainsi qu'une synergie dans ces interventions.

3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectifs

Le projet vise à accompagner de façon concrète la mise en œuvre des politiques et programmes régionaux au moyen de quatre volets opérationnels développés ci-dessous. Les
pays de la zone CILSS et CEDEAO sont éligibles à un appui direct ou indirect des fonds de ce projet.

L’objectif global est de contribuer à la gestion durable des terres et au renforcement des capacités d’adaptation aux changements climatiques dans les États membres de l’espace CEDEAO et du CILSS pour l’atteinte des OMD.

L’objectif spécifique est de créer les conditions techniques, politiques et stratégiques en matière de GDT et d’adaptation pour la réduction de la vulnérabilité des populations de l’Afrique de l’Ouest aux changements climatiques (CC).

3.2. Résultats escomptés et principales activités

Le programme, pour réaliser les objectifs en matière de GDT et de renforcement des capacités d’adaptation aux CC doit atteindre les quatre principaux résultats suivants:

15 000 à 20 000 ha de terres dégradées sont restaurés au Sahel et en Afrique de l’Ouest à l’horizon 2015 et permettent d’accroître la production agricole de 15%;

les capacités opérationnelles des États sont renforcées dans le domaine de la coordination et de la mise en œuvre du programme d’action sous-régional de lutte contre la désertification en Afrique de l’Ouest;

les connaissances sur les tendances évolutives des changements climatiques au Sahel et en Afrique de l’Ouest et leur impact potentiel sur les systèmes de production agricoles et l'environnement sont améliorées;

les capacités des pays dans l'espace CILSS / CEDEAO à intégrer la GDT et l’adaptation aux changements climatiques dans les stratégies, politiques et cadres réglementaires sont améliorées.

Pour atteindre ces résultats, le projet sera articulé autour de quatre grands volets, à savoir:

**Volet 1: Mise en œuvre d'un programme d'investissement pour la récupération des terres dégradées afin d'améliorer la production agro-sylvo-pastorale.**

Ce volet vise à renforcer les capacités d’adaptation aux effets de la variabilité et du changement climatique au moyen d'actions pertinentes et concrètes de gestion durable des terres sur le terrain. En Afrique sahélienne, l’expérience montre que le coût moyen de l’aménagement d’un hectare varie entre 250 000 à 300 000 francs CFA (€ 380 à 450 euros pour les aménagements simples). Sur cette base, il s’agira de restaurer au Sahel et en Afrique de l’Ouest, d’ici 2015, 15 à 20 000 ha de terres dégradées pour accroître la production agricole de 15%.

Les activités au titre de ce volet porteront sur l’élaboration et la mise en œuvre d’un programme régional d’investissement pour la récupération des terres dégradées.

Il s’agira d’appuyer la mise en œuvre d'environ 10 projets d'investissement par des opérateurs privés en vue de la récupération de terres dégradées dans la zone géographique couverte par le CILSS et la CEDEAO. Sur la base des enseignements tirés des programmes IREM-LCD et Fonds Italie-CILSS (lutte contre la
désertification pour la réduction de la pauvreté au Sahel), à savoir la poursuite et le renforcement des actions lancées, l’approche suivante est retenue:

La première année:
− sur la base des outils et produits mis au point par le CILSS (cartes d’occupation des terres, SIGsystèmes d'information géographiques, imageries de télédétection, …) et en concertation avec les parties prenantes dans les pays, le CILSS procédera au ciblage géographique et thématique des zones d’investissements pour la récupération des terres;
− choix des opérateurs privés sur la base d’un appel d’offres.

A partir de la deuxième année, lancement et supervision (suivi technique et scientifique) du programme.

Domaines potentiels d'intervention:
− conservation des eaux, restauration et gestion durable des sols en agriculture;
− récupérations des terres salines;
− aménagement et gestion des pâturages et des ressources pastorales;
− aménagements hydro-agricoles et gestion intégrée de bassins-versants locaux et transfrontaliers;
− aménagement et gestion participative des ressources forestières (régénération naturelle assistée, agroforesterie, biodiversité…);
− plantations forestières;
− promotion des énergies alternatives, éco-compatibles ;
− toutes les innovations prometteuses en matière de GDT.

En outre, dans le cadre du cofinancement parallèle avec les autres partenaires techniques et financiers (FFEM, ASDI, CRDI…), des subventions en cascades seront faites pour promouvoir également des actions de récupérations des terres dans d’autres zones grâce à des technologies innovantes.

Dans la perspective d’une appropriation et d’une pérennisation des investissements (gestion, maintenance, etc.), le CILSS veillera à l’implication des bénéficiaires et au renforcement de leurs capacités pour la gestion des ouvrages réalisés.

Compte tenu de la spécificité de la démarche, le CILSS renforcera ses compétences par le recrutement d’un expert en génie rural, dont la tâche principale serait d’assurer le suivi et la qualité des travaux.

Volet 2: Appui à la mise en œuvre du programme d’action sous-régional de lutte contre la désertification en Afrique de l’Ouest et au Tchad.

Le programme d’action sous-régional Afrique de l’Ouest et Tchad (PASR AO) élaboré dans le cadre de la convention sur la désertification, vise à compléter et à renforcer les actions mises en place par chaque pays en matière de gestion durable des terres. Le secrétariat technique de ce programme est assuré par le CILSS qui, à ce titre, doit assurer le suivi et l’évaluation des actions du PASR pour le compte de la CEDEAO et du secrétariat de la CCD.

Dans le cadre de la redynamisation de ce programme, un processus de relecture est engagé depuis 2008 et, conformément aux recommandations de la cinquième session du comité sous-régional de coordination (organe de gouvernance du PASR), deux activités principales sont retenues, à savoir:
– renforcer les capacités du CILSS afin qu’il puisse jouer son rôle de secrétariat technique et d’animation du PASR-AO au moyen des actions suivantes: i) appui catalytique au processus de réalignement du PASR sur la stratégie décennale de l’UNCCD; ii) appui aux pays CILSS-CEDEAO pour la préparation des rapports nationaux dans le cadre de la convention; iii) élaboration du rapport sous-régional dans le cadre de la convention; iv) appui catalytique à l’organisation d’une rencontre annuelle des points locaux CCD, en vue d’améliorer la qualité de la participation de la sous-région aux réexamen de la mise en œuvre de la convention (CRIC) et des conférences des parties (COP); v) participation du CILSS à une rencontre internationale par an (CRIC 2010, 2012 et COP 2011 et 2013;
– recenser et mettre en œuvre deux projets transfrontaliers d’envergure régionale en vue de lutter contre la dégradation des terres qui affecte les ressources vitales partagées (ressources pastorales, forêts et pâturages). Le recensement de ces projets se fera au cours des six premiers mois de la mise en œuvre du programme par le CILSS. Cette activité sera réalisée en concertation avec l’autorité du bassin de la Volta (ABV), l’autorité du bassin du Niger, « l’ABN », l’Autorité du Liptako Gourma (ALG), et les pays membres de ces institutions qui font également partie de l’espace CEDEAO. La mise en œuvre de ces projets sera également assurée par le CILSS mais les investissements seront réalisés par des opérateurs privés.

Volet 3: Développement et gestion des connaissances et des technologies et renforcement des capacités dans le domaine de la gestion durable des terres et des changements climatiques.

Il s’agit de promouvoir la gestion des connaissances et le renforcement des capacités en vue d’une meilleure gestion des terres et de l’adaptation aux effets des changements climatiques grâce à (i) la mise en place d’un mastère professionnel en « gestion durable des terres » - cette action portera sur la conception du programme du mastère professionnel et l’appui de deux promotions au moyen de bourses d’études; (ii) la mise en place d’un portail, de plateformes et de réseaux d’échanges régionaux sur les bonnes pratiques de gestion durable des terres et d’adaptation aux changements climatiques - les informations obtenues dans le cadre du programme doivent être discutées, confrontées avec les expériences des uns et des autres, et par la suite validées, et ce portail servira de forum à ces réseaux pour un tel exercice; (iii) la capitalisation et la diffusion des meilleures pratiques en matière de gestion durable des terres - l’enjeu est ici de renforcer les capacités des opérateurs locaux, grâce notamment à la diffusion des meilleures pratiques, l’élaboration de méthodes et d’outils simples d’application; (iv) l’élaboration et la mise en œuvre d’outils de communication participative et de recherche-action sur la gouvernance locale des ressources naturelles et l’amélioration des moyens d’existence au Sahel - la communication participative est une action planifiée basée, d’une part, sur les formes de communication interpersonnelle (processus participatifs) et, d’autre part, sur les différents médias (traditionnels et modernes) pour amener les populations à identifier leurs besoins et problèmes et à définir des choix d’actions.

Volet 4: Amélioration de la gouvernance des ressources naturelles et de l’adaptation aux changements climatiques.
Cette composante vise à promouvoir les politiques et stratégies de gestion durable des terres et d’adaptation aux changements climatiques au Sahel et en Afrique de l’Ouest grâce à:

l’élaboration et/ou l’harmonisation des politiques, cadres législatifs et réglementaires en matière de GDT en vue de sécuriser l’accès aux ressources naturelles dans le contexte du changement climatique. Le projet mettra l’accent sur les thèmes du foncier et du pastoralisme, peu traités au niveau régional. Il s’agira (i) d’appuyer le processus d’élaboration et de mise en œuvre de la charte régionale sur le foncier rural au Sahel et en Afrique de l’Ouest, coordonné par le CILSS en collaboration avec la CEDEAO, l’UEMOA, le ROPPA et Landnet/Afrique de l’Ouest et (ii) de finaliser le processus de formulation et de validation d’une stratégie régionale sur le pastoralisme au Sahel et en Afrique de l’Ouest en cours au niveau du CILSS et d’appuyer sa mise en œuvre;

l’appui technique aux pays du Sahel et de l’Afrique de l’Ouest pour le réexamen et la mise en œuvre de leurs politiques, stratégies, plans et programmes de gestion durable des terres et de maîtrise de l’eau (GDTME). Ceci à travers (i) l’appui aux pays pour la mise en œuvre des programmes nationaux d’investissement en matière de GDT/ME élaborés dans le cadre du programme détaillé pour le développement de l’agriculture en Afrique (PDDAA), et (ii) l’appui à l’intégration de la GDT dans les documents de planification aux niveaux régional et national (politiques régionales et nationales, plans de développement des collectivités décentralisées etc.). Cet appui sera apporté par la fourniture d’une expertise et l’organisation d’ateliers thématiques.

3.3. Risques et hypothèses

Risques

Les risques majeurs que peut courir un tel programme et les mesures d’atténuation de ces risques ont été identifiés par volet, à savoir:

Volet 1

R1: Les conséquences de la variabilité et des changements climatiques qui pourraient avoir une incidence négative sur la pluviométrie (déficit ou inondation prolongée) et compromettre ainsi la réussite des activités de récupération des terres dégradées engagées par les acteurs.

R2: Le manque d’adhésion, de motivation ou d’appropriation des populations ou la résurgence de conflits latents ou potentiels sur les zones à traiter.

L’engagement des acteurs renforce leur capacité d’adaptation et de lutte pour vaincre les aléas. Pour ce faire, ils ont besoin d’être rassurés, formés et informés, besoins qui seront pris en compte à la fois à travers les sessions d’informations et de partage prévues lors du lancement du projet, mais aussi tout au long du processus de mise en œuvre, avec l’accompagnement constant du CILSS.

Volet 2

R1: L’absence de collaboration et de synergie entre les acteurs du PASR/AO, notamment les institutions chefs de file.
Les concertations permanentes entre les acteurs chargés de la mise en œuvre, la synergie des efforts pour éviter les duplications sont indispensables dans la conduite de programmes ou de projets multi-acteurs. Le projet s’assurera que tous les acteurs sont engagés dans le processus et que les rôles et responsabilités sont bien définis et compris par tous.

Volet 3

R1: La non collaboration des institutions et des acteurs détenant les connaissances ou le manque d’intérêt des acteurs en matière de formation.

Il est nécessaire de bâtir sur ce qui existe et de développer les synergies en vue de maximiser les efforts et les ressources disponibles. Dès le début du projet, toutes les connaissances disponibles au niveau du CILSS seront mises à la disposition des acteurs chargés de la mise en œuvre du projet (pays, responsables des projets etc.). Des actions de capitalisation seront conduites au cours de la mise en œuvre du projet et les résultats aideront à renforcer les connaissances des acteurs.

Volet 4

R1: Au niveau des pays, l’absence d’une volonté politique soutenue, l’absence ou le manque de dynamisme et de synergie entre les institutions de l’État, mais aussi entre ces institutions et les populations utilisatrices des ressources naturelles.

R2: Sur le plan régional, la non-adoption de la charte foncière de coopération régionale ou de la stratégie régionale sur le pastoralisme constituerait un obstacle majeur à la gestion coordonnée et concertée et à l’utilisation durable des ressources naturelles partagées dans la sous-région ouest africaine.

La volonté et le soutien politique des États sont indispensables dans les processus de réexamen des politiques et s’acquiert grâce à d’importants efforts de lobbying et de plaidoyer auprès des acteurs concernés. Les actions qui seront engagées lors du démarrage du projet prendront en compte les démarches des pays témoignant de leur adhésion au projet et à ses objectifs, y compris au niveau régional, notamment dans le cadre de la CEDEAO.

Hypothèses

L’engagement du CILSS à mettre en œuvre ce programme et les enseignements tirés des expériences antérieures de mise en œuvre de projets similaires permettent de prendre en compte les mesures d’atténuation et/ou de réduction des risques recensés.

Au plan général, l’appropriation du programme par les pays et les acteurs et parties prenantes est une condition indispensable à la réussite du programme, de même que la stabilité politique dans la sous-région. Avant son démarrage, le projet fera l’objet d’un vaste échange d’informations entre tous les acteurs et parties prenantes afin que chacun joue correctement son rôle.

3.4. Questions transversales

Les considérations liées au genre sont cruciales, notamment l’implication des femmes et celle d’autres groupes vulnérables (jeunes, femmes etc.) dans les prises de décisions et la gestion des ressources naturelles. Ainsi, le projet prévoit la participation effective de ces
personnes aux différents processus du projet au moyen de cadres appropriés leur permettant la libre expression. Il contribue à la bonne gouvernance du fait de son action de recherche-action sur la gouvernance locale des ressources naturelles. Enfin, par son action d’amélioration des moyens d’existence des groupes les plus vulnérables, il améliore leur sécurité alimentaire et par là même le droit humain que constitue le droit à l’alimentation.

3.5. Parties prenantes

L’ensemble des activités sera mis au point par les 3 institutions constituant le CILSS: le secrétariat exécutif, l’Institut du Sahel (INSAH) et le centre régional Agrhymet (CRA). Les autres parties prenantes du projet identifiées sont les structures nationales, régionales et internationales chargées de coordonner les politiques GDT/CC et leur mise en œuvre: i) au niveau international - l’initiative TerrAfrica qui vise à mettre en place des plateformes de bailleurs de fonds pour la GDT et encourage l’établissement d’approches programmatiques pays; ii) la CEDEAO et l’UEMOA responsables de ces question au niveau sous-régional, et, iii) au niveau national, les services techniques nationaux, les partenaires techniques et financiers et les acteurs non-étatiques (ONG, organisations paysannes, secteur privé et collectivités locales).

L’UE est le principal partenaire technique et financier. Des partenaires financiers supplémentaires pour le présent programme, notamment le Fonds français pour l’environnement mondial (FFEM) et le CRDI sont déjà identifiés et le CILSS a engagé des discussions.

4. QUESTIONS DE MISE EN ŒUVRE

4.1. Mode de gestion

Gestion centralisée directe. Un contrat de subvention directe sera signé avec le CILSS. L’attribution directe se justifie par une situation de monopole de fait du bénéficiaire conformément à l'article 6.3.2 du guide pratique. De par son expertise, expérience et mandat en tant qu'institution de recherche inter-états de lutte contre la sécheresse au niveau continental et régional, le CILSS se positionne comme la seule institution à même de piloter, coordonner, mettre en œuvre, suivre et évaluer efficacement des programmes régionaux concernant spécifiquement les questions de sécurité alimentaire, d'environnement, et de changement climatique à l'échelle de la région Afrique de l'Ouest. Cette subvention permettra de renforcer la mise en œuvre du plan/programme de travail 2009–2013 du CILSS dans lequel ce projet s’intègre harmonieusement.

4.2. Procédures de passation de marchés et d’octroi de subventions

1) 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 le règlement CE n° 1905/2006 (ICD).
La passation de marchés par le bénéficiaire vis-à-vis d'un tiers ne peut se faire que dans le respect de l'Article 120 du RF et de l'article 184a des ME.

2) 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 lorsque:

- Le financement de l'action est intégral (dérogation au principe du cofinancement): le taux de cofinancement maximal envisageable pour les subventions est de [indiquer le taux, qui, en principe, ne devrait pas dépasser 80%; si le financement est intégral, il faut 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.

- Dérogation au principe de non-rétroactivité: une subvention peut être octroyée pour une action ayant déjà commencé si le candidat peut démontrer la nécessité d'engager l'action avant l'attribution de la subvention, conformément à l'article 112 du règlement financier applicable au budget général des Communautés européennes.

4.3. Budget et calendrier

Le coût total estimé du projet est de 10 493 000 €. La contribution de l'UE est de € 10 millions, tandis que le cofinancement conjoint du CILSS s'élève à 493 000 €. Le budget final pourrait être ajusté en fonction des discussions avec le partenaire chargé de la mise en œuvre. Le taux de cofinancement conjoint n'est pas élevé mais il sera compensé par un cofinancement parallèle substantiel qui soutiendra également l'action. A ce stade, le cofinancement parallèle apporté par le CRDI est acquis (CAD 1,1 million) et un accord de principe sur une contribution de € 3 millions a été donné par le FFEM, sous réserve de la mobilisation d'un cofinancement conséquent par le CILSS.

Le budget indicatif se présente comme suit:
La durée opérationnelle prévue est de 60 mois à compter de la signature du contrat de subvention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUBRIQUES</th>
<th>MONTANT (EURO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Volet 1</td>
<td>5 900 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Volet 2</td>
<td>1 600 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Volet 3</td>
<td>645 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Volet 4</td>
<td>900 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mise à niveau audit 4 piliers</td>
<td>500 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Autres coûts et services (visibilité, communication, traduction, interprètes, audit, évaluation par CILSS)</td>
<td>500 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Coûts Indirects</td>
<td>398 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. TOTAL SUBVENTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>10 443 000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Evaluation &amp; audit (CE)</td>
<td>50 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJET (CE+CILSS)</strong></td>
<td><strong>10 493 000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cofinancement parallèle CRDI</td>
<td>1 700 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cofinancement parallèle FFEM (à confirmer)</td>
<td>3 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL GENERAL ACTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>15 193 000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. **Suivi de l’exécution**

En matière de gestion des projets et programmes, le CILSS a opté pour une approche programme en lieu et place de l’approche projet et une gestion axée sur les résultats (GAR). L’approche programme permet à tous les donateurs de fournir un appui à un ou plusieurs éléments du programme de l’institution en tenant compte de leurs avantages comparatifs. Elle encourage l’intégration de toutes les ressources disponibles en vue de répondre aux priorités fixées.

La mise en œuvre technique et financière du programme sera assurée par le programme régional d’appui sécurité alimentaire / lutte contre la désertification / population - développement (PRA/SA-LCD-POP-DEV) du CILSS.

Le programme bénéficiera des instruments de suivi et d’évaluation déjà existants, qui seront renforcés si nécessaires, à savoir: le dispositif de supervision conjointe prévu dans le cadre de partenariat général entre le CILSS et ses partenaires financiers ainsi que le manuel de procédures administratives et financières du CILSS.

Un comité de pilotage du projet sera mis en place; il se réunira deux fois la 1ère année, puis au moins une fois par an jusqu’à la fin du projet. Chargé de l’orientation stratégique du projet, il inclura un représentant de la CEDEAO, le CILSS, la CE et les autres bailleurs qui participeront au cofinancement du projet (FFEM/MAE, ASDI, CRDL…). Pour le suivi technique et opérationnel rapproché de la mise en œuvre du projet, le CILSS organisera une réunion de lancement et de planification au démarrage. Par la suite, il tiendra tous les ans.
deux réunions, dont la première fera le bilan et la planification des activités, et la deuxième concernera le bilan à mi-parcours pour le recadrage des activités programmées dans l’année.


**Mise à niveau audit 4 piliers**: En octobre 2009, le CILSS a fait l’objet d’une évaluation en matière de normes comptables, de normes d’audit, de normes de contrôle interne, et de normes en matière de passation de marché, afin de s’assurer que les procédures internes du CILSS répondent aux normes internationales. A l’issue de cette évaluation, des recommandations et des axes d’appuis institutionnels nécessaires à la mise à niveau des procédures du CILSS ont été présentés. Dans cette optique et en complémentarité avec le programme de renforcement des capacités (PRC) et d’autres interventions du CILSS, les actions à considérer dans la présente action sont les suivantes:

I. Au niveau de l’Unité «administration, finance et comptabilité»:
   1) ressources humaines: dans le souci de pourvoir les postes vacants relevés par l’audit de conformité, il est prévu de recruter, pour le site de Ouagadougou, un gestionnaire comptable, un gestionnaire des services généraux et un comptable et, pour le site de Niamey, un gestionnaire financier et un comptable. Par ailleurs et du fait que des activités d’investissement seront mises en œuvre par le biais d’opérateurs privés avec une implication des bénéficiaires, cela nécessiterait véritablement d’améliorer les performances en matière de passation de marchés. Le CILSS préconise le recrutement d’un spécialiste dans ce domaine;
   2) formation: pour plus d’efficacité dans le travail, il est prévu d’organiser cinq stages de recyclage ou de perfectionnement pour le personnel administratif, financier et comptable, et une formation dans le domaine de la passation de marchés pour les chefs d’unité chargés de l’appui au management / administration finance comptabilité (UAM/AFC) au siège CILSS et unités d’appui / administration finance comptabilité (UA/AFC) basés à Niamey et Bamako, de même que pour les gestionnaires financiers, formation des cadres à l’utilisation du nouveau logiciel de gestion mis au point dans le cadre du programme de renforcement des capacités (PRC);
   3) renforcement des capacités logistiques et matérielles (renouvellement du parc informatique de l’Unité «administration finance et comptabilité» et des équipements pour la mise en réseau du nouveau logiciel).

II. Au niveau du service de contrôle interne (Audit Interne):
   1) formation continue en audit et contrôle à raison d’une session pour deux personnes par an conformément aux normes de la profession, soit au total quatre sessions;
   2) élaboration du manuel et de la charte d’audit;
   3) établissement de la cartographie des risques.
4.5. Évaluation et audit

Le projet sera soumis à une évaluation externe à mi-parcours au cours du premier semestre de la troisième année de mise en œuvre opérationnelle. Une évaluation finale sera réalisée en fin de projet. Ces évaluations externes ainsi que les vérifications financières seront organisées et pilotées par le CILSS sur les ressources de la subvention ainsi que les vérifications financières récurrentes. La Commission Européenne se réserve le droit de passer des contrats pour des missions d'audit et /ou d'évaluation additionnelles et un montant spécifique a été alloué à cet effet.

4.6. Communication et visibilité

Pour assurer la visibilité des actions du projet et de ses résultats, le CILSS élaborera un plan de communication qui précisera les outils de communications appropriés, pour informer, faciliter le partage et la circulation de l’information, mais également appuyer les actions et la mise en relation des différents acteurs. Ce plan de communication intègre le plan de communication du CILSS (en cours de finalisation). Le CILSS s'engage également à appliquer les principes et les standards de visibilité adoptés par l'UE pour les actions externes, tels qu'indiqués dans le manuel de communication et de visibilité de l’UE http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/visibility/index en.htm. Un portail d'affichage et de diffusion des actions et des expériences enregistrées par le programme sera également développé sur le site Web du CILSS pour améliorer la visibilité. Les activités de communication et de visibilité seront financées sur les ressources de la subvention.
### Abréviations et acronymes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbréviation</th>
<th>Signification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABN</td>
<td>Autorité du Bassin du Niger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Adaptation aux changements climatiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACMAD</td>
<td>Centre africain d’applications météorologiques pour le déveoppement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALG</td>
<td>Autorité du Liptako Gourma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMESD</td>
<td>African Monitoring Environnement for Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASDI</td>
<td>Agence suédoise pour le développement international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAD</td>
<td>Banque africaine de développement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAADP</td>
<td>Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Contrôle d’avancement de projet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Changements climatiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCD :</td>
<td>Convention des Nations unies sur la lutte contre la désertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Communauté européenne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
<td>Commission économique pour l’Afrique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDEAO</td>
<td>Communauté économique des États d’Afrique de l’Ouest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN-SAD</td>
<td>Communauté des États sahelo-sahariens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CILSS</td>
<td>Comité permanent inter-États de lutte contre la sécheresse dans le Sahel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORAF/WECARD</td>
<td>West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRA</td>
<td>Centre régional agro-hydro-météorologique (Institution spécialisée du CILSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIC</td>
<td>Comité pour l'examen de la mise en œuvre de la Convention des Nations unies sur la lutte contre la désertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRDI</td>
<td>Centre de recherche canadien pour le développement international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAO</td>
<td>Club du Sahel et de l’Afrique de l’Ouest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRP</td>
<td>Cadre stratégique de réduction de la pauvreté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRC</td>
<td>Comité sous-régional de coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUA</td>
<td>Commission de l’Union africaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSRP</td>
<td>Document de stratégie pour la réduction de la pauvreté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOWAP</td>
<td>Politique agricole de la CEDEAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOWEP</td>
<td>Politique environnementale de la CEDEAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARA</td>
<td>Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERSOL</td>
<td>Capitalisation des expériences de gestion durable de la fertilité des sols au Burkina Faso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFEM</td>
<td>Fonds français pour l’environnement mondial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILCDRPS</td>
<td>Fonds Italie CILSS pour la lutte contre la désertification et la réduction de la pauvreté au Sahel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSTP</td>
<td>Programme thématique sécurité alimentaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAR</td>
<td>Gestion axée sur les résultats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCCA</td>
<td>Global Climate Change Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDT</td>
<td>Gestion durable des terres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDT/ME</td>
<td>Gestion durable des terres/maîtrise de l’eau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMVSS</td>
<td>Grande muraille verte au Sahara et au Sahel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRN</td>
<td>Gestion des ressources naturelles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAF</td>
<td>World Agroforestry Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRI SAT</td>
<td>Institut international de recherche sur les cultures des zones tropicales semi-arides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSAH</td>
<td>Institut du Sahel (Institution spécialisée du CILSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>Institut de recherche pour le développement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IREMLCD</td>
<td>Initiative régionale environnement mondial lutte contre la désertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCD/GRN</td>
<td>Lutte contre la désertification/ gestion des ressources naturelles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD</td>
<td>Nouveau partenariat pour le développement de l’Afrique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIG</td>
<td>Organisation intergouvernementale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAE</td>
<td>Ministère français des affaires étrangères</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronyme</td>
<td>Signification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Mécanisme mondial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMD</td>
<td>Objectifs du millénaire pour le développement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSS</td>
<td>Observatoire du Sahara et Sahel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN/LCD</td>
<td>Programme d’action national pour la lutte contre la désertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANA</td>
<td>Programme d’action national d’adaptation aux changements climatiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASR AO</td>
<td>Programme d’action sous-régional de lutte contre la désertification en Afrique de l’Ouest et au Tchad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASR RV-AO</td>
<td>Programme d’action sous-régional pour la réduction de la vulnérabilité aux changements climatiques en Afrique de l’Ouest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCAE</td>
<td>Politique commune pour l’amélioration de l’environnement de l’UEMOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDDAA</td>
<td>Programme détaillé du NEPAD pour le développement de l’agriculture africaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNUD/DDC</td>
<td>Programme des Nations pour le développement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRA</td>
<td>Programme régional d’appui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREDAS</td>
<td>Programme régional énergies domestiques et alternatives dans le Sahel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>Partenaires techniques et financiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROPPA</td>
<td>Réseau des organisations paysannes et des producteurs agricoles d’Afrique de l’Ouest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP/CONACILSS</td>
<td>Secrétariat permanent des comités nationaux du CILSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TerrAfrica</td>
<td>Plateforme continentale pour l’investissement dans la gestion durable des terres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Union africaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE</td>
<td>Union européenne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEMOA</td>
<td>Union économique et monétaire Ouest-africaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UICN</td>
<td>Union mondiale pour la nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFCCC</td>
<td>Convention-cadre des Nations unies sur les changements climatiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCCD</td>
<td>Convention des Nations unies contre la désertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United State Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **IDENTIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>Accessible systems to manage risk in family agriculture in Africa — CRIS 2009/200-017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>EU contribution: €4 500 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint co-financing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Consortium for Agricultural Research in the Tropics (ECART: ): €275 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP: ): €549 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL: €5 324 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method /</td>
<td>Project approach — centralised management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC-code</td>
<td>52010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sector Food Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **RATIONALE**

2.1. **Sector context**

African farmers, who are mainly smallholder farmers, face severe constraints in investing in productivity-enhancing technology because of limited household resources and lack of access to finance. This can be attributed in part to the high risks to which smallholder farmers in Africa are exposed. Risks are prevalent at every stage of the agricultural value chain — from input acquisition to post-harvest storage, processing and marketing. Africa’s agriculture is predominantly rain-fed and, in consequence, farmers face major pre-harvest risks such as drought, floods, windstorms and hailstones. Emerging evidence suggests that climate change is already increasing both the likelihood and impact of these yield-reducing risks on smallholder crop and livestock production in Africa. Other production risks include pests and diseases. At the post-harvest stage, African farmers face significant market access difficulties and volatility in prices. This is often due to poor physical infrastructure, missing or weak market-supporting institutions, disabling policies and poor public service delivery systems. Uncertainty about marketing significant surpluses tends to discourage farmers from adopting high-return options such as improved farm technology. The perception that the farm sector is highly risky makes it unattractive to financial intermediaries, thereby reducing private investment in the sector. Livelihoods in entire rural communities as well as poor urban households can also be jeopardised as a consequence of these risks.
Tools already exist to allow farmers in most advanced economies to manage farm risks. For instance, they can adopt technology to manage the impact of the forces of nature and also make use of public-funded systems as well as market-based instruments to mitigate the effects of various shocks. Smallholder farmers in Africa are highly vulnerable to farm risks, but have limited options to manage them because of declining public support programmes and severely underdeveloped markets for risk management tools. They usually rely on traditional ex ante risk minimisation strategies such as diversification of farm activities (e.g. mixed cropping and crop rotation) and ex post coping strategies such as maintaining reserves of inventories and financial assets. Quite often, these strategies do not optimise productivity and provide limited protection against severe negative shocks. A study undertaken by ECART (European Consortium for Agricultural Research), with funding by AFD/MAEE, has identified risk management tools that can help manage short-term variability in prices and stabilise food prices in Africa by improving incentives for long-term output growth.

2.2. Lessons learnt

Some of the tools identified during the ECART study mentioned above have been successfully piloted in Africa98. Lessons learnt in the development of these tools, taken into account in the design of the proposed project, show that:

- Limited understanding of the context in which the tools work often leads to underdevelopment of complementary instruments.
- The sustainability of many formal risk management systems requires strengthening of the capacity of private sector service providers.
- An enabling policy and regulatory framework is as crucial as investment. Achieving this requires the involvement of a broad range of stakeholders.
- Demonstration effects are very powerful in mobilising broad support behind the development of these tools, particularly where they are seen as new.

2.3. Complementary actions

The proposed project has strong complementarities with the following programmes/projects:

- The EU-funded ‘Support for Farmers’ Organisations in Africa’ project.
- The ‘Empowering Smallholder Farmers in Markets (ESFIM)’ programme, which is implemented by IFAP/ECART with financial support from IFAD and AgriCord.
- The EU-funded All ACP Agricultural Commodities Programme (AAACP).
- The EU-funded Food Facility for ACP countries.
- The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP)99.
- World Bank/DFID-funded projects implemented by COMESA: Making Markets Work for the Poor (MMWP); the African Agricultural Market Programme; and the Improved Regional Trade in Food Staples (RTFS).
- AGRA and USAID-funded programmes in the three target regions.

2.4. Donor coordination

The project's inception phase will include regional workshops. The process of validating national priorities during the preparation of national action plans will involve strong

---

98 An example is the weather-indexed crop insurance scheme piloted in Malawi under a project led by the World Bank’s Commodity Risk Management Group (CRMG) to compensate for yield losses arising from the vagaries of the weather and therefore ease access to farm finance.

99 The Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA), which is a key player in the implementation of the TerrAfrica Initiative as well as CAADP Pillars 1 and 4, has formally endorsed the proposed project.
coordination with donors active in the agricultural sector at country level, including the World Bank, African Development Bank, IFAD (International Fund for Agricultural Development) and USAID. It is also expected that the host farmers’ organisation will utilise links with various donor coordination platforms and policy advocacy forums to ensure effective coordination and alignment of project activities with relevant donor and government-funded programmes.

3. **DESCRIPTION**

3.1. **Objectives**

The overall goal of the proposed programme is to improve the food security and livelihoods of the rural poor in Africa, *through enhancing access to and use of effective farm risk management tools by smallholder farmers and other players in agricultural value chains* (the project purpose). Achieving this purpose will contribute to: reducing farmers’ exposure to downward shocks in income; improving access to credit in the rural economy; increasing investment in the farm sector; promoting better marketing of agricultural produce; and raising farm output and productivity.

3.2. **Expected results and main activities**

The proposed programme will have a strong focus on sustainable capacity building, working with regional and national partners to adapt, install and/or scale up proven agricultural risk management tools. The following results are expected:

i) The capacity of national partners, especially farmer organisations, is strengthened in order to scale up existing risk management tools, and to develop innovative, complementary tools that optimise benefits to farmers and other players.

ii) Engagement with key national stakeholders and strategic regional and pan-African partners is fostered to create and maintain an enabling policy and regulatory environment as well as investment in required physical and institutional infrastructure.

iii) National action plans to scale up and/or develop innovative, complementary farm risk management tools are implemented in the three pilot countries.

iv) Lessons from the pilot countries are shared with other African and developing countries.

A two-phase programme approach is proposed, consisting of an inception and implementation phase.

Pre-inception has been completed, including the identification of feasible tools to manage farm risk (Annex 1) and the selection of pilot countries — Burkina Faso, Tanzania and Zambia, which was jointly undertaken by ECART and IFAP and involved consultations with national and regional farmers’ organisations as well as regional partners, including the Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA).

---

100 For instance, in Zambia, the host farmer organisation — Zambia National Farmers Union (ZNFU) — is engaged in the Agricultural Sector Advisory Group (AG-SAG), the creation of which is reported to have improved dialogue with government on agricultural policies. ZNFU is also actively involved in the Agricultural Consultative Forum (ACF). Similar platforms in Tanzania and Burkina Faso will be utilised in ensuring donor coordination under the project.
The inception phase will focus on stakeholder mobilisation and formal confirmation of participation by regional and national partners, including government organisations such as extension services departments and private service providers, as well as capacity building geared towards the preparation and implementation of country action plans.

**The main activities are as follows:**

- Kick-off planning meeting.
- Development of programme website.
- Participation by ECART/IFAP in international and regional events to promote the project as well as publication of a project newsletter and flyers.
- Synthesis and sharing of information on feasible farm risk management tools.
- MOUs with relevant national partners.
- Setting up national multi-stakeholder task teams.
- Assessing existing risk management systems; prioritising specific tools; allocating tasks to collaborating organisations.
- Identifying needs, outlining plans, producing and delivering materials for building the capacity of relevant national organisations. Contracting consultants/experts to provide technical advice.

The implementation phase will focus on implementation of the country action plans and work plans in order to roll out feasible risk management tools in the selected countries, including building the capacity of service providers and users. Relevant experience and lessons from programme implementation will be synthesised and disseminated for the benefit of other African countries/regions.

**The main activities are as follows:**

- Coordinating the implementation of adopted Country Action Plans.
- Monitoring and evaluating the implementation of country plans and information exchange among partner countries. This will include a mid-term and a final evaluation.
- Synthesising the experiences and disseminating these through three regional workshops, as well as study tours and web-based dissemination of relevant documents and reports, concerned EU Delegations, Commission DGs and CTA will be associated as far as possible to such events and activities.

### 3.3. Risks and assumptions

It is assumed that the provision of private services will be complemented by government and donor interventions that can sustain the systems developed. The anticipated risks include the following:

- disabling policy interventions;
- lack of commitment from key participants, especially the national stakeholders;
- insistence on exclusive smallholder targeting;
- occurrence of catastrophic events.

The first three risks are mitigated through the process of selecting participating countries. Where capacity constraints limit contributions by national partners, especially the host farmer organisations, specific training and capacity training will be provided. The fourth factor needs

---

101 ‘National stakeholders’ refers to all food chain players and relevant government authorities.
3.4. Cross-cutting issues

Environmental sustainability

Development of the farm risk management tools will not directly impact on the environment. However, there might be positive and negative environmental externalities due to changes in land use and land management, which need to be monitored.

Gender equality

Women usually play a very important role in food crop production and food consumption. Under the proposed programme, specific consideration will be given to gender differences in risk management while enhancing women’s access to risk management instruments.

Good governance

Developing the proposed tools can help African governments address food security concerns in a manner that is transparent, imposes minimum strain on public finances and does not distort long-term producer incentives and therefore undermine long-term domestic production capacity.

Programme sustainability

The prioritised risk management tools will require private provision. It is expected that private providers can achieve financial sustainability within the life of the proposed project. This will be validated during the inception phase, and where uncertain, specific plans to obtain co-financing will be included in the particular national action plans.

3.5. Stakeholders

The target beneficiaries of the programme are smallholder farmers in three participating African countries. The stakeholders at national level in the participating countries will include:

- National farmer organisations.
- Extension agencies and NGOs working with farmers.
- Traders and processors.
- Service providers such as financial intermediaries, insurance companies and input suppliers.
- Policy-makers.
- EC delegations in the partner countries and those working with the Regional Economic Communities (RECs).

Programme interventions at national level will be backed up by coordination and cooperation with regional and continental organisations, including the regional farmers’ organisations, RECs, the African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services (AFAAS), and FARA. The programme will also partner private sector-based regional bodies. Other potential international partners include the Common Fund for Commodities (CFC), the World Bank (especially the Commodity Risk Management Group), FAO, ITC, UNCTAD, USAID, AGRA, CTA, and CIDA.
4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Method of implementation

The project will be implemented under direct centralised management, through the signature of a grant agreement for an amount of €4.5m between ECART and the European Commission. In accordance with the provisions of the Financial Regulations applicable to the EU General Budget (PRAG 6.3.2), the direct award of the grant is justified by a ‘de facto’ monopoly situation.

ECART will implement the action in close partnership with the International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP) — a unique combination bringing together the European research and education sector and the world farmers’ organisation. ECART, which recently joined with NATURA in forming AGRINATURA, encompassing 35 universities and research organisations from 18 European countries, is the only pan-European organisation of universities and research centres. It has the largest European pool of specialists in research, education, training and capacity development for the agricultural sector in developing countries. For its part, IFAP represents over 600 million farm families grouped in 120 national organisations in 79 countries (industrialised and developing countries). IFAP has been advocating farmers’ interests at international level since 1946 and has general consultative status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. The partnership ensures an unparalleled linkage with African organisations involved in the CAADP process, at the national, regional and continental levels.

ECART institutions will manage the overall implementation of the proposed programme through a Project Manager, while national-level structures in the host institutions will be responsible for implementing approved National Action Plans and related work plans. The governance structures to be set up to assist in managing the programme will be the Programme Steering Committee (PSC) at international level, which will be hosted by IFAP/ECART to assure continuity of monitoring and evaluation beyond the project, as farm risk management is a priority for the membership of IFAP. Representation on the PSC will include ECART, IFAP and its African Farmers’ Committees, regional farmers’ organisations, the European Commission as an observer and other concerned international organisations (IFAD, WB). A Technical Management Committee hosted by ECART (and comprising the Project Manager, 2 ECART Resource Persons, and 2 IFAP Resource Persons) will focus on quality control of the implementation of work plans.

The National Project Managers (NPM) — who will be staff from the host farmers’ organisations — will be the focal point for implementation of all project activities at national level. They will be assisted in this by National Programme Advisory Committees, hosted by the partner national farmers’ organisations. Representation on the committee will include other farmers’ organisations in the country, NGOs working in the farm sector, government representatives (especially from Ministries of Agriculture) and key private sector players, for example the banking and insurance industries and traders’ associations. Representatives of the regional farmers’ organisations and/or the IFAP African Farmers’ Committee may be invited as resource persons for meetings and events when necessary.

National Task Teams will also be formed by the National Programme Advisory Committees to address specific issues. The number of Task Teams will therefore depend on specific country-level activities. Stakeholders participating in the Task Teams will represent key interests and need to have skills and experience for the specific tasks to be addressed.
4.2. **Procurement and grant award procedures**

All contracts implementing the action will 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. Participation in the award of contracts will be open to all natural and legal persons covered by DCI Regulation 1905/2006. 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 EU general budget. Derogations from these principles have to be justified.

Sub-granting to third parties from Article 120 FR and Article 184a IR have to be respected if beneficiaries of the grants will be awarding grants to third parties.

4.3. **Budget and calendar**

The estimated project cost amounts to €5324600, with a maximum EU contribution of €4.5 m, the remaining cost being covered by ECART (€275000) and IFAP (€549600). The final budget may be subject to adjustments as a function of final discussions with the implementing partner. The table below provides the indicative budget breakdown by activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Budget (€)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I: inception phase</td>
<td>273850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II: implementation phase</td>
<td>4 104 970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other costs (visibility, communication, audit, M&amp;E including surveys, evaluations etc. by ECART)</td>
<td>557280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>338 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total grant</td>
<td>5 274 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and audit (EC)</td>
<td>50 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>5 324 600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The duration of the project will be 48 months from the signature of the grant agreement.

4.4. **Performance monitoring**

A monitoring plan will be agreed during the first planning meeting, and will reflect the logframe indicators as well as annual targets and milestones for each indicator and participating country. The plan will also include baseline studies, to be delivered at month 3 of the action, to establish indicators in each country. Two aspects will be monitored. The first is the progress of the project, i.e. the development, testing and implementation of risk management tools, the second is the performance of the tools themselves (which is why implementation will be structured in a way that makes it possible to monitor tool performance and to properly attribute outcomes to specific elements of the tools).

4.5. **Evaluation and audit**

An external mid-term evaluation will be carried out at the end of year 2 and a final evaluation is planned at the end of the action. Terms of reference for these reviews will be decided jointly by the European Commission and the implementing organisations. The implementing
consortium will submit quarterly financial reports and annual reports, as well as annual audited expenditure verifications. As is the case with monitoring, the evaluation will focus on both the progress toward implementation of new tools and the tools themselves. Control groups may be designated to ensure that outcomes can be attributed to specific elements of the tools, thereby providing a proper basis for scaling up the use of the tools. An audit and/or evaluation of the project contracted by the European Commissionaire is also envisaged and financial provision has been made accordingly.

4.6. Communication and visibility

A communication and visibility action plan will be fully developed within the first three months of implementation of the action. The plan will design appropriate information and communication activities to raise awareness among targeted audiences of the reasons for the action and the EU support in the countries and regions concerned, as well as the results and impact of this support. The plan will thus identify key audience and target groups, objectives, activities, indicators (consistent with those set out in the action logframe), and financial and human resources. The plan will be drafted using the ‘Communication and Visibility Manual for EU External Actions’\textsuperscript{102}. 

\textsuperscript{102} \url{http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/index_en.htm.}
## ANNEX: List of potential market-based risk management tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk/uncertainty</th>
<th>Risk management tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Output uncertainty (due for instance to vagaries of the weather as well as pests and diseases) | i. Crop insurance, including weather-indexed insurance supplied by the private sector — piloted in India and Malawi by the Commodity Risk Management Group (CRMG) of the World Bank.  
ii. Livestock insurance piloted in South Africa, Kenya and Zambia.  
iii. Calamity fund to compensate for losses associated with highly co-variate risks which cannot be covered by private insurers — piloted in India by the CRMG.  
iv. Improved access to microfinance to encourage uptake of improved farm technology. |
| 2. Uncertain access to markets | i. Warehouse receipt systems, including institutionalisation of grading standards and market information systems — successfully piloted in Uganda, Tanzania and South Africa.  
ii. Using procurement of local grains by government and aid agencies to foster development of formal markets (e.g. procurement by WFP in Uganda).  
iii. Forward contracting involving farmer groups (e.g. milk producers in Kenya; and with grain farmers by a large-scale trader in Zambia). |
| 3. Price risk management | i. Futures contracts — used by the Government of Malawi in managing the landed price of grains imported to fill a deficit in domestic supply.  
ii. Options contracts traded on SAFEX and used by farmers in South Africa. |
### ANNEX: — LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)</th>
<th>Source and Means of Verification (MOV)</th>
<th>Assumptions/Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> Improve rural livelihoods and enhance food security in three Sub-Saharan African (SSA) countries.</td>
<td>1. Farm sectors in partner countries achieve annual growth rate of 6% set under CAADP and farm household incomes rise by 10% within 10 years from the launch of the programme.</td>
<td>1. National Statistics 2. NEPAD/CAADP reports</td>
<td>1. Production not hampered by catastrophic events such as widespread drought. 2. Governments in partner country remain committed to CAADP and pursue supportive sector policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong> Raise farm productivity of smallholder farmers in three African countries by improving access to effective pre- and post-harvest risk management tools.</td>
<td>1. Within 48 months from launch of programme, at least 10% of smallholder farm households in partner countries able to access agricultural risk management tools promoted under the programme. 2. Volume of yield-enhancing inputs used by participating farmers increased by at least 25% by the end of the programme. 3. Yields obtained by participating farmers increase by at least 25% by the end of the programme. * These generic targets will be made country-specific during the programme.</td>
<td>1. Reports from service providers and regional partners (Section 5) 2. Project reports 3. Monitoring reports 4. Final evaluation report</td>
<td>1. Use of risk-minimising tools not hampered by lack of service providers. 2. The development of market-based risk management tools is not hindered by disabling policies. 3. NEPAD (through CAADP), regional economic bodies, network of regional farmer organisations and donors remain committed to promoting good and innovative practices in agricultural sector in Africa. 4. Governments remain committed to facilitating role in agricultural sector development in Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention logic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Source and Means of Verification (MOV)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assumptions/Risks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Output 1**           | Evidence-based material on feasible farm risk management tools synthesised and shared | 1. Documents on feasible farm risk management tools produced within 6 months from launch of programme.  
2. Three regional sensitisation workshops on pre- and post-harvest risk management tools organised within 6 months from launch of programme. | 1. Copies of synthesis documents  
2. Regional workshop proceedings  
3. Website and number of hits; number of expressions of interest by potential participating countries | 1. AFD/MAEE project completed on schedule.  
2. CRMG and other relevant international bodies willing to share lessons.  
3. Regional and national stakeholders willing to participate in consultation and sensitisation activities. |
| **Output 2**           | National task teams constituted and capacity strengthened to prepare and implement national action plans in three partner countries | 1. MOUs signed with national focal organisations within 6 months from launch of programme.  
2. Task teams operational within 6 months from launch of programme. | 1. Copies of MOUs  
2. Minutes of meetings of task teams  
3. Evaluation reports on training provided | 1. Regional and national stakeholders remain committed to programme. |
| **Output 3**           | Existing risk management systems reviewed and options for scaling up and/or innovating identified in three | 1. Options for scaling up and/or innovation in farm risk management identified in three partner countries within 9 months after launch | 1. Terms of reference for task teams  
2. Reports by task teams and national focal organisations | 1. National focal organisations and task teams willing and capable of undertaking defined tasks. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)</th>
<th>Source and Means of Verification (MOV)</th>
<th>Assumptions/Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>partner countries</td>
<td>of the programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PHASE 2**

**OUTPUT 4**
Country Action Plans developed and implemented to scale up or replicate effective farm risk management tools in three African countries

1. Three Country Action Plans with country-specific targets prepared by partner countries within 12 months from launch of the programme.
2. Annual country work plans and budgets prepared by partner countries reflecting targets set in Action Plans. The first work plans should be prepared within 12 months from launch of the programme.
3. Systems to provide country-specific feasible farm risk management tools are accessible to target farmers within 30 months from the launch of the programme.

1. National action plans
2. National work plans with specific annual targets
3. Progress reports
4. Monitoring and evaluation reports
5. Reports from service providers

1. National farmer organisations and private stakeholders committed to leading in programme implementation.
2. Governments remain committed to creating and maintaining enabling environment for efficient service delivery to farmers.

**OUTPUT 5**
Lessons from programmes

1. Increased uptake of feasible farm risk management tools

1. Evaluation and progress reports

1. National, regional and international organisations willing to critically assess
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)</th>
<th>Source and Means of Verification (MOV)</th>
<th>Assumptions/Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>implemented in three African partner countries synthesised and shared</td>
<td>by non-partner countries.</td>
<td>2. Review reports</td>
<td>outputs as well as share relevant lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Monitoring reports;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1: Synthesis of evidence-based material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Prepare TOR and contract expert(s) to synthesise evidence-based material in accessible form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Establish programme website for sharing of materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Disseminate synthesised material for lesson learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2: Mobilisation/capacity strengthening for local stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Agree MOUs with regional and national partners, with roles clearly defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Organise regional and national lesson-learning workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Produce and share reports on workshop proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Undertake identification of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention logic</td>
<td>Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)</td>
<td>Source and Means of Verification (MOV)</td>
<td>Assumptions/Risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity building needs of key regional and national partners</td>
<td>2.5 Develop training and other programmes to build capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Implement capacity building programme at national and regional levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUT 3: Review of existing systems and identification of options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Assign ECART experts and contract other technical consultants to support national focal organisations and task teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Engage national task teams in assessing existing risk management systems and identifying/prioritising feasible options to be developed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Share emerging outcomes with other partner countries and regional partners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUT 4: Preparation and implementation of country action</td>
<td></td>
<td>To be determined during final formulation and programming of the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention logic</td>
<td>Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)</td>
<td>Source and Means of Verification (MOV)</td>
<td>Assumptions/Risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Draft country action plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Organise national workshops to discuss draft country action plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Identify and contract experts to provide technical advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Implement country action plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Monitor and evaluate implementation of country action plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUT 5: Synthesising and sharing of lessons and experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Document outcome and lessons from implementation of programme by three partner countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Organise final national workshop by host institution to evaluate outcome and lessons at national levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Organise regional dissemination workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTION FICHE FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
COMPONENT 3: EXPLOITING THE POTENTIAL OF CONTINENTAL AND REGIONAL APPROACHES TO IMPROVE FOOD SECURITY

‘REGIONAL INITIATIVE IN SUPPORT OF VULNERABLE PASTORALISTS AND AGRO-PASTORALISTS IN THE HORN OF AFRICA’

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>Regional initiative in support of vulnerable pastoralists and agro-pastoralists in the Horn of Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>EC contribution: EUR 5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel co-financing (Food and Agriculture Organisation - FAO): EUR 1 250 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method / Method of implementation</td>
<td>Project approach — joint management with an international organisation (FAO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC-code</td>
<td>52010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Food Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

A recent assessment of government policies and strategies within the Horn of Africa region (Omondi and Odhiambo, 2009) has revealed the following: (i) the overwhelming pre-occupation with drought and relief programmes is curtailing the development of effective long-term development initiatives; (ii) while Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) commonly include the needs of pastoralists, key policies (including livestock, land and agriculture) are ‘inconsistent with the needs and are not responsive to the uniqueness of the pastoral system’. In response, the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) Livestock Policy Initiative (LPI) has carried out intensive, multi-stakeholder consultations at national and regional level. They have found a consistent, broad and strong body of opinion indicating that many of the factors underpinning the livelihoods of pastoralists (and the livestock-dependent poor in general) require a regional response, in that they (i) are regional public goods, (ii) enjoy regional economies of scale, or (iii) require prompt regional coordination of decision making. There has since been considerable political backing from national governments in the region to establish, with the support of FAO, the institutions with which to do this. As part of its mandate, FAO will therefore continue to utilise this political backing in the proposed project to (i) increase community involvement in policy planning processes, thereby ensuring that policies are consistent with their needs, and (ii) facilitate the alignment of development actors within the region around a specified strategy in support of pastoralists. This will build the capacity of national institutions to engage with appropriate and informed stakeholders to develop policies and strategies that are in line with, and will contribute to, their targets as indicated in national PRSPs. A second component of the project will directly address pastoral and agro-pastoral poverty by scaling up tried and tested approaches to livelihood improvement. Through these approaches, the project will focus on making communities part of the solution rather than simply funding activities that aim to provide a solution for them.
2.2. Lessons learnt

For the past 21 months, FAO has been responsible for the coordination of the Regional Drought Decision (RDD phase I and II) programme funded by ECHO. This experience has confirmed once again the importance of a regional approach for properly addressing drought-related issues for pastoralist communities. An external evaluation of this programme\(^\text{103}\) concluded that FAO played an excellent supporting role, both through the provision of technical support and in coordination. External evaluation of some of the implementing partner projects found the Pastoral Field Schools (PFS) and the Village Community Banks (VICOBA) approaches sustainable, appropriate and effective, as ‘extension, information dissemination centres and also financial services provision avenues’. They were also judged to have ‘helped groups to acquire best practices and instil discipline in savings and assets management’\(^\text{104}\). A number of key lessons have been learned through this experience, including:

- **The importance of supporting government coordination structures**: while FAO’s coordination was effective, it was recognised that FAO needed to increase its support for government structures to carry out coordination.

- **The recognition that Community-driven initiatives can influence policy**: experience shows that governments often actually want to engage with community stakeholders but just do not know who to engage with. The formation of a representative group and the provision of technical support to that group would enable the government to achieve its own inclusion targets and also provide a key focal point for donors investing in the pastoral sector. As far as possible, the proposed action will use this approach, although slight adjustments will be necessary within each country based on the varying political climate.

2.3. Complementary actions

The growing number of projects in pastoral areas (many of which are linked to the ECHO RDD II project — EUR 2 671 596 for phase I and EUR 800 000 for phase II — ending in June 2010, but likely to move into a third phase thereafter) will form a network through which the community-based activities of this regional programme can be replicated. The proposed action will work with these projects by providing expertise and training, e.g. in PFS, VICOBA, community animal health work and community policy dialogue. These capacity building activities are expected to attract additional funds that will ensure their widespread scaling up. These activities will help generate the critical mass of evidence needed to bring about policy change at national and regional level. Efforts to this end will utilise the national participatory fora and livestock policy task forces developed by the IGAD LPI programme (EUR 5.4 million from the EU) and will contribute to its long-term sustainability. IGAD has submitted a concept for funding under the 10\(^{th}\) EDF to support the development of a livestock and pastoralist unit to ‘develop the capacity for regional coordination and harmonisation of the livestock sector in IGAD’. The proposed action will support the IGAD concept by building strong links with community institutions.

The project will also liaise very closely with the following initiatives:

- The EU-funded Karamoja Livelihoods Programme (KALIP) in Uganda (EUR 15 million); this programme is likely to support (among other things) the upscaling of the PFS and VICOBA concepts within Uganda, adding significant weight to the proposed action, through improved design and implementation of the PFS and VICOBA groups, impact assessment, support for network development, and links to policy fora.


The USAID-funded Pastoral Livelihood Initiative in Ethiopia (USD 29 million). Similar to the KALIP programme in Uganda, the proposed action will, where possible, work within existing initiatives and provide support in terms of networking and coordination to ensure that these projects not only feed into national-level thinking but also contribute to broader regional debate on pastoralism. To this end, the proposed action will assist the PLI with field-based technical support upon request and by supporting links to IGAD and the regional policy debate.

The WFP Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO). The project will work with WFP to identify ways of including pastoral produce in food rations. Initial consultations with WFP have reviewed options for including milk and meat in the standard food basket and found this to be unfeasible. Alternative methods through voucher schemes will be tested under this project. One of the current key limitations here is adherence to standards. If these standards could be achieved and adopted through PFS, this would provide community groups (whether supported by this project or supported by other programmes) with ready markets for their produce.

NEPAD and in particular pillar 3 of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), with the Regional Enhanced Livelihoods for Pastoral Areas (RELPA) project, funded by USAID ($19.8 million). The proposed action will work closely with the second phase of this project as well as with the USAID-funded livestock marketing project currently under development in Kenya. The RELPA project has a significant focus on range land management and livestock marketing. Lessons learned from the evaluation of this project (currently ongoing) will feed into the initiatives under result C of this project. There are currently FAO-led initiatives to try and develop a broad livestock marketing programme within Kenya that incorporates components from a number of different donors. If these are successful, it is likely that the proposed USAID livestock marketing project will be incorporated into a much larger programme. The activities under result A, particularly the potential links to WFP, will complement this.

Additional projects that will be loosely involved in the coordination component of the proposed action include: the EU-funded African Union (AU) IBAR VACNADA and SERECU projects, both of which primarily target animal health and will provide important links for certification of livestock products if and when needed under result A.

In addition to the above, FAO, as part of the regional pastoral forum, works with the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) to contribute to the Pastoral Policy Framework, an African Union initiative led by its Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture (DREA). The forum facilitates information flow between the major parties in the policy process: pastoralists, African Union (AU) and Regional Economic Communities (IGAD, COMESA (Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa), etc.), as well as relevant UN bodies, such as the UN Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) based in Addis Ababa.

2.4. Donor coordination

Under its food security mandate, FAO works (i) through its network of country representations, Emergency Coordination Units, and sub-regional offices throughout the African continent, (ii) with the support of the technical services and operational divisions at FAO headquarters, and above all (iii) through the country and regional inter-agency food security coordination mechanisms that gather together all humanitarian, developmental and other institutional stakeholders, including UN sister agencies, national and international NGOs, governments and donors.

This approach links in with FAO’s involvement in the One United Nations initiative, the clusters approach, the Common Appeals Process / Common Humanitarian Appeals Process, as well as its official support for the Good Humanitarian Donorship Initiative.
3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectives

**Overall objective**: to contribute to reduce the vulnerability of (agro-)pastoral communities in the Horn of Africa.

**Specific objective**: to set up an institutional and policy framework to strengthen the resilience of (agro-)pastoral communities in the Horn of Africa and the diversification of their livelihoods.

The project will be implemented in Kenya, Uganda, Ethiopia and Djibouti. In addition, Somalia and Sudan will also be involved in order to allow their participation in the regional discussion, essentially for Result C, even though with limited financial allocations. These countries were selected based on the fact that they all are key members of IGAD, and based on considerations regarding FAO’s operational absorption capacity, feasibility and financial constraints.

3.2. Expected results and main activities

Project activities will be organised according to three results (A, B, C). Results A and B will improve and inform national level pastoral policy, while Result C will help governments to feed these national policies into regional level commitments.

**Result A**: Communities are proactively addressing their own needs in terms of improved disaster preparedness and response and are active participants in policy debate.

This result assumes that poverty in the Horn of Africa is inextricably linked to disaster preparedness. The more sustainable a family’s livelihood, the greater its ability to prepare for and cope with disasters. In the current context of increased climatic variability, livelihood sustainability is increasingly linked to diversification. Hence, the project focuses on livelihood diversification as a means to promote both poverty reduction and disaster preparedness. It takes a three-pronged approach to livelihood diversification: (i) community-based planning — involving the community and getting it to own the process by ‘turning it into part of the solution’, (ii) Pastoral Field Schools — enabling pastoralists to experiment with different livelihood options tailored to management of resources, crop or fodder production where appropriate, marketing of products (meat/milk), and different methods of feeding and keeping different types of livestock (camels/chickens); (iii) Village Community Banking — involving not just a savings scheme, but also providing in-depth training in the use of money and the development of business plans, and enabling group members to take out loans from the group bank (where socially acceptable interest is charged on these loans).

Activities to achieve this result (through Letters of Agreement — LoA — with implementing partners) will enable community participation in preparedness planning and policy debate through work at the level of villages or (where they exist) strong customary institutions. This work will help communities to define their own development objectives, to act on these through approaches such as PFS and VICOBA (which will enable communities to identify appropriate livelihood innovations in response to climatic changes, increasing population pressure and decreasing mobility) and then obtain the seed.

105 Under this project, the PFS/VICOBA groups are expected to focus on livestock marketing. One of the key barriers to early sale of livestock in the event of drought is the ability to re-invest in livestock once the situation recovers. The VICOBA approach will enable investment of money from livestock sales and its re-investment in appropriate livelihood activities after the drought. The focus on livestock marketing will also enable the PFS groups to explore the possibility of achieving set standards for marketing. Preliminary discussions have been held with WFP over the use of meat and milk from pastoral livestock in their rations, for both refugee camps and pastoral communities. The possibility of using a voucher scheme where food recipients would be able to purchase certified products from a local butcher or milk bar with vouchers is being explored. For WFP this would provide an excellent opportunity to invest in livelihoods, particularly in host communities around refugee camps.
capital and the financial management capacity to address these changes. Activities will also link communities to networks, local civil society groups and local associations (or national-level participatory fora depending on the country), so that they are able to contribute to policy debate. Key activities will include:

**A.1 Community participation in preparedness planning:** Linked to A.2 and A.3 below, this activity will work with villages to define their development objectives, the assets they possess and how they can be best utilised to reach stated objectives. Based on this, villages will be assisted to develop contingency plans for shocks (disease, drought or floods) which will identify community-based indicators for, and specific planned responses to, each IPC\textsuperscript{106} phase. This will feed into District/Woreda-level planning under Result B.

**A.2 Pastoral Field Schools (PFS):** This activity will build training capacity for implementing farmer-led activities to enable communities to identify best livelihood practices, measured against their own indicators for success. This will include training of trainers and designation of regional master trainers. A growing number of NGOs are implementing PFS in the region, and this activity will provide the capacity building support needed to ensure better quality as well as field examples of well-run PFS for demonstration purposes. This activity will complement activities under A.1 above.

**A.3 Village Community Banking (potentially as a component of PFS):** this aims to increase the ability of communities to diversify livelihood activities, sell livestock in the event of an emergency and retain funds for re-investment in priority livelihood activities in the recovery period.

**A.4 Community participation in policy debate:** this activity will specifically target local civil society organisations and community-based NGOs. Activities implemented through LoAs will ensure that communities are informed (through their representative institutions) of the policy debate under Results B and C. Communities will be given the opportunity to influence the content of the debate and sign off on advisory notes for policy makers (such as the strategy for improved coordination developed under Result B).

**A.5 Monitoring, feedback and coordination:** (i) **Coordination:** A prerequisite for providing funds to implementing institutions under Result A will be the development of a clear framework for supporting/linking with existing government initiatives and participation in local coordination fora (for example district steering groups in Kenya). (ii) **Monitoring:** A monitoring team will be set up in each country, comprising key government and donor departments. These teams will assess the progress of the above activities and adapt lessons learned for inclusion in policy briefs. (iii) **Feedback:** Information from the monitoring missions will feed back to participating communities through their representative institutions in order to enable them to influence the content of key lessons learned and policy briefs.

**A.6 Minimum Standards:** Based on lessons learned to date and the lessons learned through the above activities, FAO will develop standardised course contents for implementing agencies in order to ensure that minimum implementation standards are maintained.

**Result B:** Effective government coordination of both development and humanitarian initiatives in pastoral areas at district and national level.

**B.1 The formation or strengthening of national-level civil society umbrella groups.** Most of the targeted countries have numerous local civil society organisations (CSOs) that uphold similar ideals but operate in different geographical settings. While these bodies are effective, there is no single body through which either governments or donors can engage in broad consultative processes with communities. Similarly there is no single voice for pastoral concerns on the national agenda, apart from the Pastoral Parliamentary Groups, which often lack the time for in-depth consultation.

\textsuperscript{106} Integrated food security phase classification.
Accordingly, the project will facilitate the formation of representative civil society umbrella groups in each country and will provide technical support to these bodies. The bodies will be voluntary, so will have limited running costs and will not divert funds from member organisations. Support will be given to the development of operating procedures for each body, including the use of rolling chairs and secretariats so that no single organisation can monopolise the process. The aim will also be to develop the most effective coordination structure possible within each of these bodies.

**B.2 Improved collection and dissemination of data:** Organisations have to want to attend coordination meetings for them to be effective. From experience, the availability of relevant data provides an excellent incentive for organisations to attend coordination fora. To this end, FAO will assist in the collection of relevant, verifiable and comparable food security data within each country. This will be achieved through a consultative process where country coordination fora are involved in the selection of the type of data for collection, as well as in the design of a collection and monitoring process. The possibility of using set forms and technology such as digital pens to allow rapid transmission and analysis of data will be explored.

The process would be as follows: 1) a brief consultation to review existing data collection systems and their effectiveness; 2) the presentation of this work to coordination groups and the involvement of group members in generating ideas as to what data are absolutely necessary and what can be omitted (filtering the data); 3) development of set formats for data collection, possibly on a form used in conjunction with a digital pen; 4) pilot testing the system and review of effectiveness with the coordination group; 5) ensuring that analysed data are presented on a monthly basis within the public domain; 6) finalisation of the system and institutionalisation of funding arrangements to ensure sustainability; 7) monitoring the direct effects of data collection on organisation attendance at coordination meetings as well as the impact of improved availability of accurate and timely data in terms of appropriate and timely responses.

**B.3 Review of national and district-level coordination systems:** FAO will conduct a review of national and district-level coordination systems for emergencies and development in pastoral areas. This activity will triangulate existing information against district and community opinion (utilising the links developed in this project under Result A and activity B.1). The results of the review will be presented to key decision makers (government ministers/directors, civil society organisations and donors) through country workshops aimed at building consensus on best practices and gaps in current national systems, as well as developing key targets for improvement over the next three years. A key output of the country workshops will be the development of terms of reference for the Livestock Policy Fora established under the IGAD Livestock Policy Initiative in each country to develop a strategy for achieving the improvement targets.

**B.4 Develop national strategies for coordination:** Based on the above terms of reference, FAO will facilitate the development of national strategies for improved coordination of emergency and development work in pastoral areas through National Livestock Policy Fora. Draft strategies will be presented to communities and district-level development actors (facilitated by FAO through activities under Result A and through the representative civil society bodies) in order to ensure that the input and opinions of all stakeholders are included in the eventual strategy. A finalised draft strategy will be resubmitted to the initial participants of the country workshops to obtain their input into the final document. FAO will advocate an explicit commitment from different groups towards alignment of their implementation methods with the strategy.

**Result C:** Regional policies and institutions developed to support pastoralist livelihoods.

**C1: Establish the institutional mechanisms within IGAD for making regional decisions that support the livelihoods of pastoralists in the Horn of Africa.** This will include a livestock and pastoralist unit, reporting to the IGAD secretariat, which will employ IGAD’s convening power to bring together technical expertise, stakeholders and political decision makers, as appropriate. It will be linked to national, participatory fora established by IGAD -LPI, which will assist in ensuring a focus on
pastoralist livelihoods, livestock-dependent women and poverty, in both regional policy making and national implementation. The unit and its national fora will provide a means through which analysis, best practice and the voices of various actors, particularly those who have previously been marginalised, can be brought into policy debate. It is IGAD’s intention that, after initial donor support at start up, the unit will continue under IGAD’s core funding.

C2: Agree Regional Policy Response to Emergencies through Development Planning. Building on IGAD’s existing capacities in conflict resolution, conflict early warning (though its CEWARN centre) and climate prediction (though its ICPAC centre), IGAD will apply the approach it has been using successfully to develop regional policies on animal health, trade and vulnerability, and to agree a regional policy response to emergencies through development planning. This will use the institutions described under C1 to ensure a targeted response to livelihood needs, particularly those of poorer and women livestock keepers, and will draw on existing material such as the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS). It is likely that this will result in improved contingency planning, livelihood support in the event of emergencies, resource mobilisation, and coordination.

C3: Establish a regional network for pastoral institutions and associations supported by the umbrella bodies formed under result B. This regional network will enable pastoral communities to share experiences and contribute to cross-border debate throughout the region. It will be web-based and provide an e-mail-linked discussion forum as well as a repository for research papers, development reports and pastoral-related policy.

3.3. Risks and assumptions

Purpose-level assumption: The alignment of institutions with a specified policy will improve the cohesiveness and effectiveness of pastoral development initiatives, thereby contributing to reduced poverty and increased sustainability of pastoral livelihoods. Result-level assumptions: (i) Greater community involvement in planning and decision making will lead to more focused and sustainable interventions. (ii) An effective coordination strategy will provide an overarching framework for both development and emergency project implementation. (iii) The national coordination strategies will be widely accepted by development actors. (iv) Both donors and Governments will endorse the strategy developed under Result C, thereby creating mutual accountability for the achievement of strategic targets.

Risks: (i) Lack of commitment of stakeholders at regional level towards an improved strategy. (ii) National and local stakeholders not willing to participate in government coordination mechanisms. (iii) Collection and dissemination of information hampered. (iv) Insecurity in the region.

3.4. Cross-cutting issues

The project approach will ensure environmental sustainability through improved rangeland utilisation (resulting from the PFS groups), gender equality (through minimum numbers of both women and men in each group), good governance through empowerment of community leadership and human rights by enabling pastoralists to understand and influence access to their rights.

3.5. Stakeholders

Key partners and stakeholders include IGAD, government departments, relevant EU Delegations, national coordination fora, district coordination groups, civil society organisations, customary institutions and beneficiary groups. Beneficiary groups will comprise vulnerable (agro-)pastoralists selected by communities against set criteria, which will comprise a minimum 50% membership of women and 10% membership of the most vulnerable.
4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Method of implementation

Joint management through the signature of a standard contribution agreement with an international organisation (Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations).

The choice of FAO is based on consideration of the areas where this agency has a comparative advantage, which are: (i) linking of emergency response and development: FAO is an inter-governmental agency with both an emergency and development mandate, coupled with long experience of work at community level using participatory approaches to help ensure local sustainability; (ii) wide technical expertise: as a technical agency, FAO is able to provide technical expertise in planning, monitoring the technical aspect of activities (such as community animal health workers — CAHW, pastoral field schools, animal health, water, etc.) and to provide technical guidelines; (iii) coordination: recognised capacity to bring partners together and build consensus due to its privileged position as a neutral specialised agency with power to convene and to support coordination; (iv) privileged access to governments: smooth working relationship with governments and local authorities, thanks to a regional network of Emergency Coordination Units and FAO representations in each country, which helps influence national and regional policies; (v) FAO is a unique, neutral, international forum for agriculture and food security.

Through its regional offices, FAO will liaise with the concerned EU Delegations in coordinating and following up activities.

4.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

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

In particular, FAO will subcontract implementing partners through standard Letters of Agreement (LoA) based on a competitive bidding process.

4.3. Budget and calendar

The total project cost is estimated at €6 250 000. The EU will provide a budget of €5 m channelled via a contribution agreement with FAO (table below). FAO will provide the remaining €1 250 000 as parallel co-financing. The final budget may be subject to adjustments as a function of final discussions with the implementing partner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative EU funding breakdown</th>
<th>EUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project activities and general operating expenditure</td>
<td>4 539 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>341 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total grant</td>
<td>4 880 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External evaluation (EU)</td>
<td>120 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5 000 000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The duration of the project will be 36 months starting from the signature of the contribution agreement.

The project inception phase will run for 6 months. All initial studies will be completed within this period and will be used to update the project log-frame as well as to inform the development of calls for proposals.
4.4. Performance monitoring

The basis for programme monitoring and reporting will be the logical framework. In practice, monitoring will be carried out in different ways: (i) *For Result A, a joint monitoring team* will be established in each country of operation, comprising key government and donor departments. The team will be led by FAO and will be responsible for assessing the progress of the project as well as ensuring that communities are informed and contributing to activities under Results B and C. The biannual missions will ensure that lessons learned and recommendations from different stakeholders are fed back in timely fashion to the steering committee meetings for potential inclusion in the implementation framework. (ii) In addition, *FAO* will monitor and support the implementation and administration of funds under LoAs, through ensuring detailed reporting (both narrative and financial) from partners, cross-checked against information compiled during field visits by FAO.

4.5. Evaluation and audit

*External evaluations*: Two external evaluation missions will be conducted (at the end of year 1 and upon completion). These evaluations will provide information on project effectiveness/impact on beneficiaries, value for money, suitability of approach and suggested improvements. Moreover, the European Commission reserves the right to conduct an additional external evaluation by the end of year 1 by means of a specific budgetary allocation.

*Audits* will be carried out by FAO according to its Financial Regulations, Rules and Directives.

4.6. Communication and visibility

Communication and visibility activities will form a key component of the project’s accountability system. Radio programmes and visibility material will acknowledge the EU as the donor and publicise the targets to be achieved by the programme as well as key selection criteria for beneficiaries. A full communication and visibility plan will be developed in compliance with the ‘Communication and Visibility Manual for EU External Actions’\(^{107}\) once the project is under way.

## ANNEX: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Action</th>
<th>Regional initiative in support of vulnerable pastoralists and agro-pastoralists in the Horn of Africa.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal/Principal Objective</strong></td>
<td>To contribute to reducing the vulnerability of (agro-)pastoralist communities in the Horn of Africa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Verification</th>
<th>Risks and Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Purpose, Specific Objective** | To strengthen the institutional and policy framework influencing the resilience of (agro-)pastoral communities and improve diversification of their livelihoods. | • State funding in support of pastoral livelihoods increases by 3% by the end of the project.  
• Increased cohesiveness of emergency and development interventions within the region, measured through a 10% increase in the number of donor-funded projects that link emergency relief to long-term livelihood initiatives.  
• Reduced vulnerability of target communities, measured by a 10% decrease in the number of target beneficiaries dependent on food aid. | District, government and regional coordination group reports.  
National budgets.  
Baseline survey identifying percentage income diversification among target beneficiaries.  
Bi-annual monitoring reports on progress against these indicators. | It is assumed that the alignment of institutions with a specified policy based on community involvement will significantly improve the cohesiveness and hence effectiveness of pastoral development initiatives throughout the region, thereby contributing to reduced poverty and increased sustainability of pastoral livelihoods. |

### Expected Results

| Result A | Communities are proactively addressing their own needs in relation to improved disaster preparedness and response and are active participants in policy debate. | • A 50% increase in the number of beneficiaries able to identify with a defined community development objective.  
• Improved livelihood sustainability among target communities, measured by a 50% increase in the number of target beneficiaries investing in sustainable livelihoods (as a result of the VICOBA/PFS work) and having more than one source of income.  
• Representative institutions and associations are | Mid-term and final project evaluations.  
Bi-annual monitoring reports, presenting data against initial indicators identified in the baseline survey.  
Meeting and communication records of national CSO umbrella bodies. | It is assumed that greater community involvement in planning and decision making will lead to more focused and sustainable interventions and will build the capacity of communities to take control of their own development. |
engaging in policy debate (80% of community associations / institutions in target areas are active members of a national civil society umbrella body).

**Result B**

Effective government coordination of both development and humanitarian initiatives in pastoral areas at district and national level.

- 4 national civil society umbrella groups are active (holding at least 3 well-attended meetings per year) and are engaged in policy dialogue (are members of livestock policy / sector strategy development groups as well as national agriculture and livestock coordination groups).
- Maps to inform coordination (detailing different interventions plotted against livelihood systems, levels of poverty and livestock disease) are developed and widely available through the TCS website by month 18 of the project.
- 3 draft national strategies for the coordination of livelihood support for pastoral communities are developed and shared at regional level (through IGAD).

Minutes of umbrella group coordination meetings.
Minutes of livestock policy / sector strategy development group meetings.
Minutes of coordination meetings.
Presence of detailed maps on the TCS website.
Draft strategies.

It is assumed that an effective coordination strategy defining the responsibilities of different actors (from communities to policy makers) in development will provide an overarching framework for both development and emergency project implementation.

It is assumed that the involvement of different sectors (including different line ministries, the private sector, donors and NGOs) in the Livestock Policy Fora will ensure that the coordination strategy is widely accepted and adhered to.

**Result C**

Regional policies and institutions developed in support of pastoralist livelihoods

- A livestock and pastoralist unit is institutionalised within IGAD and supported by active national policy fora in each of the countries of implementation.
- Regional policies on animal health, trade and vulnerability as well as regional responses to emergencies are developed through broad stakeholder engagement (through national livestock policy fora incorporating civil society umbrella bodies).
- A regional network for pastoral institutions and associations is established and engaged in policy development.

Publications, workshop reports, final evaluation

It is assumed that both donors and governments will endorse the strategy developed for Result C, thereby creating mutual accountability for the achievement of strategic targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 1</th>
<th>A.1: Community participation in preparedness planning</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Associated costs</th>
<th>Pre-conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff salaries</td>
<td>1609939</td>
<td>Stable political environment in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2: Pastoral Field Schools</td>
<td>Letters of agreement with implementing partners</td>
<td>2708709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3: Village Community Banking</td>
<td>Training and workshops</td>
<td>459111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4 Community participation in policy debate</td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>167900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.5 Monitoring, feedback and coordination</td>
<td>Expendable procurement</td>
<td>150700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.6 Minimum Standards</td>
<td>Non-expendable procurement</td>
<td>95000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General operating expenditure</td>
<td>510000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visibility and communication</td>
<td>19762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation (EC)</td>
<td>120000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support costs</td>
<td>408879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6250000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>all implementing countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1 Formation or strengthening of national-level civil society umbrella groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of co-financing by FAO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2 Improved collection and dissemination of data</td>
<td></td>
<td>Government and development partner involvement in the finalisation of the project implementation plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3 Review of national and district-level coordination systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4 Development of national strategies for coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1 Establishment of the institutional mechanisms within IGAD for making regional decisions to support the livelihoods of pastoralists in the Horn of Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2 Agreed regional policy response to emergencies through development planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3 Establishment of a regional network of pastoral institutions and associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTION FICHE FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
COMPONENT 3: EXPLOITING THE POTENTIAL OF CONTINENTAL AND REGIONAL
APPROACHES TO IMPROVE FOOD SECURITY

‘SUPPORT FOR NUTRITION STRATEGY IN WEST & EAST AFRICA’

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>Support for Nutrition Strategy in West &amp; East Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>EU contribution: €15m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint co-financing: UNICEF: €6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total cost: €21m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method / Method of implementation</td>
<td>Project approach — joint management with an international organisation (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC-code</td>
<td>52010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

The scale of undernutrition and hunger in the world is staggering: 1 billion people are undernourished; 129 million children under 5 are underweight and 195 million are stunted. Most of the 20 countries that have made no progress towards the Millennium Development Goal 1 target of halving the number of people suffering from hunger are in Africa.

Between 35 and 50 per cent of all under-5 deaths are attributable to undernutrition, and the highest under-5 mortality rates are found in Africa108. HIV/AIDS, the recent food price and economic crises, and the growing effects of climate change are also increasing the number of children suffering from undernutrition in Africa. The countries and regions proposed for this project are among the most affected, and have been selected according to a set of quantitative and qualitative indicators.

Nutrition109 is central to human, social, and economic development, yet its multi-sectoral nature requires coordinated, effective structures and strategies at regional and country levels. While most countries have government structures for nutrition, they remain weak for several reasons. Awareness of nutrition and political concern have generally been low. Weak institutional capacity, lack of human resources, and unclear harmonisation between relevant sectors, mainly health and food security, hamper effective measures. These issues have to be addressed in order to meaningfully tackle undernutrition.

---

108 Mali (218 per 1000) followed by Burkina Faso (191 per 1000).
109 Nutrition is defined here as having ALL nutrients in sufficient quantities and bioavailability to maintain optimum health and resist disease. Nutrition security is thus different from food security, which is normally assessed only in terms of energy and protein availability.
Continental or regional initiatives are under way to strengthen country capacity to address undernutrition. The African Union (AU) has revitalised the African Task Force on Food and Nutrition Development (ATFFND) and aims to sensitize Africa’s leaders, address policy-level constraints, and operationalise an Africa Regional Nutrition Strategy (ARNS). The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) under NEPAD (New Partnership for Africa’s Development) includes a menu of options for reducing hunger and undernutrition in the immediate, medium-term and long-term future. At the ECSA Ministers of Health Conference held in February 2008, the East Central and Southern Africa Health Community (ECSA-HC) passed a resolution on nutrition to increase nutrition expenditure under the health budget by 20% and to support the scaling up of high-impact nutrition interventions. The progress made so far to implement the nutrition resolution will be reviewed and reported at the ECSA 2010 Ministers of Health Conference. The West African Health Organisation and the CILSS (Permanent Inter-State Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel) — the technical committees of ECOWAS — have developed nutrition initiatives to develop capacities and to strengthen national policies, implementation and information systems.

UNICEF has established strong partnerships with regional bodies. For instance, the agency supports ECSA-HC in advocating increased national budget allocations to nutrition. In West Africa, it supports the West African Health Organisation (WAHO) with its nutrition initiatives.

2.2. Lessons learnt

Although progress towards the MDG 1 hunger target has been wholly insufficient in many instances, there are lessons to be learnt from successes. The main lessons learnt, presented below, draw from experience in Africa (e.g. Ethiopia, Malawi, Mauritania, and Senegal) and elsewhere (e.g. Brazil, Mexico, Thailand):

- **Acknowledgement of the extent of the nutrition problem is a pre-requisite for effective action. Therefore, raising awareness among political leaders and decision makers is essential in order to prioritise nutrition in development and political agendas.**
- **Political commitment to act needs to be sustained and translated into national frameworks and programmes with adequate and sustained financial resources.**
- **Experience has shown that clear leadership is essential, together with an appropriate institutional set-up and strong coordination mechanisms bringing together the relevant sectors and actors.**
- **Increasing and maintaining managerial, technical and strategic capacities is essential. This involves pre-service and in-service training through networking.**
- **Substantial improvements have often been achieved by a combined package of actions, such as effective direct nutrition interventions coupled with poverty alleviation measures. These actions should be implemented at scale and effectively reach those in need.**
- **An information base relevant to decision-making is essential to tailor the response to context-specific needs.**

2.3. Complementary actions

Policy development and nutrition awareness
At continental level, UNICEF has provided ad-hoc support to the AU Department of Social Affairs such as the ‘Snapshot of the nutrition situation in Africa’ for dissemination at high-level policy meetings. Further, it has supported the review of the Africa Nutrition Strategy (ARNS) in relation to the Framework for Africa Food Security (FAFS), Pan-African Nutrition Initiative (PANI) and Ten Year Strategy (TYS) on Elimination of Vitamin and Mineral Deficiencies (VMDs), and on this basis developed an outline for the harmonisation of nutrition strategies, frameworks, initiatives as well as instruments and tools for presentation and discussion at the second ATFFND meeting on 24-26 November 2009. This will ensure the development of a harmonised and operational ARNS framework so as to ensure its effective implementation to address nutrition security in Africa in a result-oriented, coherent and coordinated manner.

At regional level, the EU supports advocacy for nutrition in West Africa through ECHO.

At national level: In Ethiopia, the National Nutrition Plan was developed with UNICEF support and is implemented with funding from the World Bank and other donors. In Burkina Faso, UNICEF and the World Bank have also contributed to the establishment and work of an inter-ministerial coordination body on nutrition (CNCN — Comité National de Concertation sur la Nutrition). In Mali, both the EU (through the Food Facility) and ECHO support awareness raising on nutrition.

Institutional capacity building, training and research

At continental level, the EC, through the seventh framework research programme, has launched a call for proposals to determine research needs in nutrition.

At the 2nd ATFFND meeting on 24-26 November 2009, a two-year work plan was developed to map existing education and research institutes and support a capacity development strategy in food and nutrition for Africa.

At regional level, the EC funds a 5-year research project on micronutrient and food fortification with 6 northern and 5 southern universities, including 3 Kenyan universities (INSTAPA). In West Africa, a regional initiative for public health nutrition research and training is currently being launched, with contributions from Helen Keller International (HKI), UNICEF and countries of the Economic Community of West Africa States (ECOWAS).

The EU is also actively supporting coordination at that level in West Africa. For instance, ECHO is supporting the REACH approach for facilitation of coordination in nutrition. The EU also supports CILSS/NUSAPPS (Nutrition, Food Security and Public Policies in the Sahel) to facilitate linkages between food security and nutrition.

At national level, UNICEF is supporting the nutrition department under the Ministry of Health in Uganda. The Burkina Faso Nutrition Directorate has its own budget with external aid support.

Nutrition information systems

At continental level: UNICEF will continue to support the AUC capacity for nutrition information and data analysis.

At regional level: in East Africa, the EU through ECHO is co-funding the UNICEF-led NIPHORN initiative (Nutrition Information Programme in the Horn of Africa) for the compilation and standardisation of nutrition data; FAO is funding the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC — an analytical tool to improve food security assessment
for response strategies in emergency situations). In West Africa, the EU and the Agence Francaise de Developpement (AFD) are funding the NUSAPPS initiative under CILSS (Permanent Inter-State Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel).

At national level: UNICEF supports the Emergency Nutrition Coordination Unit (ENCU) in Ethiopia in standardising and harmonising nutrition surveys. Traditionally, UNICEF has supported national nutrition surveys in various countries.

Operational backstop

At national level: through ECHO, the EU is providing funds for emergency nutrition and food aid projects in all countries of the two regions\(^{110}\).

In Ethiopia, the EU supports the safety net programme aiming to mitigate the effects of the economic crisis on the most vulnerable groups, while in Mali the EU Food Facility programme supports the management of acute malnutrition.

2.4. Donor coordination

Donor coordination is often along sectoral lines (e.g. health, agriculture), so coordination on nutrition issues, which requires overcoming such sectoral barriers, is generally weak. Nevertheless, some mechanisms exist such as the CAADP Partnership Platform, which offers a coordination forum to all partners, including donors, though mainly in the food security/agriculture field.

The new, revitalised ATFFND task force potentially offers a platform for the coordination of nutrition initiatives and investments at continental level.

Relevant regional coordination mechanisms include: the West African Health Organisation, CILSS / NUSAPPS, and the Food Security and Nutrition working group for East Africa.

In Ethiopia, donor inputs are coordinated through the National Nutrition Plan budget. In Uganda, the Ministry of Health (MoH) steers the Sub-Committee on Nutrition with various technical working groups. In Burkina Faso, regular meetings are organised with all its PTFs (Partenaires Techniques et Financiers).

3. DESCRIPTION

This project is part of a long-term approach to support institutional building and capacity development for nutrition in Africa.

It will be articulated at three geographical levels:

- continental level, with support for the African Union HQs;
- regional level, with support for the two West and East regions (WAHO and ECSA-HC);
- country level, in 4 countries: Mali and Burkina Faso in West Africa and Ethiopia and Uganda in East Africa.

Interventions under the four components might eventually be considered in other African countries, e.g. Mauritania.

\(^{110}\) Budget for Uganda, Kenya and Ethiopia in 2008: USD 80m — see Matrix No 56; budget for West Africa: EUR 10m.
3.1. Objectives

The project’s overall objective is to contribute to achieving the nutrition-related targets of MDGs 1, 4, 5 and 8 in West and East Africa, ensuring that children and women are protected from the adverse consequences of the global financial and economic crisis.

The specific objectives of the project are as follows:

1. To better integrate nutrition in African regional and national strategy frameworks and strengthen synergy and multi-sector coordination for nutrition
2. To reinforce capacities at regional, national and local level to assess, plan and manage human resources for nutrition in coordination with regional/international organisations
3. To improve nutrition information systems at country, regional and continental levels so as to feed timely data into information systems and provide accurate situation analysis
4. To support regional, national and sub-national nutrition programmes with particular attention to protecting infants and mothers from the adverse effects of volatile food prices and the financial and economic crisis.

3.2. Expected results and main activities

The specific objectives will be attained through the development and implementation of a package of comprehensive activities, with the following components:

1. Policy development and nutrition awareness, focusing on enhancing the awareness of Africa’s key policy-makers and leaders of civil society and their commitment to review and implement the Plan of Action on Nutrition at regional and national levels, in a coherent, result-oriented and coordinated manner.

2. Institutional building and capacity development at continental, regional, national and local level in coordination with regional/international research and academic institutions.

3. Nutrition information system support at country, regional and continental levels so as to feed timely data into information systems and provide accurate situation analysis.

4. Operational backstop, to ensure that regional and national programmes tackle malnutrition and are implemented in a coherent, coordinated and synergic manner.

The four expected results of the proposed project are:

RESULT 1: Strengthened policy development and nutrition awareness — Africa’s key policy-makers and leaders of civil society are committed to the review of the Regional and National Plan of Action on Nutrition, ensuring that adequate support is provided to implement the nutrition action plan for effective and sustainable socio-economic development.

Activities

At continental level
Support for the AU Commission to review the ARNS in full cooperation with regional bodies (WAHO/ECSA-HC) and to ensure effective embedding within NEPAD/CAADP

Support for ATFFND to develop an advocacy strategy, including the organisation of one high-level seminar/meeting at continental level involving heads of state / prime ministers and key decision makers

**At regional level**

- Support for active participation by the Regional Economic Communities in the review of the ARNS
- In line with the continental advocacy strategy and policies, support for the RECs (e.g. CILLs/ECOWAS in West Africa, and ECSA/IGAD (Inter-Governmental Authority for Development) / COMESA (Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa) in East Africa) to organise one to two high-level seminars/meetings at regional level involving heads of states / ministers and key decision makers

**At country level**

- Support for the development/review/update of national plans for nutrition and food security
- Cost analyses of nutrition security activities in line with national plans and advocacy for inclusion in the national budget
- Support for leading national bodies to organise seminars/meetings for ministers/key-leaders/parliamentarians and civil society on nutrition and food security

At all levels: Developing awareness tools and ensuring country-wide dissemination.

**RESULT 2: Institutional building and capacity development** — Departments and units strengthened at all levels with qualified practitioners in nutrition and coordination mechanisms reinforced, involving African networking.

**Activities**

**At continental/regional level**

- Support for mapping of existing training institutions (curricula, human resource capacities, budgets)
- **East Africa:** strengthening of a regional network of training / research institutions based on an understanding of progress, constraints and lessons learned
- **West Africa:** support for the ongoing initiative in public health nutrition research and training
- Coordination between national, regional and continental level on policies, the mapping exercise and networking

**At country level**

- Support for a review of nutrition curricula in accordance with international standards and harmonisation among national centres in coordination with regional and continental strategies and initiatives
- Review of and support for in-service training

111 Ethiopia: support for implementation of the NNP; Uganda: advocacy of ratification of the Food and Nutrition Bill, and support for development of a budget for a food and nutrition strategy; Burkina Faso: support for implementation of a nutrition plan of action; Mali: support for development of a new strategic plan, including a plan of action and budget.

112 Initiative involving two West African Universities (one French- and one English-speaking) under the leadership of the West African Health Organisation (WAHO).
Building and supporting nutrition units within the Ministries of Health\textsuperscript{113} and promoting coordination at sub-national level in complementarity with other stakeholders

Promoting and supporting national multi-sectoral coordination mechanism through sensitization and training for personnel of institutions such as line ministries and organisations of the civil society (agriculture, water and sanitation, education)

RESULT 3: Nutrition security information systems — Sustainable nutrition information systems are developed with strong linkages with other food security information systems.

Activities

At continental level: support for collecting and processing authoritative data on nutrition in Africa for dissemination.

At regional level

- Recommending and supervising the adoption of standardised and internationally recognised guidelines for data collection
- Evaluating national models for linkages between food security and nutrition and recommending best possible options
- Supporting data collection from countries, quality checking and data storage systems
- Facilitating information flow to continental level

At country level\textsuperscript{114}

- Support for the collection of nutritional data from available sources: MICS (Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey)/DHS (Demographic Health Survey), small-scale surveys, HIS (Health Information System)
- Ensuring quality control, triangulation and centralisation of nutrition data
- Reinforcing the standardisation of data collection methodology, considering seasonality and livelihood zones
- Supporting operational research models to link food security data systems to nutritional data (Ethiopia: assessing, readjusting and expanding the Emergency Nutrition Coordination Unit (ENCU) model; Uganda: linking with IPC (Integrated Food Security Phase Classification)/ MoA to incorporate nutrition conditions in food security mapping; Burkina Faso and Mali: links with food security data producers, e.g. CILLS/NUSAPP/Système d’Alerte Précocé)

RESULT 4: Operational backstop — Regional and national programmes tackling malnutrition are implemented in a coherent, coordinated and synergic manner.

Activities

\textsuperscript{113} \textit{Mali}: support for the creation of a fully functioning nutrition unit; \textit{Burkina Faso}: strengthening of the Nutrition Directorate in MoH and coordination bodies at sub-national level; \textit{Ethiopia}: strengthening of nutrition within MoH and coordination bodies at sub-national level; \textit{Uganda}: strengthening the nutrition department within MoH.

\textsuperscript{114} Uganda in MoH, in connection with the nutrition/unit department; in Burkina Faso, in the nutrition directorate of MoH; in Ethiopia, between ENCU (Emergency Nutrition Coordination Unit) and EHNRI (Ethiopian Health and Nutrition Research Unit); in Mali, in the CPS (Cellule de Planification et Statistiques).
At country level: in-depth analysis and support for community-based nutrition initiatives such as: improved family and community nutrition practices, strengthened links to health facilities, provision of essential WASH\textsuperscript{115} and nutrition services, as well as food and nutrition security production practices. Particular attention will be given to community dialogue.

3.3. Risks and assumptions

The main assumptions are:

- political commitment to implementing plans and strategies at country and regional level
- appropriate staffing and availability of human resources

Major risks are:

- lack of donor commitment to maintaining a sustainable and common approach
- social and economic deterioration within the global context, political instability and natural disasters
- sharing of information hampered

Mitigation measures:

- Component 1 will focus on increasing the number of nutrition policy supporters and ensuring that policy makers are fully aware of the impact of nutrition interventions on their nation’s development and growth.
- Component 2 will develop a strong partnership with civil society, technical government services, research / academic institutions and the private sector to strengthen capacity.

Sustainability: key government ministries will be directly or indirectly involved in the proposed actions.

3.4. Cross-cutting issues

Gender issues are an important component of nutrition/food security assessment, analysis and response. In addressing malnutrition, vulnerable groups will be targeted (women and children). Nutrition surveys will systematically include analysis of data along gender lines. The gender balance in training will be systematically addressed.

3.5. Stakeholders

The target beneficiaries for this programme are mostly children under five and pregnant or lactating mothers.

The main stakeholders involved in this programme are:

At continental level: the African Union (AU) with NEPAD and CAADP in conjunction with the UN agencies.

At regional level:

- For East Africa, ECSA-HC, based in Arusha, in conjunction with the regional Food and Nutrition Working Group in FAO, Nairobi (regional and

\textsuperscript{115} Water, sanitation, hygiene.
international non-governmental organisations, regional offices of United Nation Organisations and donors such as DFID, the EC, etc.)

For West Africa, ECOWAS, in close collaboration with the UNICEF regional office and the Nutrition Sub-Working Group.

At national level, African governments with their Ministries of Health, Agriculture, Education, and Finance will be supported by the programme, as well as their universities and institutes e.g. University of Dakar (UCAD), Kenya, Jimma (Ethiopia), Addis Ababa.

Other agencies/bodies: IRD (Institut de Recherche et Développement) and NUSAPPS/CILLS are the other collaborating partners.

Finally, the EC (DG ECHO, DG AIDCO and concerned EU Delegations) will be involved in project implementation, in particular to ensure coordination with the implementing agency.

4. **IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES**

4.1. **Method of implementation**

Joint management through the signature of a standard contribution agreement with an international organisation (the United Nations Children Fund — UNICEF).

The choice of joint management with UNICEF is based on the following considerations:

- UNICEF’s mandate in health and nutrition and its position in strengthening continental and regional African structures through its regional structures (UNICEF ESARO/WCARO);
- At continental level, its ability to work across sectors and engage in continental initiatives with NEPAD/CAADP, the AU Commission and ATFFND, e.g.: (i) technical support to strengthen and harmonise ARNS, (ii) advocacy of a framework for Africa Food and Nutrition Security; (iii) promotion of cross-sector strategies;
- At regional level, its implementing role in supporting the main relevant African inter-governmental organisations — ECOWAS and ECSA: (i) enhancing regional commitment to nutrition and harmonisation of nutrition policies/strategy; (ii) developing regional institutional capacities and human resources; (iii) collecting, assessing and disseminating information, (iv) strengthening the regional network of coordinators (food and nutrition security), along with its on-the-ground project experience in nutrition/food security;
- At country level: long experience with technical and programme guidance on nutrition; (i) support for national nutrition policy and strategy, (ii) carrying out nutrition assessment and data management, (iii) project implementation at community level, (iv) HR development.

4.2. **Procurement and grant award procedures**

All contracts implementing the action will 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 project cost is estimated at €21m. The EU will provide a budget of €15m channelled via a contribution agreement with UNICEF. The latter will provide the remaining €6m as joint co-financing. The final budget may be subject to adjustments as a function of final discussions with the implementing partner.

The proposed budget for implementation is indicatively distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>EUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 1</td>
<td>3970000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2</td>
<td>5953300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 3</td>
<td>1960000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 4</td>
<td>2100000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>966700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14950000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project evaluation (EC)</td>
<td>50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total EC contribution</strong></td>
<td><strong>15000000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF contribution</td>
<td>6000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT</strong></td>
<td><strong>21000000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The duration of the programme will be forty eight months (48) starting from the signature of the Contribution Agreement with UNICEF.

4.4. **Performance monitoring**

In terms of monitoring and evaluation, the project will be subject to UNICEF’s current monitoring procedures under the *Joint Guidelines on reporting obligations under the FAFA*.

During the project inception phase, a monitoring system, including the design and set-up of a Project Steering Committee, will be agreed between UNICEF and the EC based on the implementation plan.

4.5. **Evaluation and audit**

Financial transactions and statements will be subject to the internal and external auditing procedures laid down in the financial regulations, rules and directives of the international organisation concerned, which will submit a copy of the audited financial statements to the European Commission. Project evaluation will be undertaken by UNICEF as appropriate during the course of the project. However, in view of the innovative nature of the project, the European Commission reserves the right to have an independent mid-term review carried out in order to learn lessons from the implementation of project activities as well as from other EU-supported programmes in the field of nutrition/food security. A specific amount is earmarked for this purpose.
4.6. Communication and visibility

The implementation of the project will ensure that communication and visibility are integrated in all its activities, in compliance with the ‘Communication and Visibility Manual for EU External Actions’[^116]. During the inception phase of the project, a communication and visibility plan highlighting communication activities will be discussed and agreed between UNICEF and the relevant European Commission services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFD</td>
<td>Agence Française de Développement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNS</td>
<td>Africa Regional Nutrition Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFFND</td>
<td>African Task Force on Food and Nutrition Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAADP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CILSS</td>
<td>Permanent Inter-State Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCN</td>
<td>Comité National de Concertation sur la Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMESA</td>
<td>Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>UK Department For International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECD</td>
<td>European Commission Delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOWAS</td>
<td>Economic Community of West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECSA-HC</td>
<td>East Central and Southern Africa Health Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCU</td>
<td>Emergency Nutrition Coordination Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESARO</td>
<td>East South African Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKI</td>
<td>Helen Keller International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGAD</td>
<td>Inter-Governmental Authority for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPC</td>
<td>Integrated Food Security Phase Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoA</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoH</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD</td>
<td>New Partnership for Africa’s Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIPHORN</td>
<td>Nutrition Information Programme in the Horn of Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUSAPPS</td>
<td>Nutrition, Food Security and Public Policies in the Sahel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>Partenaires Techniques et Financiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECs</td>
<td>Regional Economic Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCAD</td>
<td>Université Cheikh Anta Diop De Dakar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAHO</td>
<td>West African Health Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCARO</td>
<td>West Central African Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 1: Country selection matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Needed</th>
<th>West Africa</th>
<th>East Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malnutrition Trends</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micronutrients</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Vitamin A supplement % (6-59 mo), at least one dose, 2005 (UNICEF)</td>
<td>MALI: 66, BURKINA: 95, NIGER: 95</td>
<td>ETHIOPIA: 96, KENYA: 59, UGANDA: 69, TANZANIA: 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Iodised salt consumed in % of households, 2000-2006 (UNICEF)</td>
<td>MALI: 74, BURKINA: 34, NIGER: 46</td>
<td>ETHIOPIA: 2, KENYA: 20, UGANDA: 91, TANZANIA: 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

117 Under CCA used 8 indicators.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Needed</th>
<th>West Africa</th>
<th>East Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALI</td>
<td>BURKINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Population 2005 (UNICEF)</td>
<td>11.6 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Population growth 2007, annual % (WB 2007)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Population aged 0-4 years 2005 and % of total (UNDP)</td>
<td>2.05 m (17.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Population, women aged 15-49 years 2005 and % (UNDP)</td>
<td>2.84 m (47.5 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Information Needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West Africa</th>
<th>East Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Climatic risks and hazards in the last 5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALI</td>
<td>ETHIOPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BURKINA</td>
<td>KENYA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NIGER</td>
<td>UGANDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drought in 2005/6: Border with Nigeria/Burkina Faso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAURITANIA</td>
<td>TANZANIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invasion of locusts and flooding</td>
<td>Drought in the Masai area in 2006, Floods Red locusts 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ETHIOPIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drought, invasion of locusts and flooding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KENYA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floods 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UGANDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TANZANIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GDP 2007 current US $ (WB 2007)</th>
<th>6862520320</th>
<th>7766986240</th>
<th>4170491648</th>
<th>2643784960</th>
<th>19394727936</th>
<th>24189880320</th>
<th>11771364352</th>
<th>16180884480</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>GNI 2007, PPP current intl. US$ (WB 2007)</td>
<td>12832064347</td>
<td>16494041905</td>
<td>9009086262</td>
<td>6256156980</td>
<td>61651287914</td>
<td>58105678089</td>
<td>32111681115</td>
<td>48691624986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Inflation 2007, GDP deflator (WB 2007)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Human Poverty Index (HPI-1) rank (HDR 2007)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic crisis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Total health expenditure as % of GDP 2005 (WHO 2006)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government health expenditure as % of total health expenditure 2005 (WHO 2006)</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government health expenditure as % of total government expenditure 2005 (WHO 2006)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External resources for health as % of total health expenditure 2005 (WHO 2006)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total per capita health expenditure, Intl US$2005 (WHO 2006)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial context

|---|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Needed</th>
<th>West Africa</th>
<th>East Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALI</strong></td>
<td><strong>BURKINA</strong></td>
<td><strong>NIGER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milliards FCFA for 5 yrs</td>
<td>to Unicef (Plan de soutien 2007-8), PAM &amp; NGOs (Plan de soutien)</td>
<td><strong>MAURITANIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33</strong> HIV prevalence in % (age 15-49) 2005 (UNICEF)</td>
<td>1.7 [1.3-2.1]</td>
<td>1.82 [1.5-2.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>35</strong> Existing National Food Security structure</td>
<td>CSA under the President’s office in charge of SAP. No dialogue with the agriculture and food security sector; and between agriculture and other sectors (fishing, forestry, natural resources, pastoralist)</td>
<td>CNSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>36</strong> Stakeholders</td>
<td>DNS (Direction National de la Santé) &amp; MoA</td>
<td>Nut: MSP, MA, Social, Education,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Needed</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALI</strong></td>
<td>Economy and Finance FS: CNSA</td>
<td><strong>ETHIOPIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BURKINA</strong></td>
<td>CNCN (Nut) CNSA (FS)</td>
<td><strong>KENYA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIGER</strong></td>
<td>CCA</td>
<td><strong>UGANDA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAURITANIA</strong></td>
<td>CCA under CMC</td>
<td><strong>TANZANIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>37</strong> Inter-ministerial committee on Nut/FS</td>
<td>CNCNC: (Ministries; CILSS; CRS; Plan Burkina Africare; UNICEF; WB; WFP; EU)</td>
<td><strong>38</strong> Stakeholders in Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NUSAPP: initiative: from IRD &amp; MAE under CILSS</td>
<td><strong>ENCU</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>39</strong> Potential Leadership — Focal Point for Nutrition</td>
<td>DN</td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Needed</th>
<th>West Africa</th>
<th>East Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders involved in nutrition policy</td>
<td>WFP (SFP/School Feeding) UNICEF (Survey/TFP); ACF-Spain (North: Nut/FS/Water); CNCN; DN UNICEF, WHO, WFP, FAO UNICEF under REACH WB FAO WHO WFP</td>
<td>UNICEF; FAO, WHO, SC-UK HENNEDT WFP; UNICEF, WHO; Fanta/USAID UNICEF, UNAIDS, WFP, FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders involved in implementation of nutrition programmes</td>
<td>Nut/FS; ACF-Spain; HKI; CRS/Ami de Gao and others FS Dév - VSF-CICDA; GRDR; CR-Spain; CIVS; Christian Aid, Care, AAA, Afrique Verte 21 NGOs (between UNICEF/WFP) HKI, MSF-B, CH, Spain, SC-UK, ACF-Spain, CRF, Concern, CARE, Islamic relief Service, MdM (free trt), HELP (free trt) WV, Mercy Corps, SOSSahel Intl, Local NGOs? Others CR-F FS ACF-S Soutien aux ONGs locales Care, Concern, GOAL, IMC, MERLIN, MSF-H, B, F-Greece, Samaritan’s Purse, ACF-F, IMC, WV, SC-US,UK Local NGOs with WFP SCF, WVI, Helen Keller Intl, Tdh, Sante Sud, Fédération Luthérien Mondial (FML) Santé Sud. ONGI Counter Part International (CPI) NGO's, Interministerial groups ACF; MSF; IMC and others WV, AED/Linkage Christian Social,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors in Nut/FS</td>
<td>EC: Food facility B (FS/Nut) WB Bilateral: MAFA, EU, USAID; ECOWAS, CILSS ECOWAS, CILSS</td>
<td>Bilateral NL (Health HIV); F,B (FS: Banques céréalières); ECHO, DFID Leadership; B (Health / Rural Dev); CH cooperation F(AFD) &amp; WB: free treatment; DCE; MDM/ACF, Care, Aquadev, HKI FM 7th round for OFDA/HKI/UNIC EF for fortification of zn &amp; fe CIDR, UNOCHA/CRF, Ireland, Humanitarian Thematic Fund, ECHO; problems of strategy LRRD Inter-Agency Standing Committee Global Nutrition Cluster (WB, UNICEF, Spanish MDG-Fund, Japan Govt., JICA, UK Natcom, WFP) ECHO, OCHA,USAID Humanitarian Aid: Nut: ACF; IMC; DK FS: Germany; Reg. Coord: EAC, East Africa established the Lake Victoria Basin Commission. Nat. Coordination: PRBS common framework and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DCE subsidy.
## Information Needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West Africa</th>
<th>East Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALI</td>
<td>ECHO; USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURKINA</td>
<td>joint annual review processes for budget support, health, educ., transport, public sector reform, public financial Manag. reform, water, HIV-AIDS, local gvt, forestry, private sector reform, agric., FS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGER</td>
<td>Donors: DPG B, Canada DK, EC, FN, F, D, Ir., I, Jn, Kor., NI, Norway, Sp, SW, CH, UK,USA, UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAURITANIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHIOPIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENYA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGANDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANZANIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coordination

- Coordination needs to be improved between PTFs
- MISAME, etc.; DK: Dév Rural (with UE, AFD, PAM, MA, MRA, MECV)
- Malaria, HIV (CILS), PNUD: TB & Malaria.
- ECOWAS, UEMOA, CILSS
- OCHA?
- Leadership: B (Health / Rural Dev)
- AFD & WB: MSP free trt

### Needs

- United Kingdom, MI, UNICEF Self-aside Fund, OFDA, MDG-F Spain
- COMESA, IGAD, GFATM, PEPFAR, GAVI
- FS: CIDA, DFID, Italian Dev Coop.

### Key Potential Partnership

- UNICEF
- DN: UNICEF; WB; IRD
- UNICEF/DSSAN, CCA, WFP, WB,
- UNICEF ACF CRB
- EHNRI; ENCU
- Nutrition Department MoH
- Nutrition Department MoH
- Nutrition Stakeholders Forum
- TFNC
- UNICEF

### Source of Nutritional and Food Security Data

- Relevant
- Subsidiary
- Feasible
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Needed</th>
<th>West Africa</th>
<th>East Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Nutritional Data</td>
<td>SAP, MSP</td>
<td>UNICEF, MSF-EPICENTRE, MSF-CH, B, Spain, ACF-Spain, Concern, HKI, WV, CRF, Mercy Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compilation/ Management of Nutrition Data</td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Food Security Data</td>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>DGPSA, WFP, CILSS, IRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compilation/ Management of Food Security Data</td>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>CNSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management system for combination of Nut and FS</td>
<td>CCA? SAP To check</td>
<td>UNICEF MDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Delegation involvement in nutrition programmes</td>
<td>Support for rural development, food security; Health not in the PTF of the 10th FED</td>
<td>Neither Health nor nutrition in the PTF of the 10th FED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>Sahel</td>
<td>Sahel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Needed</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALI</strong></td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme for Targeting acute malnutrition</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget decreased because of REACH to EUR 2m instead of 5m in 2008.</td>
<td>In SNMR, SRS and Southern Oroma</td>
<td>of which 5.5 for food aid for Northern areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BURKINA</strong></td>
<td>NIP: 10th EDF 2008-13</td>
<td>Country Diagnostic Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>NIP: 10th EDF 2008-13</td>
<td>NIP 10th EDF 2008-13: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIGER</strong></td>
<td>NIP: 10th EDF 2008-13</td>
<td>To move from 'EC Response Strategy' to a 'Joint EC &amp; EU Member State' Response Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAURITANIA</strong></td>
<td>NIP: 10th EDF 2008-13</td>
<td>NIP 10th EDF 2008-13:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>NIP: 10th EDF 2008-13</td>
<td>NIP 10th EDF 2008-13:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training &amp; Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57 EC/NIP support area focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIP: 10th EDF 2008-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIP: 10th EDF 2008-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIP: 10th EDF 2008-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Med. Univ; 2) Nursing Schools;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) UNICEF (Nutrition Planning, BCC, IYCN, Malnutrition Protocol, SMART); 4) ACF (SMART);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) IRD (FS, SMART); UFR Ouaga (see below);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF, Université de Médecine; doctors trained in 2007 (financed by UNICEF) MoH personnel trained in the fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOA/2;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF for Acute malnutrition Surveys, Management of acute under-nutrition and IYCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Med Univ. Jimma Un., Bondar Un. Hawassa University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Nursing schools private &amp; public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 HealthExt-Workers with UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Med Univ. Jimma University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Department of Food Science and Technology, Agriculture Faculty, Makerere;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-School of Public Health;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Kyambogo University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-RCQHC for Nut and HIV/IDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATI; KATC; Mlingo training institute; LITIs; Mpwapwa Agency; TOSCA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institut National de Santé Publique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Nord/Sud 1.1. IRD (Montpellier; Orléans);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epicentre: Rotavirus, Nutrition, santé mentale,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be developed in collaboration with University of Nouakchott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 North/South: Jimma University with Copenhagen Un.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFNC National Institute for Medical Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

121 Poverty Reduction through Accelerated Economic Growth 2006.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Needed</th>
<th>West Africa</th>
<th>East Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALI</td>
<td>BURKINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>research not developed</td>
<td>1.2. Institut Médecine Tropicale Anvers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 60                  | Human Resources Availability | Lack of HR at all levels; most urgent at community levels | Lack of nutritionists at provincial level | NGOs, Epicentre, Nobody | Inadequate (only 17% of hospitals have nutritionists) | TFNC, decline in available skilled staff in the health sector |

<p>| 61                  | Nutrition component in curricula for health staff | Medical training: 20 h on acute malnutrition; module on SAM and MAM in nurse training school in Goa | Module on SAM and MAM treatment at nurse training school (ENSP) | No, except nurse and bachelor of food technology but a process is ongoing to revise the curriculum of Faculty of Medicine, Nursing schools and Master of public health with | Yes, integrated in Nursing School &amp; HEW | ? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Needed</th>
<th>West Africa</th>
<th>East Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALI</td>
<td>BURKINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support of UNICEF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2: Log-Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement</th>
<th>Sources and means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To contribute to achieving MDG 1, 4, 5 and 8 targets related to nutrition (Annex 1) in sub-Saharan Africa, ensuring that children and women are protected from the adverse consequences of the global financial &amp; economic crisis.</td>
<td>Nutrition-related targets for MDGs 1, 4, 5, and 8 show progress in selected countries and regions</td>
<td>Publications of MDG tracking organisations on the selected countries and regions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Objective 1</td>
<td>To better integrate nutrition in continental, regional and national strategy frameworks of sub-Saharan Africa and strengthen synergy and multi-sector coordination for nutrition</td>
<td>Number of approved strategy documents that include nutrition. Establishment of functioning multi-sectoral coordination bodies for nutrition.</td>
<td>Strategy documents Reports of coordination bodies</td>
<td>Political commitments to implement plans and strategies at country and regional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy development and nutrition awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Result 1</td>
<td>Africa’s key policy-makers &amp; leaders of civil society are committed to reviewing the regional and national action plans on nutrition to ensure adequate support is provided to implement these plans for effective and sustainable socio-economic development.</td>
<td>Number of national/regional action plans on nutrition developed or updated. Funding for national nutrition plans is earmarked in national budgets</td>
<td>Publication of national/regional plans on nutrition. National budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities 1</td>
<td>At continental level: - Support for the AUC to review ARNS in full cooperation with regional bodies (WAHO/ECSA-HC, UNICEF ESARO and WCARO, etc.), ensuring it is anchored with NEPAD/CAADP - Support for ATTFND to develop advocacy strategy including the organisation of 1 high-level seminar/meeting at continental level, involving heads of state / prime ministers and key decision makers At regional level: - Support for active participation by RECs in the ARNS review - Support for RECs (e.g. CILLS/ECOWAS in West Africa, and ECSA/IGAD/COMESA in East Africa) to organise 1 to 2 high-</td>
<td>Personnel (Technical Assistant, Short-term Consultant) Equipment Training (seminars/ workshops) Publications</td>
<td>Costs: breakdown in the budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
level seminars/meetings at regional level involving heads of state / ministers and key decision makers

**At country level:**
- Support for the development of national plans in nutrition and food security
  - Ethiopia: support for implementation of NNP; 
  - Uganda: advocacy for ratification of the Food and Nutrition Bill, and 
    support for development of budget for food and nutrition strategy; 
  - Burkina Faso: support for implementation of nutrition plan of action; 
  - Mali: support for development of new strategic plan, including plan of action and budget)
- Carrying out cost analyses on nutrition security activities in line with the national plan and advocating inclusion in the national budget
- Support for national leading body to organise seminars/meetings for ministers / key leaders / parliamentarians and civil society on nutrition and food security

**At all levels**
- Developing awareness tools and ensuring country-wide dissemination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific objective 2</th>
<th>Institutional building and capacity development</th>
<th>Expected result 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reinforce capacities at regional, national and local level to assess, plan and manage human resources on nutrition in coordination with regional/international organisations</td>
<td>Number of nutrition practitioners in the countries and regions</td>
<td>Departments and units strengthened at all levels, with qualified practitioners in nutrition and coordination mechanisms involving African networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National HR development plan on nutrition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training for non medical/nutritionist staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manilla report</td>
<td>Creation of networks of universities and institutions with nutrition courses, with S-S and S-N links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Line ministry activity reports</td>
<td>Coordination mechanisms in place between nutrition and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scientific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Specific objective 3 —

To improve nutrition information systems at country and regional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities 2</th>
<th>At continental/regional level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ensuring coordination between national, regional and continental level on policies, mapping exercise and networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support for mapping of existing training institutions (curricula, human resource capacity, budget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- East Africa: Strengthening regional networking of training/research institutions, based on understanding of progress, constraints and lessons learnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- West Africa: Support for ongoing initiative for Public Health Nutrition Research and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At country level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support for review of nutrition curricula in accordance with international standards and ensuring harmonisation among national centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reviewing and supporting in-service training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Building up and supporting the nutrition unit inside the Ministry of Health and promoting coordination at sub-national level in complementarity with other stakeholders (Mali: support for creation of a fully functioning nutrition unit; Burkina Faso: strengthening of Nutrition Directorate in MoH and coordination bodies at sub-national level; Ethiopia: strengthening of nutrition within MoH and coordination bodies at sub-national level; Uganda: strengthening of the nutrition department within MoH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Promoting and supporting national multi-sectoral coordination (food, health, statistic, education, finance and planning)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Personnel (Technical Assistant, Short-term Consultant) |
| Equipment |
| Training (seminars/workshops) |
| Publications, Grants | Costs: breakdown in the budget |

| other sectors, in particular food security |
| Number of universities and institutions with nutrition training courses |
| Nutrition units / departments in each country adequately staffed and resourced |

| publications |
| Structural level of nutrition unit within the government system (own budget line; decision-making power) |

122 Proposal by UNICEF, HKI, 2 West African Universities (one French- and one English-speaking) under the leadership of the West African Health Organisation (WAHO).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information systems</th>
<th>Sustainable nutrition information systems are developed with strong linkages with other food security information systems</th>
<th>Number of standardised methods implemented and coordinated</th>
<th>List of sources for nutrition data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected result 3</td>
<td>Methods to integrate nutrition into food security analysis</td>
<td>Agreement and procedures in place for data compilation and analysis</td>
<td>Central database for nutrition data exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>Repository centres for nutrition data established</td>
<td>Publications on situation analysis, including FS and nutrition data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities 3</td>
<td>At continental level (i) Support for collecting and processing authoritative data available on nutrition in Africa and processing for dissemination</td>
<td>Personnel (Technical Assistant, Short-term Consultant Equipment Training (seminars/workshops) Publications</td>
<td>Costs: breakdown in the budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information system</td>
<td>At regional level (ii) Recommending and supervising standardised and internationally recognised guidelines for data collection (iii) Evaluating national models on linkages between food security and nutrition and recommending best possible options (iv) Support for data collection from countries, quality checking and data storage system (v) Facilitating information flow to continental level At country level (vi) Support for the collection of nutritional data from available sources (MICS/DHS, small-scale surveys, Health Information System) (vii) Ensuring quality control, triangulation and centralisation of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

123 Uganda, in MOH in connection with the nutrition/unit department; Burkina Faso, in the nutrition directorate of MOH; Ethiopia, between ENCU and EHNRI; Mali, in the CPS.
| Specific objective 4 — Operational backstop | To support regional & national and sub-national nutrition programmes with particular attention to the protection of infants and mothers from the adverse effects of volatile food prices and the financial & economic crisis. |
| Expected results 4 | Regional and national programmes tackling malnutrition are implemented in a coherent, coordinated and synergic manner. | Community programmes studied and effectiveness proved | Reports and reviews on community programmes |
| Activities 4 | At country level (i) In depth-analysis of community-based nutrition programmes | Personnel (Short-term) Training Publications | Costs: breakdown in the budget |
ACTION FICHE FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
COMPONENT 3: EXPLOITING THE POTENTIAL OF CONTINENTAL AND REGIONAL
APPROACHES TO IMPROVE FOOD SECURITY

‘MATERNAL AND YOUNG CHILD NUTRITION SECURITY IN ASIA’

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>Maternal and Young Child Nutrition Security in Asia FOOD/2009/225-788</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>EUR 27 million (estimated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU contribution: EUR 20 million maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other contributions¹²⁴:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF EUR 2.7 million, Spain: EUR 4.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method / Method of implementation</td>
<td>Project approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC-code</td>
<td>12240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Basic Nutrition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

Hunger remains one of the most important problems the world faces. More than one billion people — nearly a sixth of the world’s population — suffer from chronic hunger and 63% of this number live in Asia. It is a crisis with devastating and far-reaching effects. Ensuring food security has thus become the aim of many governments and the international community. Dozens of countries in Africa and Asia have been developing comprehensive agriculture development strategies. Recently, at the Aquila G8 Summit (2009), donors committed more than USD 20 billion to support a renewed global effort on food security.

Ensuring global food security will remain a challenge in the future, as demand for food is projected to increase by 50 per cent over the next 20 years, while climate change is expected to severely constrain food production and increase the incidence of natural disasters. Consequently, greater support has been pledged to improve agriculture productivity, market access, post-harvest infrastructure and rural incomes. Although such measures are necessary to ensure food security, they are not sufficient to ensure nutrition security for all. Several

¹²⁴ As at November 2009.
countries have seen improvements in their agricultural output and economic growth, but have failed to improve the nutritional status of their populations, particularly women and children.

The EU’s food security interventions are guided by a four-pillar approach to food security, comprising: 1) food availability, 2) food access, 3) food utilisation along with vulnerability to shocks, and 4) stability over time, which is often seen as a fourth dimension impacting the other three pillars. Availability, access, and utilisation of food should also be guaranteed over time. The present action focuses on nutrition security and complements the EC’s other food security interventions.

Worldwide, the nutrition situation remains a concern in terms of reaching the MDGs with equity. The just released 2010 State of the World’s Children and the recent UNICEF nutrition report ‘Tracking Progress on Child and Maternal Nutrition: a Survival & Development Priority’ (2009) report insufficient progress in nutrition status and unacceptable persistence of malnutrition rates in spite of the relatively good economic growth observed in Asia in recent years. Among children under 5 years of age, the prevalence of stunting is still 34%, while wasting, low birth weight and underweight are 13%, 16%, and 23%, respectively. However, these average figures do not reflect the wide disparities between countries and even within countries. Severe micronutrient deficiencies are highly prevalent in Asia. All forms of undernutrition (stunting, wasting, underweight, micronutrient deficiencies) are the result of a combination of factors with basic and underlying causes. The immediate causes of malnutrition are inadequate dietary intake (in terms of quantity and quality) and frequent illnesses. These are in turn influenced by underlying factors at household and community level such as inadequate care, poor hygiene, lack of knowledge and inadequate health services. The current global food, fuel and economic crises, additional threats to food security, political instability and insecurity all come into play and exacerbate the already precarious nutritional status of children and women in the region.

With a focus on improving nutrition among women and children, the proposed action will therefore complement and add value to what is being done at country and regional levels to improve food and nutrition security and ensure that nutrition is given a higher priority on the development agenda. It is consistent with the priorities of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the South Asia Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) to achieve the MDGs with equity to ensure the sustainable survival, growth and development of children.

By having a regional approach, the action will support and reinforce policy dialogue by advocating greater emphasis on nutrition security in the Asian development agenda, better integration with other sectors, and political commitment. It will build connections through the use of national and regional institutions, and will contribute to the development of sound evidence-based programmes by using a common framework for monitoring and evaluation and as far as possible a common approach to address malnutrition and in particular stunting. This regional approach will help establish a network to strengthen capacity in nutrition and create mechanisms for knowledge sharing and cross-country fertilisation.

Specific attention will be given to five Asian countries, namely Bangladesh, Nepal, Laos, Philippines and Indonesia. The choice of these countries has been determined by their pressing need for improvement in reducing child undernutrition and by their existing potential for

125 Stunting, or low height for age, is caused by long-term insufficient nutrient intake and frequent infections. Stunting generally occurs before age two, and effects are largely irreversible: delayed motor development, impaired cognitive function and poor school performance.

126 Wasting, or low weight for height, is a strong predictor of mortality among children under five. It is usually the result of acute food shortage and/or disease.
building on and creating new synergies with current interventions in infant and young child feeding (IYCF) and maternal nutrition. These countries have demonstrated a commitment to alleviating stunting and tackling the unfavourable situation with complementary feeding and the micronutrient status of their population of young children. For example, Indonesia’s National Planning Commission has specifically identified ‘prevention of stunting’ as a key priority for the coming years. These countries are all quite different in terms of size, demography, typology, government structure, etc., so will provide a wealth of diverse information.

The impact of the action will extend beyond the five targeted countries to other countries in the region that have high malnutrition rates. Countries like India, Pakistan and Afghanistan, although having the largest proportion of stunted children in the region, are not directly targeted by the action. In the case of Afghanistan and Pakistan, both countries are in a very acute emergency phase where the primary focus is responding to the urgent lifesaving needs of the vulnerable population. There is also a fair amount of funding to support nutrition activities through the emergency funds. India has quite satisfactory economic growth and adequate financial and human resources to tackle nutrition on its own. In comparison, countries like Laos and Nepal where capacities are weak are expected to benefit more from direct EU support. Through the regional approach, countries such as Afghanistan, India, Pakistan, Myanmar, etc. are expected to benefit from the project indirectly, as they will be included in training activities, dissemination workshops, and the sharing of experience.

2.2. Lessons learnt

UNICEF’s nutrition report ‘Tracking Progress on Child and Maternal Nutrition: a Survival & Development Priority’ (2009) shows that maternal and child undernutrition is the — largely preventable — cause of more than one third of all deaths among children under 5. Twenty-four countries account for more than 80% of global chronic undernutrition. Asia is particularly affected by stunting: it has 10 of the 24 countries with the largest numbers of children under 5 years old (Bangladesh, Nepal, Indonesia, Philippines, India, Pakistan, Burma/Myanmar and Vietnam). This amounts to 111,017,000 children (56.1% of the developing world total).

The Lancet Series on Child and Maternal Undernutrition concluded that ‘of the reviewed interventions, breastfeeding promotion, appropriate complementary feeding, supplementing with vitamin A and zinc, and appropriate management of severe acute malnutrition [proved] the most promising for reducing child death and future disease burden related to undernutrition’. In order to tackle stunting, efforts need to focus on improving maternal nutrition and complementary feeding practices among children of 6-23 months. The physical and mental damage associated with poor foetal growth and stunting is known to be largely irreversible after the age of two years, leaving a narrow window of opportunity for intervention, starting before birth up to the second year of life. The high levels of low birth weight (an important indication of foetal growth) and the low levels of optimal breastfeeding and complementary feeding practices are largely responsible for the high levels of stunting in the region. The set of interventions recommended by the Lancet could prevent about one-quarter of child deaths under 36 months of age and reduce the prevalence of stunting at 36 months by about one-third in the 36 countries with 90% of stunted children under five years of age. Although substantial, these actions will not be sufficient on their own. They need to be part of a broader set of policies and actions to address other underlying causes of undernutrition.

127 The 5 targeted countries for the current programme (Bangladesh, Nepal, Indonesia, Laos, Philippines) have 10.7% of the world’s stunted children.
The community-based management of severe acute malnutrition (CMAM) approach has been developed to reduce the problems with the traditional facility-based treatment of severe acute malnutrition (mainly high numbers of cases with limited beds, risk of cross-infection, high cost, high default rate because parents cannot stay for a long time, and high fatality rates). The current CMAM approach was developed in 2000 and has so far covered over 25,000 children. Where CMAM was well implemented, mortality rates fell below 5% due to early detection of severe cases and treatment at home using ready-to-use therapeutic foods (RUTF). The approach is implemented in combination with inpatient care for complicated cases and with supplementary feeding or, in non-emergency contexts, programmes to address the issue of moderate acute malnutrition. In Asia, the approach has recently been introduced in Afghanistan, Bangladesh, DPRK, Indonesia, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Timor Leste in an emergency context. However, the implementation of CMAM needs to be better monitored in emergency contexts and scaled up to non-emergency contexts. The local production of RUTF is under way under the Nutriset franchise in several African countries and outside the Nutriset franchise in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi and Zambia.

2.3. Complementary actions

For short-term needs, the European Commission (DG ECHO) is working closely in Asia with WFP for delivering emergency food aid to vulnerable groups affected by natural or man-made disasters in many countries in Asia, in particular recently in: Afghanistan, Pakistan, Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Vietnam and the Philippines. Many EU-funded interventions in Asia with both DCI and ECHO funding focus on disaster preparedness, from central to community level, and with the support of NGOs and agencies such as UNDP. These actions are complementary to the present action.

In the short and medium term, the EU’s facility for a rapid response to soaring food prices in developing countries (the Food Facility) has made available €1 billion (by the end of 2008), with around €280 million for Asia. The EU Food Facility targets Bangladesh, Laos, Nepal and the Philippines among the five countries to be given special attention under this action, and also covers Afghanistan, Burma/Myanmar, Cambodia, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka within the Asia region. For its part, in response to the global food price crisis, UNICEF committed in mid-2008 USD 51 million of its own resources to boost nutrition security, in addition to its regular nutrition programmes. These funds mainly target 48 countries that were worst affected by the crisis, including those in the Asia-Pacific region.

In the medium and long term, the EU-funded country programmes focus on food security in Bangladesh and Laos, among the specially targeted countries, and in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Pakistan and Mongolia among the other countries in the Asia-Pacific region. In addition, the EU Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP) currently supports innovative approaches in Cambodia and Laos and a regional project with FAO on food security information systems in Cambodia, Laos and Burma/Myanmar. A regional project to address technology transfer for food security in South and South East Asia is under preparation. Innovative food security approaches in Afghanistan, Bangladesh — on nutrition — and Laos are also under preparation. Health is a focal sector in many countries in Asia, including Bangladesh — with particular attention to mothers and young children with UNFPA — and the Philippines.

DFID is planning to allocate £3.4 million over 5 years (2009/10 to 2012/13) to fund the South Asia Food Security and Nutrition Initiative (SAFSNI). The project aims to improve policy coherence and coordination on food security and nutrition among South Asian governments, regional institutions and international agencies by strengthening the evidence base on the most effective ways to improve food security and nutrition, facilitating policy dialogue at all levels.
of policy makers and policy advisers, and supporting the development of a South Asian Food Security and Nutrition Network of policy research and civil society organisations.

Many WFP activities — some EC-funded as in Bangladesh — in several countries in South and South-East Asia complement the proposed action.

2.4. Donor coordination

Constructive cooperation with relevant European Commission services offices will continue during the implementation phase. Ensuring coherence forms part of the activities described in section 3.2 ‘Expected results and main activities’. Donor coordination is often along sectoral lines (e.g. health, agriculture), so coordination on nutrition issues, which requires overcoming such sectoral barriers, is generally weak. Nevertheless, some mechanisms exist at both country and regional levels.

There are several ongoing and forthcoming food and nutrition security initiatives in the Asia region. Coordination with the donors and implementing partners involved in such initiatives will be essential in order to ensure coherence and avoid duplication of interventions. To ensure proper coordination at regional level, a steering committee will be established. Its composition will need to be agreed with partners but would include representatives from UNICEF, the European Commission, other donors (e.g. DFID), the World Bank, UN agencies (e.g. WFP & FAO), and possibly a representative from ASEAN. The body will meet at least once a year to review progress and ensure coordination with other initiatives, including the WB South Asia Food Security and Nutrition Initiative supported by DFID. This will be facilitated if the European Commission and UNICEF are also invited to participate in the WB-led South Asia steering committee.

Complementarity with the DFID-World Bank initiative in South Asia will be ensured. A dialogue has been initiated between UNICEF, the European Commission and DFID in consultation with the nutrition specialist of the World Bank for South Asia and synergies have been identified. The DFID/WB initiative will focus on policy research and contribute to generating evidence on food and nutrition security to feed into the operationalisation / implementation of interventions proposed under the present action. Likewise, lessons learned from the European Commission-UNICEF initiative will feed into the policy research agenda. The steering committee will provide a forum for inter-regional collaboration and exchange of information on the DFID/WB initiative in South Asia and the European Commission-UNICEF programme in South and East Asia. Discussions will take place to identify areas where joint activities can be undertaken to enhance food and nutrition security in the South Asia region. Work plans will be shared and interventions can be adjusted to streamline and harmonise efforts.

At country level, coordination for this action will build on existing mechanisms as most countries have existing coordination mechanisms in place under the UNDAF framework. Four countries (Bangladesh, Indonesia, Nepal and Philippines) have a coordination mechanism using the cluster approach because they are or have been in an emergency situation in recent years. In the case of Laos, REACH (WHO, WFP, FAO and UNICEF) ‘Ending Child Hunger and Undernutrition’ was set up as a sector working group to respond to needs and is being currently piloted in Laos.

The existing structures coordinating food/nutrition security in the targeted countries comprise the government, UNICEF and other UN agencies, implementing NGOs and donors. If the EU delegation is not already part of these groups/committees, it will be invited to play an active role. Most groups meet on a regular basis (monthly to quarterly). If an extraordinary meeting is necessary, or at the EU Delegation’s suggestion, UNICEF will be able to mobilise its partners to discuss any relevant issue.
At headquarters level, a donor meeting on nutrition was hosted by the European Commission in Brussels on 15 June 2009 and included presentations by EU Member States on nutrition strategies under review. A next step will be the development of a ‘Common European Ground on Nutrition’ to highlight the coherence across European donors’ strategies and common key orientations on nutrition. The ultimate aim is a coherent EU strategy and policy on nutrition.

Food security, nutrition and health interventions implemented by international and local NGOs — many of them funded by the EU or by EU Member States — are numerous in Asia and are particularly important for addressing the problems of vulnerable groups in some of the targeted countries, like Bangladesh, the Philippines, etc. Where relevant, these NSAs will be systematically involved by UNICEF during the implementation of the action.

3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectives

The overall objective of the EU support is to contribute to improving child survival, growth and development throughout the life cycle and enhancing nutrition security interventions contributing to the overall achievement of the MDG 1, 4, 5 and 8 targets relating to nutrition. The specific objective is to ensure priority for nutrition security on the Asian policy and development agenda and to strengthen capacities and information systems, build on lessons learned and scale up high-impact interventions for children and women in Asia with a specific focus on five targeted countries. This will translate into a reduction in undernutrition and in particular stunting (5 percentage point reduction from the baseline in the targeted countries).

Evidence shows that catch-up growth for a stunted child is very limited after the age of 24 months at individual level. At population level, very few programmes have been able to reduce stunting in U5 children. After 5 years, the IMCI project in Bangladesh reported a reduction of 12.7 percentage points (pp) in the IMCI group as compared to 5.4 pp in the comparison group, for 24- to 59-month children. However, significant improvements can be achieved with this project by using recent developments in nutrition programming, namely by focusing on the window of opportunity (from pre-conception to 24 months), and by linking multiple micronutrient supplementation to IYCF activities and deworming to vitamin A supplementation and proper care and hygiene practices. A good example of this is in Peru, where the Good Start in Life Programme was able to reduce stunting in children under 3 years by 17.2 percentage points (from 54.1% to 36.9%) between 2000 and 2004. It is therefore expected that a reduction of 5 pp over a period of 4 years is achievable. This project will also ensure stronger links across sectors (from health to agricultural production) to ensure longer term sustainability.

3.2. Expected results and main activities

This section summarises the expected results and main activities. This action will focus on addressing undernutrition using a lifecycle approach to improve child survival, development and growth in the Asia region. It will operate at five levels (regional, national, district, community and household) and focus on a selected number of evidence-based, cost-effective and high-impact interventions identified in the Lancet Series and in UNICEF’s Medium-Term Strategic Plan, to address the underlying causes of undernutrition. In countries where social protection and poverty alleviation measures are in place, a better understanding of the links between nutrition outcomes and poverty alleviation measures and how to strengthen these links will be sought. Building on its nutrition security and social policy expertise at country and regional levels, UNICEF can strengthen these links to support food/nutrition security and help reduce chronic undernutrition. In countries like
Nepal and the Philippines, this linkage already exists (see below under activities). Overall, proposed interventions will be implemented in UNICEF convergence districts. The selection of districts (and sub-districts) will be based on composite indicators, including poverty and social services, as well as some of the MDG indicators, thus bringing this action more into line with poverty reduction strategies.

It is estimated that, through this action, stunting will be reduced by 5 percentage points\textsuperscript{128} and that global acute malnutrition will also be reduced to less than 10% in countries where the prevalence is higher than 10%. The expected results at regional and country levels are based around four main interrelated result areas, as follows:

1. **Upstream Policy**: policies, strategies, guidelines / protocols and tools adopted / revised and implemented at scale (result 1)

2. **Capacity Building**: enhanced capacities at all levels (community, district, central) to address malnutrition in collaboration with selected regional and national institutions to create a strong nutrition community network (result 2)

3. **Data Analysis & Knowledge Sharing**: strengthened information systems, data collection & analysis and mechanisms for knowledge sharing and management established (result 3)

4. **Scaling Up Interventions**: directly improved infant, child and female nutrition through implementation of key interventions (result 4)

**Regional level**

The specific feature of this action is its regional focus, which will help raise awareness of nutrition security in regional fora and institutions (ASEAN & SAARC.), promote integration across sectoral lines, and strengthen coherence and coordination among countries as well as among actors. It will also seek alignment with other regional initiatives such as the DFID/WB South Asia Initiative, especially on cross-country and cross-regional lesson learning and policy research and development. The European Commission-UNICEF Action will also help set up and strengthen networks of institutions to build nutrition capacity in the region and create mechanisms for knowledge sharing and cross-country fertilisation. It will contribute to developing sound evidence-based programmes by using a common framework for monitoring and evaluation, leading to a common approach to address malnutrition and particularly stunting, where feasible.

**RESULT 1 — Upstream Policy**: policies, strategies, guidelines / protocols and tools adopted / revised and implemented at scale

Knowledge strengthened and policy development on nutrition security supported.

**Main activities under result 1**

UNICEF and partners will advocate a coherent approach at all levels to make nutrition security a key component of the development agenda, because undernutrition undermines progress towards achievement of the MDGs. Several activities will be organised to support or reinforce the policy dialogue at country level, including:

- Organising a high-level regional meeting on nutrition security bringing together key strategic ministers (such as Health, Agriculture, Planning and Finance) from all Asia. If a similar activity is to be undertaken by the WB/DFID initiative for the South Asia

---

\textsuperscript{128} This represents a total of around 1 million stunted under-five children in the 5 targeted countries, which had an estimated 20.6 million stunted children in 2008: Indonesia: 7.7 m; Bangladesh: 7.2 m; the Philippines: 3.6 m; Nepal: 1.75 m and Laos: 370000 (UNICEF report).
region, the European Commission/UNICEF Action will take the lead in organising a regional meeting within the East Asia region.

- Lobbying to draw attention to nutrition security in various fora at regional level, such as ministerial meetings, the Pacific Food Security Summit and other food security meetings. In addition, UNICEF will have a half-day session on social protection at the Asia Development Bank meeting in April 2010 and a paper will then be presented on how to strengthen the links with nutrition security outcomes.

- Strengthening food and nutrition security policy through the development of policy papers based on evidence generated by policy research and experience from the field.

- Developing advocacy tools, including key messages linking nutrition security to development in the Asia region (using recent evidence from the Lancet Series, the Copenhagen Consensus statement, and evidence coming out of research supported by the DFID/WB initiative, etc.). These tools can be used within various fora.

- Promoting better integration of nutrition security at country level in development plans, PRSPs, sector plans, (and particularly the agriculture/food production sector), etc.

- Use of the Marginal Budgeting Bottlenecks (MBB) tool (an integrated health and nutrition planning and budgeting tool) to ensure that key nutrition interventions are costed and included in budget plans.

- Coordinating with relevant donors and implementing partners active in Asia in order to ensure coherence between the activities of this project and other initiatives to promote access to food and reduce poverty. In coordination with DFID/WB, developing an overview (mapping) across the specifically targeted countries.

- Technical support for the regional institutions will be provided to advise member countries on food and nutrition security issues and to reinforce the policy dialogue. Policy papers and advocacy tools (as mentioned above) would be used to support the policy dialogue. Institutions to be involved could include: the SEAMEO (South East Asian Ministers of Education Organisation) Centre for Community Nutrition, Indonesia, and the International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh (ICCIDR.B), together with BRAC, IFPRI and other relevant research institution in the field of food production, University in Bangladesh and Los Baños University in the Philippines, given their international reputation. These institutions will be invited to be part of a network to be coordinated by a leading institution. The network will be established in consultation with other partners, including the DFID/WB initiative in South Asia, which is planning to support the development of a South Asian Food Security and Nutrition Network of policy research and civil society organisations. The European Commission/UNICEF initiative would contribute to broadening the network and building cross-regional experience, since it also targets ASEAN country members.

RESULT 2 — Capacity Building: enhanced capacities at all levels (community, district, central) to address malnutrition in collaboration with selected regional and national institutions to create a strong nutrition community network

- Establishment of a network of national and regional academic and research institutions to support cross-fertilisation between countries in consultation with partners;
- Increased capacity of national/regional institutions to collect, analyse and evaluate nutrition data to inform policies and programmes;
- Increased access by countries to the roster of experts developed by UNICEF.

Main activities under result 2
• Strengthening of the network of academic and research institutions such as the International Centre for Diarrheal Disease Research in Bangladesh (ICDDR,B), BRAC University in Bangladesh, IFPRI and other relevant research institutions in the field of food production, the SEAMEO (South East Asian Ministers of Education Organisation), Centre for Community Nutrition in Indonesia, the University of Los Baños in the Philippines and Mahidol University in Thailand, among others, in order to provide technical support, including development of modules for professional health and nutrition curricula, training in data collection and analysis, etc. Countries that do not have such institutions will be invited to send their experts to participate in training organised by these institutions to ensure coherence and cross-country fertilisation.

• Strengthening of government capacities in nutrition programming, including monitoring and evaluation in countries with weak capacity.

RESULT 3 — Data Analysis & Knowledge Sharing: strengthened information systems, data collection & analysis and mechanisms for knowledge sharing and management established

- Common monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework adopted to document impact of project and advise on future scale-up;
- Structured forum to share experiences and good practices in nutrition at regional and national level.

Main activities under result 3

- Support for a reputable institution to develop a common monitoring and evaluation framework in order to monitor and assess the impact of interventions to be supported by the action as a starting point. The development of the common framework and selection of key indicators will be in consultation with the targeted countries and will allow sufficient flexibility to ensure that country specificities are also captured. The possibility of broadening the scope of M&E will be explored especially in countries where activities will be implemented in the same areas where social protection programmes are ongoing.
- Support for the capacity of institutions to conduct good quality data collection and analysis. In countries where no such institutions exist, external institutions or consultants will be contracted to assist with data collection and analysis while working closely with government to strengthen its capacity.
- Documenting and publishing in peer-reviewed journals the experiences, lessons learned and best practices, particularly for the improvement of complementary feeding practices and community management of acute malnutrition. Practices and evidence creating better links between nutrition and food production will be documented. In addition, documenting the lessons learned on the regional dynamics and initiatives, including coordination mechanisms. Information and dissemination workshops will also be organised, addressing not only the targeted countries but any likely to benefit from this experience sharing.
- Experience sharing through country exchanges with targeted and non-targeted countries.

RESULT 4 — Scaling Up Interventions: directly improved infant, child and female nutrition

- Options assessed for a minimum package of cost-effective and safe interventions;
- Opportunities identified to increase capacity for the local production of micronutrient powders (MNPs) and ready-to-use therapeutic foods (RUTF) to ensure sustainability.

Main activities under result 4

- Facilitating the provision of micronutrient supplies to countries not directly targeted by the project but where lack of supplies is a key issue;
• Assessing opportunities to increase local capacity for the production of MNP and RUTF including assessment of opportunities for production of agricultural products containing necessary nutrients (small holders);
• Supporting situation assessments using a common framework to assess knowledge, attitudes and practices among decision makers, staff and communities.

Country level

RESULT 1 — Upstream Policy: policies, strategies, guidelines / protocols and tools adopted / revised and implemented at scale

**Bangladesh:** (1) National food & nutrition policy and strategy developed; (2) National plan for infant and young child feeding (IYCF) rolled out; (3) National plan for anaemia prevention and control in women and children rolled out; (4) Community management of acute malnutrition (CMAM) guidelines developed; (5) International code for marketing of breast milk substitutes adopted; (6) Multiple micronutrient powder supplementation and integrated community and facility-based management of acute malnutrition integrated into HNPSP.

**Indonesia:** (1) IYCF strategy implemented; (2) Legislation developed to regulate marketing of breast milk substitutes; (3) Policies on treatment of acute malnutrition revised to ensure compliance with international standards as well as enhanced strategies to tackle chronic undernutrition (stunting).

**Lao PDR:** (1) National Nutrition Plan operational by end of 2010; (2) Protocols & tools between UN agencies & government strengthened and more formalised through REACH.

**Nepal:** (1) National Nutrition Plan of Action finalised and approved by 2010; (2) Increased budget allocation for nutrition in the health sector and possibly in other sectors such as rural & social development; (3) Nutrition Child Protection Grant effectively implemented in five districts of Karnali zone.

**Philippines:** (1) Enabling environment created to support working mothers to continue to exclusively breastfeed; (2) National food fortification law revised to add folic acid and zinc in rice and flour.

**Main activities under result 1**

• Updating national nutrition policies and nutrition plans of action and better integration of nutrition programmes using a multi-sectoral approach.

• Advocacy to integrate nutrition in PRSPs and relevant sector plans.

• Strengthening links between nutrition interventions and social protection/poverty alleviation measures.

• Development/implementation of IYCF strategy and use of multiple micronutrient supplements.

• Rollout of anaemia control for women in countries where not already in place, accompanied by a national communication strategy.

• Developing and implementing guidelines for community management of acute malnutrition (CMAM), as this approach has proved very effective in increasing access to and coverage of treatment and care services for children suffering from acute malnutrition.

• As a means to increase the EBF rate and improve complementary feeding practices, counselling on infant and young child feeding to be integrated in pre/postnatal services and health facility protocols. In addition, the adoption of a national code on the marketing of breastmilk substitutes will be advocated in countries where this is still lacking. In countries that already have a national code, support will be provided to ensure it is effectively monitored and enforced. An enabling environment to support
working mothers to continue to exclusively breastfeed will also be advocated where relevant.

**RESULT 2 — Capacity Building:** enhanced capacities at all levels (community, district, central) to address malnutrition in collaboration with selected regional and national institutions to create a strong nutrition community network

**Bangladesh:** (1) Capacity of health staff and relevant NGO partners strengthened in implementing and monitoring IYCF interventions and anaemia prevention activities among pregnant women and children under two; (2) Capacity of partners developed in the integrated management of severe acute malnutrition; (3) Increased capacity within relevant sectors (particularly agriculture) to integrate nutrition objectives in their programming.

**Indonesia:** (1) IYCF strategy included in the pre-service and in-service training curricula of health and nutrition professionals; (2) Strengthened health system & communities for appropriate counselling on IYCF, care of undernourished children and maternal nutrition; (3) Improved technical capacity of provincial/district governments in planning, managing and monitoring nutrition programmes.

**Lao PDR:** (1) Counselling skills strengthened in IYCF & women’s nutrition at health facilities and at community level; (2) Strengthened capacity of health staff in micro-planning and monitoring of micronutrient supplementation activities for children and women; (3) Strengthened capacity in quality control systems to improve coverage of adequately iodised salt.

**Nepal:** (1) Strengthened capacity of government in nutrition emergency preparedness and response, including CMAM; (2) Strengthened capacity of central and district health staff in nutrition programming and in monitoring and evaluating IYCF and maternal nutrition interventions; (3) Increased capacity within relevant sectors (particularly agriculture) to integrate nutrition objectives in their programming.

**Philippines:** (1) Strengthened capacity of health providers and employers to support exclusive breastfeeding (EBF); (2) Strengthened capacity of health workforce to promote optimal complementary feeding practices.

**Main activities under result 2**

- Activities include the promotion of optimal feeding practices, training and counselling, the introduction of IYCF counselling in all relevant maternal and child health contacts in the health system, and training of management, health and other relevant staff on the Baby-Friendly Hospital Initiative and on procedures, quality assurance and monitoring systems of all maternity facilities. This will be reinforced by strengthening the capacity of women’s groups to support mothers at community level. In several countries, there is little information on maternal nutrition in the antenatal care package, so this will be revised to strengthen the skills and knowledge of health staff and communities on maternal nutrition. The pre-service and in-service training curricula of health and nutrition professionals will be reviewed and advocacy carried out to ensure that IYCF and maternal nutrition are sufficiently addressed in the curricula.

- Relevant curricula for other relevant staff will be developed, e.g. looking at opportunities to develop basic training for professionals in the field of agriculture extension. As the CMAM guidelines are developed, it will be important to train and strengthen the capacity of partners, health workers and communities in the integrated management of severe acute malnutrition activities. Activities to treat severe acute malnutrition will be closely linked to preventive activities, especially IYCF activities.
• An important aspect of the present action is to strengthen information systems and data collection and analysis (see Result 3). Efforts will therefore focus on building the capacity of health staff and other sectors, where relevant, in micro-planning, monitoring and data management. For example, in the case of Nepal, this action will support surveys in the districts where the Nutrition Child Protection grant will be implemented to assess the performance of the initiative.

**RESULT 3 — Data Analysis & Knowledge Sharing:** strengthened information systems, data collection & analysis and mechanisms for knowledge sharing and management established

**Bangladesh:** (1) National evaluation capacity enhanced for monitoring nutrition programmes; (2) Nutrition survey results, including specific surveys, conducted in programme areas and results disseminated.

**Indonesia:** (1) Monitoring mechanisms established to assess progress on breastfeeding and complementary feeding; (2) Nutrition surveillance system strengthened to ensure early detection of malnutrition.

**Lao PDR:** (1) Strengthened monitoring systems for iodised salt; (2) Strengthened monitoring for activities implemented using the REACH framework to strengthen government ownership.

**Nepal:** (1) Information system strengthened by regular district level surveys to monitor progress on infant and young child feeding and maternal nutrition.

**Philippines:** (1) Monitoring mechanisms established to assess progress on breastfeeding, complementary feeding and food fortification.

*Main activities under result 3*

• Strengthening existing information systems (including nutrition surveillance systems). In a few countries, the information system will be updated to include key nutrition indicators.

• Conducting baseline and endline surveys in the 5 countries (if no other source of data is available) in order to assess the impact of the interventions (see below under ‘Regional level’ for the development of a common framework).

• Promoting and supporting the use of data to better inform policies and programmes, as too often data are collected without being used or are not analysed in time to properly inform decision makers.

**RESULT 4 — Scaling Up Interventions:** directly improved infant, child and woman’s nutrition

**Bangladesh:** (1) Increased coverage of children and women with package of interventions (IYCF, including MNP and iron folic acid (IFA) tablets for women), which will contribute to increasing exclusive breastfeeding rates, ensuring the timely introduction of complementary feeding, and reducing anaemia prevalence among children 6-23 months and pregnant women; (2) Increased coverage of CMAM.

**Indonesia:** (1) Increased coverage of children and women with package of interventions (IYCF, including MNP and IFA tablets for women); (2) Increased coverage of CMAM.

**Lao PDR:** (1) Increased coverage of children and women with package of interventions (IYCF, including MNP and IFA tablets for women);

**Nepal:** (1) Increased coverage of children and women with package of interventions (IYCF
and including MNP and IFA tablets for women); (2) Effectiveness of giving adolescent girls IFA supplements demonstrated; (3) Increased coverage of CMAM.

**Philippines:** (1) Increased coverage of children and women with package of interventions (IYCF and including MNP and IFA tablets for women); (2) Increased coverage of fortified rice and flour through the Accelerated Hunger Mitigation Programme (AHMP), an initiative supported by the Philippines government to mitigate the impact of hunger in several provinces.

In Indonesia and Nepal, conditional cash transfer (CCT) programmes are already in place, so this action will liaise with them to strengthen the nutrition component where applicable. In the Philippines, it will link with the AHMP through the rice fortification project. For Laos, the World Bank is going to implement a CCT project in the southern provinces of the country. Nutrition interventions will be part of the admission criteria. UNICEF will collaborate with the World Bank on this issue.

**Main activities under result 4**

**Infant & Young Child Feeding (intervention 1)**
- Promotion of optimum infant and young child feeding practices, increased nutritional awareness and improved care-giving skills of caregivers, through interpersonal communication on behavioural change in mothers, caregivers and families using community-based structures.
- Provision of extensive training and counselling to mothers, community workers and health staff and community support groups, with networks established to sustain adoption of new practices including improved access to quality nutrient foods.
- Support for harmonisation of communication materials developed by various partners and used for social mobilisation, nutrition education and advocacy.

**Anaemia control programme (intervention 2)**
- Promotion of a package to reduce anaemia in children aged 6-24 months, including use of micronutrient powders, deworming tablets (12-59 months) and appropriate feeding practices to improve iron intake and absorption.
- Support to improve the delivery of a package of interventions (iron-folic acid tablets and control of parasitic infections, mainly hookworm and malaria) for women of childbearing age. This will be done by ensuring sufficient supplies, adequate training of health workers, antenatal care services, community support (through the use of volunteers in most cases) and well-designed communication strategies to improve maternal nutrition. Rice fortification as a nutrition security intervention will also be part of the anaemia control programme in countries interested in learning from the Philippines experience.

**Community-based management of acute malnutrition (intervention 3)**
- Support for the development of national guidelines for CMAM and their implementation through government structures with NGO technical support.
- Building capacity of government and other partners in the management of acute malnutrition in line with the national guidelines to ensure harmonisation of protocols and standardisation of reporting systems.
3.3. Risks and assumptions

**Assumptions**

- Political commitment to implementing plans and strategies at country and regional level
- Sufficient number of partners in the field to support implementation of activities
- Effective nutrition coordination mechanism
- Effective BCC activities to promote optimal practices in child and maternal nutrition

**Risks**

Risks include:

- Economic, social and political stability might deteriorate within the global context
- Worsening economic and food crises may hamper progress or impact of intervention
- The region is prone to natural and manmade disasters
- Lack of appropriate staffing and human resources

**Mitigation measures**

UNICEF will advocate expanding the number of nutrition supporters, and will ensure that policy makers are fully aware of the evidence of the impact of nutrition interventions on their nation’s development and growth. UNICEF will develop strategic partnerships with civil society, technical government services, research/academic institutions and the private sector to strengthen capacity. In the event of humanitarian emergencies, the direct consequences for project implementation may include: breakdown of social services, lack of personnel for the implementation of activities, loss of stocks, and a breakdown in family structures and community values. However, this should not divert attention away from the action, and efforts will be made in such cases to continue the activities supported. Other funds will be mobilised to address humanitarian emergencies in collaboration with humanitarian partners already identified in the preparedness phase. In addition, the MDGF project implemented in two targeted countries has built-in emergency mitigation activities, while UNICEF internal emergency preparedness and response plans also clearly outline the emergency mitigation activities that need to be undertaken, such as the development of comprehensive emergency nutrition contingency plans, the development of emergency tools, including guidelines and rapid assessment tools, and the establishment of emergency coordination structures.

**Sustainability**

- Key government ministries will be directly or indirectly involved in the proposed action.
- Activities will be undertaken under mainstream government programmes, which will provide and strengthen evidence for further scaling up.
- The proposed interventions are not standalone projects but rather come within and alongside regular health and nutrition programming by government.
- Advocacy will be carried out to mobilise government resources to support the scaling up of programmes and to increase government budgets for nutrition.
- Together with key implementing partners, UNICEF will forge synergistic and strategic partnerships through programming that complements government planning and policy. Innovative approaches will be used to enhance existing initiatives, to build community
capacity and to establish common knowledge bases. Capturing and sharing best practices with national institutions and partners will be a major element in the design of the action, and due attention will be given to ensuring that best practices are later replicated and scaled up by and through national partner institutions beyond the action’s lifetime.

3.4. Cross-cutting issues

Enhancing gender equality is clearly addressed with this action, through its focus on the most vulnerable women, particularly in minority groups. By improving the nutritional status of women and children, the action aims to break the vicious circle of food insecurity and poverty where the daughters of ill-fed mothers have a high chance of becoming ill-fed mothers themselves. Moreover, the action aims to improve the advocacy capacity of women to request adequate aid from relevant government services. This is expected to have a positive effect on the empowerment of women to voice their problems and stand up for their (human) rights in general. Breaking the circle of food insecurity and poverty will also reduce the number of children with disabilities, mental as well physical. Children’s rights will also be partly addressed with this action.

The action will also support the improvement of government structures and capacities to deal with the nutritional needs of the most vulnerable parts of their populations. Naturally, this support will cover general initiatives for good governance and the fight against inequalities in the targeted countries, and, where relevant, linkages will be sought with other ongoing and planned initiatives.

The fight against HIV/AIDS and support for patients and their children is an important part of UNICEF’s activities. As this action will be carried out by the same offices dealing with the HIV/AIDS activities, the integration of HIV/AIDS issues in the activities under this action will be ensured.

Climate change is likely to have significant impact on the nutritional situation in the targeted countries. First of all, changing climatic patterns can undermine agricultural production, thus further constraining the availability of food, in particular for the most vulnerable populations. Climate change will also lead to a higher incidence of natural disasters, which often has a detrimental impact on the nutritional status of women and children in particular. The proposed action will help to improve the capacity of governments and people to better manage such disruptions and increase their resilience. It will link, where relevant, with ongoing and planned initiatives on disaster preparedness, to ensure coherence.

3.5. Stakeholders

Given the nature of this regional, multi-country approach, there are stakeholders at regional, national and sub-national levels. In most cases, UNICEF is already partnering the stakeholders listed below. Where relevant, it will further develop strategic partnerships to implement high-impact interventions, strengthen capacities, monitor progress and document lessons learned.

**Regional institutions:** ASEAN and SAARC, which are already involved in regional food and nutrition security initiatives, will be targeted to leverage support for nutrition in the region and ensure priority for nutrition on the food security and agriculture agenda.

**Asian governments:** Ministry of Health (MoH), Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Education (MoE), Ministry of Industry and Commerce, Bureau of Statistics.

**Research/Academic Institutions:** SEAMEO (South East Asian Ministers of Education Organisation) Centre for Community Nutrition, Indonesia, International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh (ICDDR, B), South Asia Infant Feeding Research Network (SAIFRN).
Civil Society: local NGOs, community-based organisations, consumers’ associations.

Private sector: food processing industries, social marketing companies to support communication campaigns.

Multilateral and bilateral donors/partners: other UN agencies, international NGOs, Asian Development Bank (ADB), World Bank (WB), EU and DFID.

Main target groups: Asian decision makers, government officials (Ministry of Health/Agriculture/Education /Industry and Commerce) at central, district and local levels, NGOs, research and academic institutions, private sector (mainly food industries), teachers, health workers, community volunteers, women’s groups or associations. It is estimated that a total of 100,000 decision makers, health staff and volunteers will be targeted in the five countries covered.

Final beneficiaries: the vulnerable populations in the five countries, in particular the close to 30 million under five (U5) children and 5 million pregnant and lactating women. Where food fortification activities are in place, close to 100 million people may be potentially covered by the programme after 4 years. Provision has also been made to support implementation of key nutrition activities in non-targeted countries where resources are insufficient. The number of children reached will increase depending on the size of these countries and their demand. It is expected that children and women in countries not supported by the action will benefit in the long run following experience sharing and the collating of lessons learned.

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Method of implementation

The method of implementation for this action is joint management through the signature of a contribution agreement with UNICEF. This is justified based on the global leadership role of UNICEF in the area of nutrition.

At regional level, UNICEF is well positioned to provide a multidimensional response to nutrition security. Both UNICEF regional offices, based in Kathmandu and Bangkok, focus delivery on regional partnerships that include ASEAN and SAARC with their ability to influence sub-regional Asian policies. In addition, UNICEF’s Asia Pacific Shared Services Centre (APSSC) in Bangkok, which serves both the South Asia and East Asia-Pacific regions will facilitate coordination of efforts and experience sharing across sub-regions. It will also facilitate the provision of technical services to regional offices, 22 country offices and their UN country teams and partners.

The Centre offers nutrition expertise ranging from tackling chronic undernutrition to handling the impact of emergencies on nutrition. Two senior nutritionists form the nucleus of a larger network of more than 40 UNICEF nutrition experts based at country level. This network is further strengthened by support from the Nutrition Section in UNICEF’s New York Headquarters and by a roster of technical experts that can be tapped into. The centre has established a regional nutrition emergency network comprising other UN partners, ECHO and key NGOs. The possibility of broadening the scope of this network to include other partners and encompass non-emergency issues will be explored. Alternatively, a nutrition working group could be established as part of the network (with the EU having a special advisory role) to ensure effective implementation and coordination.

ASEAN and SAARC are based in two of the five countries targeted by this project (Indonesia and Nepal). The provision of technical support to these institutions is under discussion (either by supporting/seconding a post or by providing technical assistance as needed) to advise member countries on food and nutrition issues and to reinforce policy dialogue. UNICEF is
also in discussion with DFID and the nutrition specialist of the World Bank for the South Asia region to identify areas of collaboration in targeted countries.

**At country level:** UNICEF has an office in each country, which facilitates coherence and coordination. UNICEF will work closely with implementing partners, mainly government bodies in various sectors (Health, Agriculture, Education, Women, Local Development/Industry, Commerce, and the Bureau of Statistics) at central, district and community levels. Cross-sectoral nutrition working groups exist in a few countries and will be used for coordination of activities. Where they do not yet exist, they will be established. UNICEF will also collaborate with training and research institutions to strengthen capacities and help to translate knowledge into effective programmes. To support the implementation of key nutrition interventions, UNICEF will extend the partnership to local and international NGOs, women’s associations and community volunteers. Collaboration with UN agencies will be maintained and strengthened, particularly with WFP for nutrition security programmes and emergencies. The private sector will also be an important partner, especially where food fortification and the production of ready-to-use therapeutic foods are planned.

### 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 UNICEF.

### 4.3. Budget and calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>EU (EUR)</th>
<th>Other Donors (EUR)</th>
<th>Total (EUR)</th>
<th>Contracting Authority</th>
<th>Paying Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Joint management 1.1 Contribution Agreement with UNICEF</td>
<td>20000000</td>
<td>7000000</td>
<td>27000000</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>20000000</strong></td>
<td><strong>7000000</strong></td>
<td><strong>27000000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total cost of the action is estimated at EUR 27000000, of which the total EU contribution is EUR 20000000. The other main donors known at the time of preparing the fiches are UNICEF (€2.7 m) and the Spanish MDG Fund (€4.3 m), covering mainly Result 4. The Action Fiche is for the entire action and a more detailed budget will be provided for the Contribution Agreement (European Commission/UN Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) format).

The duration of the project will be 48 months following the signature of the Contribution Agreement with UNICEF.

### 4.4. Performance monitoring

Project progress and performance will also be reviewed and monitored during implementation under UNICEF’s internal programme monitoring and evaluation framework. Through this framework, achievements and implementation quality will be evaluated during a mid-term review held after two years of implementation, based on an independent evaluation.

The main performance indicators for the project are as follows, with a particular focus on the five specifically targeted countries:
- Reduction in undernutrition (target: global acute malnutrition — GAM — reduced to <10% where baseline is >10%; stunting reduced by 5 percentage points from baseline);

- Reduction in anaemia (target: by one third from baseline in pregnant women and children);

- Nutrition highlighted in reports of high-level regional meetings on development and policy issues;

- Countries have implemented mechanisms to scale up high-impact interventions for children and women;

- Increased budget allocation for nutrition in health and other sectors such as rural local development and education.

The EU Delegation will be in charge of managing the contract with UNICEF. In close cooperation with the EU Delegations in the targeted countries, it will also conduct regular monitoring and progress reviews of the action, in line with the European Commission’s regular external results-oriented monitoring (ROM) approach. EU Delegations will also ensure adequate monitoring on the basis of key indicators established in the Logical Framework, progress reports and participation in relevant meetings/committees together with UNICEF and partners.

4.5. Evaluation and audit

UNICEF and partners will conduct an internal evaluation. External evaluation will be carried out by independent consultants recruited in accordance with terms of reference agreed between UNICEF, the European Commission and the other contributing donors.

As a UN agency, UNICEF is subject to the single audit principle, which gives the UN Board of Auditors the exclusive right to audit the accounts and statements of UN agencies. The European Commission/UN Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) contains provisions that allow the EU to conduct verification visits for projects it has financed in order to meet the accountability requirements of its stakeholders. In April 2009, the UN and EU agreed on common terms of reference for verification to meet the accountability needs of the European Commission while still respecting the single audit principle that UN agencies must observe.

4.6. Communication and visibility

UNICEF and partners will take action to raise awareness among specific or general audiences of the reasons for the action and the EU support in the countries and region concerned, as well as the results and impact of this support. A communication and visibility plan will be prepared during the inception phase, complying with the communication and visibility manual for EU external actions, which includes joint visibility guidelines for European Commission-UN actions.
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ACTION FICHE FOR THE 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Linking relief to rehabilitation and development (LRRD) in exceptional situations of transition and in fragile situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>EU contribution: €42 800 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cris No: 2009/021-971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method/Management mode</td>
<td>Calls for proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC code, if applicable</td>
<td>52010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. RATIONALE

2.1 Sector context

The present programme aims to support food security (FS) projects implemented by non-governmental organisations (NGOs), international organisations and UN agencies for vulnerable populations in countries where people are affected by food insecurity.

This component addresses food insecurity at national and sub-national level. The targets are the most marginalised and discriminated groups, who are very often the ultra-poor and hence food-insecure. In particular, it aims to help tackle the underlying causes of food insecurity in the context of the LRRD process and in countries in transition.

Actions financed under the component are coherent with past Commission operations under the Food Security Programme and are complementary to ECHO’s activities. By linking relief to rehabilitation and development (LRRD) operations, the aim is to support rural economies and increase the food security and resilience of poor rural households through income-generating activities.

2.2 Donor coordination and national policies related to food security

Donor coordination is at country level, involving consultation with stakeholders at all levels.

The EU Delegation in Sudan considers Rural Development and Food Security to be one of its strategic priorities for supporting the recovery and development of Sudan. Through consultations with the main stakeholders and a number of assessments, the EU has been able to support food security programmes at different levels, in line with government policy and complementary to other large programmes supported by other development agencies.
The main programmes supported by the EC are SIFSIA (Sudan Institutional capacity programme: Food Security Information for Action, €40 m), SPCRP (Sudan Productive Capacities Recovery Programme, €80 m), RRP (Community-Based Recovery and Rehabilitation Programme (€50 m), LESP (Livestock Epidemiology-Surveillance Project, €6 m) and ERDP (Eastern Recovery and Development programme, €12.5 m). These programmes aim to build government capacity at different levels (national, state, county/locality, community) in the area of food security and to support specific gaps identified by in-depth assessments (information systems, livestock, economic recovery, agriculture production). They complement other large programmes supported by other agencies, such as MDTF (supported partly by the EU), BRIDGE (USAID multi-sector programme in countries bordering North and South Sudan, aiming to support local government and decentralisation, service provision and economic growth, $34 m) or the Sudan Recovery Fund — South Sudan (multi-donor, with wide-ranging support, including agriculture, for quick recovery impact and peace dividends, $36 m). Since the inception of the FSTP in Sudan (2007), the European Commission has selected projects that are in line with government policies, complement large EC food security programmes and consolidate EU-funded (ECHO or previous food security) projects.

The Government of Liberia has formulated a Food Security and Nutrition Strategy in 2008 with the aim of: (i) enhancing food availability; (ii) improving access to food; (iii) improving food utilisation and nutritional status; and (iv) reducing vulnerability and improving resilience. Furthermore, the Government’s Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) was finalised in April 2008. Agriculture’s contribution to economic recovery is fully recognised. Indeed, the first goal of Pillar II — Revitalising the Economy — is to revitalise the food and agriculture sector to contribute to shared, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and development, ensure food security and nutrition, increase employment and income, and measurably reduce poverty. In April 2008, the Government of Liberia also finalised its Food and Agriculture Policy and Strategy (FAPS). The overall goal of FAPS is a revitalised, modernised agriculture.

As part of this broad strategy, Government of Liberias has committed to self-sufficiency in rice production by 2015. In support of this goal, it is currently in advanced discussions with key investment partners, in particular the African Development Bank (ADB) and IFAD, for financing the proposed Seed Chain Programme and related agriculture-sector recovery initiatives.

In response, the EU has made LRRD the focal sector for its EDF cooperation with Liberia. This translates, for the 10th EDF, into the following priorities:

- Rehabilitation of basic infrastructure and basic services (€125 m);
- Cross-cutting programme for governance, institutional support and capacity-building (€20 m)

In addition, a series of budget lines and emergency EDF envelopes have been mobilised to support efforts to combat food insecurity in Liberia.

As the humanitarian situation continues to be an issue in Liberia, The European Commission (ECHO) has kept an active presence in Liberia mainly to continue assisting people returning to and resettling in their place of origin, once basic living conditions are restored. ECHO will gradually reduce its support, but not before the end of 2009.

The 2010 call for proposals will focus on counties not at present covered by the existing FSTP for ECHO projects. The call will be designed to ensure complementarity between Food Facility and FSTP interventions.

Apart from the UN Joint Programme on Food Security and Nutrition, under which all UN food security and nutrition interventions (including the EU Food Facility) are coordinated
with Government of Liberia through an agreement signed in June 2008, there is as yet no effective coordination mechanism in the field of food security between NGOs and between NGOs and the Government of Liberia. This issue will need to be addressed in the proposed interventions.

In Sierra Leone, all current donor actions in the field of food security and in response to soaring food prices are coordinated by the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security (MAFFS) under the National Agriculture Response Plan (NARP). This coordination is led by the Agriculture Advisory Group (AAG), chaired by the Minister of MAFFS and comprising the major development partners (bilateral donors, NGOs, UN agencies, the EC and the private sector). Future EC interventions will continue to contribute to and be coordinated through the NARP. By 2010, the NARP will be gradually replaced by the National Sustainable Agricultural Development Plan prepared under the AU CAADP.

A new Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper has recently been produced by the Government of Sierra Leone with the support of all major donors. It has five priority areas: energy, water, agriculture, transport and human resources development (health and education).

The FSTP ‘Innovative Approaches’ will have a specific focus on the development of livestock and/or inland fisheries to address food insecurity in the most vulnerable rural and urban areas. In addition, an EDF project worth €16 m will be started in 2010 in support the development of cash crop production in the country, including substantial support for MAFFS decentralisation and for local development councils and civil society organisations.

In addition to this EU support, other food security programmes have recently been initiated. IDB (Inter-American Development Bank), IFAD (International Fund for Agricultural Development), ADB (Asian Development Bank) and JICA (Japan International Cooperation Agency) all implement, under the NARP, community-based food security programmes covering most of the country. These programmes amount to more than $30 m for the next 5 years. In addition, USAID has started a $13 m programme in the east of the country, to be implemented through NGOs.

In Zimbabwe, the EU is probably the main donor in agriculture. Without access to the 9th EDF, all EU-funded interventions in the field of humanitarian aid or food security have been funded from the EU general budget.

Strategically, the EU Delegation contributes to most coordination activities in the country and bases its interventions on the three pillars of its short term strategy: 1) Food Security and Agriculture; 2) Social sectors including Education and Public Health; 3) Governance and Implementation of the Global Political Agreement (GPA). It currently participates in the following agricultural coordination mechanisms:

1. Agriculture Coordination Working Group (FAO-led, with participation of main donors and national and international NGOs)

2. Conservation farming working group (FAO-led)

3. Market linkages working group (FAO-led)

4. Water and sanitation working group (UNICEF-led)

5. Donor input working group (European Commission-led)

6. Food security and agricultural development seminar. Organised by the ECD on 17-18 March 2009
7. MDTF Agricultural Technical Review Group (WB-led)

8. Scoping mission in agriculture (European Commission, WB, ADB and UN)

The programmes implemented with EU funding are usually defined through a permanent multi-stakeholder coordination approach. Several workshops have been organised to increase coordination. For example, a multi-stakeholder food security workshop was organised by the EC Delegation in March 2009. Results will be used as a basis to define the food security strategy in the country after 2010, ensure coordination between the different EC DGs (incl. ECHO) as well as with other donors and international organisations, such as the FAO Emergency Unit.

In 2009, the EU Delegation also launched a general coordination group on input supply for the 2009/10 season. This was specifically to ensure that all donors would commit funding in time for implementing input programmes for the 2009/10 agricultural season.

In Afghanistan, coordination in the food security sector is through the Food Security and Agriculture Cluster (FSAC), with the growing involvement and participation of non-governmental organisations. Donor-focused coordination is generally via consultative groups and the Agriculture Task Force chaired by the Minister of Agriculture. Also, the reopening of an OCHA office in Afghanistan allows increased coordination of humanitarian interventions. There is close and constant coordination between the Delegation and the ECHO Afghanistan office on food security matters, to ensure that both strategies are complementary. In fact, the 2008 and 2009 LRRD activities have been selected in collaboration with the ECHO Afghanistan office to ensure the transition from relief to development.

In North Korea (DPRK), since the 2002 Council conclusions, EU actions are limited to humanitarian aid, which is considered to cover food security. There is no development aid for North Korea, and no Country Strategy Paper or Multiannual Indicative Programme. Actions are regularly discussed with DG RELEX and DG ECHO. Since DG ECHO closed its technical office in Pyongyang in May 2008, the Commission has, wherever possible, incorporated some of its activities under the Food Security Programme (i.e. health and water & sanitation, mostly as a sub-component of food security-focused projects).

Annual programmes and their scope are discussed with the North Korean authorities (i.e. all stakeholders and as many beneficiaries as possible, at all levels), EU Member States (especially those present in North Korea), other donors (particularly Swiss Development Cooperation) and international agencies, as well as with the resident European NGOs. These discussions feed into the actions envisaged under the Annual Work Plans.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE CALL FOR PROPOSAL(S)

3.1 Basic act and financing source


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 with, as far as possible under the envisaged activities, a special focus on pregnant or lactating women (PLW) and young children, thus enabling them to recover from crisis situations and to take advantage of development opportunities.

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

In terms of approach, priority will be given to projects following on from or complementing current EU-funded projects (Humanitarian, EDF, DCI geographic instrument, Non-State Actors thematic programme, etc.) at country level and having a concrete impact on vulnerable populations, in particular PLW and young children, 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 the EU or other donors.

Under the present Annual Action Plan (AAP), the following countries will receive assistance:

**EAST AFRICA**

**Sudan** has not ratified the revised Cotonou Agreement, Cotonou II, but remains party to Cotonou 2000 (Cotonou I). The Commission notes that the current situation in Sudan is largely due to under-development in some parts of the country, so achieving structural stability depends on the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA). In this particular context, the FSTP can potentially play an important role in improving food security in Sudan. Accordingly, an envelope of €1.8 million is included for the FSTP in Sudan as ‘special measures’ (Article 23 of the DCI Regulation (1905/2006).

For the FSTP 2010/2011 in Sudan, the European Commission proposes to reinforce the NGO food security component, which is currently minimal considering the needs and other funding opportunities.

Priority will be given to the following sectors: agriculture, income-generating activities, vocational training and alternative technology. These sectors have been identified by stakeholders (NGOs, government, UN) as the most relevant for linking relief to recovery and development. They are also fully in line with the FSTP strategy. Projects will be required to mainstream environment, gender, returnee reintegration and capacity building for non-state actors / local government administrations. Projects will be in line with the government’s strategic plan and complement other programmes supported by the EU (SIFSIA, SPCRP, RRP).

The Delegation will in particular examine whether successful projects under previous FSTPs have the potential to be expanded, and will also jointly analyse with DG ECHO ongoing actions for which humanitarian funding can be phased out because the potential for recovery exists.

Regarding geographical coverage, the focus will mainly be on East and South. However the EU must be able to provide specific support for other vulnerable areas such as the IDP camps in Greater Khartoum or Transitional Areas if the situation deteriorates. The insecure and
volatile context of Darfur does not at this point allow for long-term or development projects to be implemented.

In the East, projects should focus on natural resource management and combating desertification. They should complement the new EU-funded East Recovery Development Programme and/or other ongoing EDF programmes implemented in the area.

In the South, selected projects should focus on returnee reintegration. The stakeholder analysis conducted last year by the EU Delegation revealed particularly significant gaps in the South East of Sudan. The Delegation will conduct a new stakeholder analysis before starting the contracting phase in order to update the information available and subsequently decide on the target area in the South.

**WEST AFRICA**

In Liberia, fourteen years of civil war, brought on by marginalisation and economic collapse, ended with a Peace Agreement brokered in Accra in June 2003 and a two-year National Transitional Government of Liberia (NTGL). This was followed by presidential and legislature elections in late 2005. An ambitious transitional and development programme was launched, with transparency and anti-corruption as its main aims.

However, Liberia’s conflict makes achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) a daunting challenge. Moreover, the war essentially put an end to human capital formation and resulted in the mass exodus of skilled workers. The country’s infrastructure is completely destroyed, and the state is unable, given the lack of financial and human resources, to provide basic services to the population. Despite rich natural resources such as timber, iron ore or diamonds, government revenues remain insufficient to meet the needs of the country.

It is clear that the country is still mainly in a rehabilitation phase, with various areas remaining in an emergency situation. Food security in Liberia has also significantly worsened as a result of the recent soaring food prices.

The specific objective of the call is to achieve a timely and sustainable reduction in the food insecurity of vulnerable groups in the most affected areas of Liberia (in particular PLW & young children), thus enabling them to recover from the crisis and take full advantage of development opportunities.

The main focus will be on supporting the post-conflict recovery phase in areas with high rates of malnutrition, including restoration of and support for livelihood systems, in complementarity and in coordination with the Food Facility interventions.

The main sectors of intervention under this programme are those that aim to:

- protect, maintain and recover productive and social assets vital for food security, to allow economic reintegration and longer-term rehabilitation;
- address vulnerability to shocks and strengthen people’s resilience through support for crisis prevention and management;
- improve food security, in particular nutrition, of particularly disadvantaged and marginalised groups through interventions to improve access to adequate resources for acquiring food;
- strengthen/consolidate local institutions and emerging central institutions.

The proposed projects will take into account the current process of ‘decentralising and devolving power to the counties to ensure that the people and their interest guide development policy making and its implementation’, to which the government is committed with the support of various development partners, including the EC.
The geographical scope will probably be the central and eastern counties. However, the door should remain open to other areas, including secondary urban centres.

About 70 per cent of Sierra Leone’s 5 million people (projection for 2009) are living below the poverty line, with 52 per cent living on less than USD 1 per day while 26 per cent cannot afford the minimum daily caloric requirements. Despite significant progress since 2002 in government and donor support for the resettlement and reconstruction of war-affected communities and the rehabilitation of productive households and community assets, food production levels and economic development remain low. A significant proportion of the population still remains highly vulnerable to food insecurity, and high rates of malnutrition prevail.

Since the end of the war in 2002, the country has followed a path of reconstruction and consolidation of peace and stability. Unfortunately, the socio-economic development of the country remains slow, which, if not corrected soon, could lead to social unrest with masses of unemployed youth wanting change and a general population seeing little benefit from the new-found peace and stability. Another potential risk is the destabilising effect of the political situation in Guinea Conakry.

The specific objective is to achieve a timely and sustainable reduction in the food insecurity of vulnerable groups in Eastern Tonkolili and Northern Bombali Districts, thus enabling them to recover from the crisis and take full advantage of development opportunities.

The main sectors of intervention under this programme are the same as for Liberia.

Improving access to food, through broad-based participation in income-generating activities in key agricultural supply chains, and the development of safety nets to protect the welfare of vulnerable individuals and households represent two major food security challenges that will need particular attention.

This programme is limited to the consolidation of two soon-to-close food security projects, in order to consolidate their achievements and ensure their sustainability under a more LRRD-oriented logic. This means the following priorities:

- A greater focus on capacity-building of intermediary organisations and local development actors;
- Ensuring that their interventions fit in with and contribute to the National Sustainable Agricultural Development Plan and other government development frameworks (PRSP);
- Enhanced partnership, including experience sharing, with other development actors and with the private sector, where input supply and produce processing and marketing will play an important part;
- A greater focus on nutrition and social safety nets;
- Building of a common monitoring system with other development actors, district councils and government services;
- Possible expansion of project activities to adjacent areas.

The main objective is to have all the present food security budget lines and FSTP aligned on a common strategy towards integration of their interventions within the general government development framework, so that future support can be taken over by EDF interventions or by the government itself.

The geographical scope of the programme will the same as for the existing projects it is consolidating, i.e. Northern Bombali District for the first and Eastern Tonkolili for the second. However, it is expected that these projects will be able to expand their coverage to new
communities and/or adjacent chiefdoms.

**SOUTHERN AFRICA**

In Zimbabwe, the general objectives of the different EU-funded actions are to help improve the living standards of vulnerable groups/communities, usually in rural areas but also in some cases in urban and peri-urban areas.

Programmes aim to secure, diversify and intensify production and its nutritional levels in order to increase household resilience to risks and reduce vulnerability. Communal households mostly rely on production from low-yield, soil-impoverished land without adequate external support. Improving production requires the adoption of techniques to maximise food production without major investment and without further detriment to the land. Integrated approaches are preferred and a degree of flexibility is necessary to allow adaptation to the ever-changing Zimbabwean context.

As Zimbabwe is experiencing ever-increasing over-exploitation of natural resources such as deforestation, the promotion of new environmentally friendly technologies and mainstreaming of environment issues are standard features in the programmes. Both HIV/AIDS and gender issues are also actively mainstreamed.

The specific objectives of this call for proposals are to:
- Support the efforts of Zimbabweans to improve their own food production at local and household level, and help reduce their dependence on food aid;
- Encourage Zimbabweans to be independent in terms of their food, either by increasing production, or by improving purchasing power;
- Promote food security and livelihood activities geared to raising/improving the standard of nutrition (in particular for PLW & young children) of the recipient population and help them obtain a balanced diet;
- Improve natural resource management.

**ASIA**

In Afghanistan, a landlocked and mountainous country with nearly three decades of continuous insecurity behind it, the majority of the population is still highly vulnerable to shocks. As a consequence, livelihoods are poor and scarce, and a large part of its population suffers from food insecurity.

Three quarters of the Afghan population live in rural areas, so the economy is largely dependent on the agricultural sector. In terms of labour, nearly 59% of the employed population is engaged in work in agriculture or livestock farming. With nearly 85% of the population entirely dependent for their livelihoods on agriculture and allied activities like animal husbandry, any impact on agricultural yields is felt across the country. And agricultural production does fluctuate significantly from one season to another (with a nearly 100% difference between 2008 and 2009 for cereal production). This contributes to the recurrent humanitarian crises that hamper attempts to address root causes.

Approximately 8.5 million Afghans throughout the country, roughly 30% of the population, cannot meet their minimum food requirements and are food-insecure to some degree. 20% of the population suffer from chronic food insecurity. Food insecurity in Afghanistan is
characterised at household level by inadequate access to food, resulting from low household incomes due to poor livelihood conditions and rising food prices.

To address this situation, the EU, through an additional contribution of EUR 5 million, will continue to support community-level livelihood recovery programmes in localised areas throughout Afghanistan. The EU will seek to support further relevant interventions aiming for long-term impacts through the recovery, stabilisation and enhancement of livelihood systems in Afghanistan. The objective of this programme is to increase the food security of highly vulnerable households by supporting measures to increase production or improve purchasing power through community-based integrated food security projects.

In North Korea, the humanitarian crisis ended in 2004. Food insecurity is now primarily due to long-term and structural problems. The problem of food security is less a problem of food availability than one of food accessibility. While the political context of North Korea leaves little room for trying out and introducing new practices other than technical activities, LRRD actions implemented over the last few years are being continued.

Since it is acknowledged that the food situation is more sensitive in urban areas, the programme covers both rural and urban areas. The objectives for 2010 continue and build on those for 2009:

i. Stabilising food production and availability by further building and strengthening the resilience of cooperative farms, communities and households through community-based projects: this will target cooperative farms, health and social institutions, small factories, research institutes, mechanical workshops, etc. Given the importance of agricultural production on slopes and the risk of recurrent flooding in the country, disaster prevention/reduction and environmental protection will, as much as possible and when suitable, be integrated in project design. Themes such as income generation, the rights of people with disabilities, and gender equality will also be mainstreamed. Nutrition has become a theme in its own right under FSTP 2009, and is also mainstreamed.

ii. Strengthening, through partnership projects, the capacity of North Korean institutions involved in every aspect of food security to tackle the current issues and initiate the changes required: this will aim to build and/or strengthen the capacity of North Korean research institutes, academies, universities, ministry departments, federations, etc. dealing with food security by initiating or pursuing contacts with foreign counterparts.

Accordingly, indicative areas of action will focus on community-based and small partnership projects aimed at improving the nutritional status of the most vulnerable groups, the resilience of communities/cooperative farms, and rehabilitating or strengthening the country’s production capacity:

- Soil fertility / crop production / plant nutrition; food processing (cooperative/county or dong level), including for health and social institutions; natural resources protection / management; urban agriculture & food security; livestock development; income generation; post-harvest treatment and storage; sustainable renewable energies; farm management; nutrition; integrated pest or crop management / organic pesticides; organic and conservation agriculture.

Furthermore, small and medium-scale machinery and equipment will be provided to reinforce and increase the autonomy of cooperative farms, or to support other institutions involved (for
instance) in increasing/diversifying food production, protecting the environment or supporting sustainable agricultural production (incl. non-timber products).

Moreover, if no other source of funding is available, and depending on the timetable for adoption of the 2011 FSTP Financing Decision, part of the 2010 budget may have to be allocated to ensuring continuation of the Pyongyang-based Food Security Office as from 2012 onwards.

A service contract would be awarded via a restricted call for tenders.

### 3.3 Risks and assumptions

Risks and assumptions vary depending on specific local conditions.

**In Sudan**, the European Commission considers that the South and East are a conducive environment for LRRD activities. However, in view of the upcoming elections and vote for self-determination in the South, there is a risk of local conflicts or tensions undermining the proper implementation of the projects. Natural disasters are another type of risk that any project has to integrate in the risk analysis.

**In Liberia**, the main risks relate to the political and security situation of the country, which could be compounded by the impact of the food crisis on sensitive populations, particularly youth. However, the political and security situation has improved since the inauguration of the new government following the November 2005 elections, and has been progressively consolidated with the support of the international community. Political stability should promote the social and economic stability required for the implementation of this programme.

The main assumptions are:

1. Consistency with other initiatives on agricultural development, food security, and humanitarian aid, so that these various actions do not negate each other but are mutually supportive and well integrated.
2. The Government of Liberia develops appropriate policies at macro-economic level on trade issues and on agricultural development.
3. The Government of Liberia continues to be open to frank dialogue and negotiations with the European Commission and other development partners.
4. The availability of good quality stocks and inputs (feeds, veterinary products, etc.) on local or even sub-regional markets is a major challenge in Liberia. Even if proposed schemes use a very low level of technology and/or foreign inputs, applicants will need to ensure productivity and production quality and thus address this problem in their proposals.
5. The environmental risks linked to agricultural development (inland valley swamps and upland cultivation in particular) will need to be addressed as a matter of utmost importance. The same applies to potential health risks.
6. Finally, the proposals will need to take into consideration the cultural and/religious preferences of the populations as these could lead to programme rejection and even potential conflicts.

**In Sierra Leone**, it is assumed that:

- The present partner NGO will continue its commitment to the areas concerned beyond the present FSBL project life.
The District Councils concerned are indeed willing to participate in a scheme where NGOs are providing them with capacity building. In the case of one of the Districts (Bombali), this is not guaranteed.

Good quality stocks and inputs will be available on national and even sub-regional markets. This is a major challenge in Sierra Leone. Even if proposed schemes use a very low level of technology and/or foreign inputs, project designs will need to ensure this is factored in.

The present political situation in Guinea Conakry will not bring security/stability problems to Sierra Leone, in particular its Northern Districts (including Bombali). Should this not be the case, emergency contingency measures may need to be incorporated in the design of the projects.

In Zimbabwe, a possible constraint on the implementation of the food security programmes may be the ongoing uncertainty surrounding the stability of the new Unity Government, and the potential new policies and structures that will emerge over the next months and may have an impact at all levels. The possibility of the collapse of the power-sharing arrangement and a return to civil unrest cannot, unfortunately, be ignored.

In Afghanistan, corruption, both within and outside the government, is a significant risk to development processes. Major efforts will be put into stakeholder participation and planning to foster and encourage trust, collaboration, and ownership. Additional risks are security and increased volatility in certain rural areas that were previously calm. Opium smuggling and the potential risk of natural disasters also represent threats to development efforts. Other risks derive from long-practised historical traditions in Afghanistan, i.e. the low status of women and child labour.

In North Korea, it is assumed that the authorities will:

- Cooperate with, and second suitable technical local staff to, the EUPS and visiting project partners throughout the project cycle;
- Allow more direct contacts between EU project partners and the concerned technical/line ministries and agencies;
- Cooperate actively to ensure the proper implementation of EU-funded programmes, under the terms of the Financing Agreements;
- Enable the European Commission and its project partners to explore new geographical and technical areas of intervention under the EU-funded programmes;
- Commit to addressing the sustainability of EU aid;
- Do not come back on the implementation points discussed and agreed with the European Commission.

The main risk is deterioration of the political situation and worsening operational/implementation conditions for the European Commission, EUPS and other implementing organisations in the DPRK.

3.4 Eligibility conditions

All non-profit-making legal persons such as non-governmental organisations, public sector operators, local authorities, or international (inter-governmental) organisations as defined by Article 43 of the Implementing Rules of the EU Financial Regulation (Commission

3.5 Essential selection and award criteria

The actions will be mainly selected on the basis of a call for proposals launched by the relevant European Commission Delegations in the different countries and by Commission headquarters in the case of North Korea. In a limited number of cases (namely North Korea and Afghanistan), some activities might be implemented through calls for tenders for supplies and services.

The EU Delegations, with support from Commission headquarters 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 actions. The maximum possible rate of co-financing for grants should not normally exceed 80% so as to allow specific countries to apply different (higher) rates as required. Full financing may only be provided 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 calls for proposals is the second half of 2010.

3.7 Indicative amounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Amount in €</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>2 800 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>6 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>2 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>16 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>5000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>11000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>42800000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Support Measures**

Annual audits and visibility activities will be covered by the budget under the grant contracts to be awarded under the calls.
1. **Identification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Innovative approaches to food insecurity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Total cost | *EU contribution: €25,300,000*  
  Cris No: 2009/021-972 |
| Method/Management mode | Calls for proposals |
| DAC-code, if applicable | 52010 | Sector | Food Security |

2. **Rationale**

2.1 **Sector context**

This component is intended to stimulate and capture innovative, locally owned and 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 climate change and the degradation of natural resources 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;
• Links 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 be at country level and involve consultation with stakeholders at all levels.

In Chad, EU support for food security early warning systems started at the end of 2006. For the AAP FSTP 2010, the action will take into account the current implementation of the food security early warning system and its extension to national scale. It will also follow up the AAP FSTP 2009 actions. The specific activities are to be implemented by organisations that can ensure an appropriate response, thanks to SISA (Information System on Food Security) monitoring, at local level.

This action is complementary to programmes founded by the 10th EDF, bringing an added value to PADL (Programme Support for Local Development) and SIDRAT (System of Information in Rural Development and Territory Development). Implementation will be harmonised with Plan Sahel 2009 (tackling acute malnutrition), funded by the European Commission (DG ECHO) in Chad.

Since 2005, the Government of Ethiopia (GoE) and donors have designed and engaged in a Food Security Programme (FSP), scaling up their level of intervention in the food security sector and incorporating and combining two main components: a large-scale Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP) and a set of development interventions under the Other Food Security Programme (OFSP). The Donor Coordination Group and the Joint Coordination Committee, as well as a number of joint technical working groups, have ensured a high level of partnership, which has led, among other things, to a joint review of the first phase and design of the new phase of the FSP between 2008 and 2009.

While the PSNP can be considered a strategic cornerstone of EU-funded interventions in the sector, it is complemented by several other EU-funded programmes implemented through ECHO, UNICEF and FAO as well as several NGOs funded through the Food Security Budget Line and other facilities. A small pilot project in the micro finance sector is also supported through CGAP in a PSNP Woreda of Tigray Region in Ethiopia.

La CE intervient dans le secteur avec plusieurs types d’interventions:

- Appui au PAM et WB dans l’exécution du programme d’urgence pour répondre à la flambée des prix des denrées alimentaires (€6 millions)
- Les financements sous les lignes thématiques ‘Sécurité alimentaire’ et ‘Acteurs Non Étatiques’ (€5 millions) avec des projets mise en ouvre par des ONG locales et internationales visant surtout à améliorer la production des biens alimentaires, et leur commercialisation
- Des actions FED qui combinent la protection de l’environnement avec la stimulation de la production agricole soutenable (€3 millions): les programmes ‘Gestion des Ressources Naturelles de Guinée-Bissau (AGIR II)’, ‘Renforcement des capacités en Protection Végétale’ ‘Stabex’ pour la dynamisation de l’économie rurale
- Le projet SISA (€1 million) avec le MADR qu’a permis la publication d’un atlas de vulnérabilité’ da la Guinée Bissau en termes de sécurité alimentaire et il est aujourd’hui un instrument entre les mains du gouvernement pour la formulation des politiques dans le secteur.

Over the last few years in Malawi, the EU Delegation has informally discussed a number of innovations with colleagues at headquarters including call options for maize, put options for maize, macro weather insurance, emergency cash for work programmes and smartcards with biometrical data (for example for cash transfers, food distribution or subsidy schemes). A number of market-based options have been, and continue to be, discussed with the World Bank and DFID and with the Government of Malawi (GoM) at country level. It is also understood that discussions have also been taking place between the World Bank and the European Commission headquarters level.

Of the above innovations, call options for maize, put options for maize and macro weather insurance have been included in the ‘Identification Fiche’ for the Institutional Capacity Building Programme (ICB, €15 million), under the 10th EDF envelope for Malawi. The planned 10th EDF ICB programme will contribute to the institutionalisation of innovative instruments such as the market-based instruments planned under the same programme, but could also cover smartcards. In addition, the ICB will promote strategic situation analysis, strategic forecasting and more cost- and time-efficient prevention and response to emerging food crises.

As several interventions have already used smartcards in Malawi, interventions under this innovative approach programme will build on these local experiences as well as on the experience with the use of smart cards by the private sector (e.g. banks, fuel companies, retail stores, etc.).

En Mauritanie le Programme d’Appui à la Sécurité Alimentaire (PACSA) 2000-2005, financé par l’ancienne Ligne Budgétaire de Sécurité Alimentaire, a conduit à la mise en place d’un observatoire de la sécurité alimentaire (OSA), intégré dans le Commissariat à la Sécurité Alimentaire (CSA), qui gère l’aide alimentaire.
Le système de suivi de la vulnérabilité alimentaire géré par l’OSA s’est avéré insuffisant et non durable. Le manque total de confiance entre institutions nationales (ministères, CSA) entretient un système de production de données sans lien certain avec la réalité et produites, pour certaines, en fonctions d’intérêts personnels ou politiques. De plus, pour les domaines où des données indépendantes existent, elles se limitent au niveau régional et elles ne sont pas cadrées sur les besoins des utilisateurs finaux. Enfin, les nombreux acteurs sont contraints par ce manque ou la faible fiabilité des données.

Plusieurs ONG et OI, avec l’appui ponctuels de représentants de services techniques de l’État, (comme par exemple Fews-Net Mauritanie, Fews-Net-PAM, Unicef/Ministère de la Santé et Caritas-Partenaires locaux) ont commencé à se concerter sur la situation de l’information de la sécurité alimentaire, afin de créer des possibilités de mise en commun des services de collecte de données, de leur analyse croisée (éventuellement au moyen de SIG) et de rediffuser les informations obtenues auprès des utilisateurs directs finaux (paysans, commerçants, éleveurs, etc.).

La coordination avec les autres bailleurs et partenaires techniques et financier sera assurée à travers les réunions de deux groupes thématiques organisées et animés par les Nations Unies.

In Sierra Leone, in response to the recent food price crisis, the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security (MAFFS) has established a National Agriculture Response Plan (NARP), which is intended to set out the core response for all government and donor agencies to food insecurity in the country.

All current donor actions in the area of food security and in response to soaring food prices are coordinated by the MAFFS under the NARP. This coordination is led by the Agriculture Advisory Group (AAG), chaired by the Minister of MAFFS, and comprises the major development partners (bilateral donors, NGOs, UN agencies, the European Commission and the private sector). Future EU-funded interventions will continue to contribute to and be coordinated through the NARP.

In Somalia, the 2008-2013 Joint Strategy Paper (JSP) for the country resulted from a joint coordination effort by the European Commission with several Member States and Norway in response to the UN/WB-led Joint Needs Assessment and Reconstruction and Development Programme. Coordination for International Support to Somalis (CISS) is the apex body for aid coordination, which comprises representatives from donors, UN agencies, NGOs and sector committees (e.g. the Food Security and Economic Development Sector Committee). Other donors active in the food security/rural development sector are Denmark, Italy, Norway, Sweden and the US. The EU is by far the most important donor in Somalia for the economic growth and food security sectors.

The proposed innovative approach of supporting the market for cereal produced in the high-potential areas of Somalia will not develop in a vacuum. The European Commission is already supporting large-scale rehabilitation of canals, supplying seeds and other agricultural inputs, providing tractors for larger farmers, training farmers, rehabilitating small roads, etc. The proposed innovative approach will redress the disproportionate attention given by EU-funded programmes to the productive sector and support the market to generate sustainable production increases.

In Zimbabwe, the project concept is based on a previous project funded in 2006 by the Food Security Budget Line, which pursued a multi-sectoral approach to the most vulnerable households (including HIV/AIDS-affected households).
The UN sectoral coordination meetings constitute the main coordination forum for donors and NGOs. As this is a livelihood support project, different coordination bodies might be involved such as the Agricultural Coordination Working Group, the WATSAN Working group, and the Health Development Partners Coordination Working Group. Also, where possible, maximum alignment with government policies will be ensured.

There will be communication with the Delegation in Zambia, as a similar project is understood to have been funded in 2009. Also, stakeholder consultation prior to the full development of the project proposal should be organised to ensure that the different technical approaches are taken on board.

In Myanmar, the EU is committed to playing a leading role in implementing the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action on Aid Effectiveness, as provided for in the European Consensus on Development, by advancing coordination, harmonisation and alignment among donors.

The EU Delegation and the EU Member States are active participants in various coordination mechanisms, such as the Partnership Group for Aid Effectiveness. With the start of the Livelihood and Food Security Multidonor Fund — the LIFT Fund, close coordination will continue through donor membership of the Fund Board, and complementarities will be explored. Another forum for coordination will be the LIFT Fund’s Board Consultative Group, where stakeholders, including donors not contributing to the LIFT Fund, will coordinate and exchange experiences. Coordination will also be through the NGO Food Security Working Group meetings.

Close coordination will also be continued with EU-funded (DG ECHO) operations in Myanmar to explore innovative approaches in linking relief, rehabilitation and development.

In Timor Leste, coordination efforts have been made by the Member States that are represented in Dili and active in food security and rural development. This coordination will focus on information sharing on both planned activities and each country’s strategy. However, coordination efforts have not yet got as far as designing or adopting common response strategies for the government’s food security strategies.

Of the seven National Priorities, Food Security is National Priority 1. The Food Security Working Group is chaired by the Ministry of Agriculture (production), while the Ministry of Commerce (imports) is the most significant information forum where coordination focuses on food availability.

Through government coordination mechanisms at district and national level, and through strategic support for Timorese civil society organisations, a number of development agencies and NGOs have made significant contributions to the coordination of overall development efforts, the implementation and monitoring of the government’s Food Security Policy, and the strengthening of government outreach and extension mechanisms. Lessons learned are shared nationally with the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF) and at district level with MAF, the District Food Security Committee, and related line ministries.

Au Nicaragua, en ce qui concerne la cohérence et complémentarité avec d’autres activités de l’UE, un protocole d’accord sera probablement à souscrire avec le Programme régional de Sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle pour l’Amérique centrale (PRESANCA II), 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 de gestion de systèmes d’alerte précoce en SAN; ii) la gestion des informations pour la prise de décisions. De la
mêmes façon pour la mise en place des instances de fonctionnement de la Loi de Sécurité Alimentaire.

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 d’installer des systèmes d’alerte précoce. Des synergies seront également créées avec les groupements de producteurs du DECOEUR.

In the **West Bank and Gaza**, following intense discussion at the Aid Harmonisation Liaison Committee meetings, the importance of improving the effectiveness of donor structures to provide assistance and financial support to Palestine was underlined. Accordingly, in line with the OECD-DAC Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, an improved donor coordination and support structure was set up in 2007. Three levels of coordination have been put in place. At institution level, the Local Development Forum coordinates the overall coherence of aid. At macro-sectoral level, the Strategy Groups work with the main clusters of economic policy, governance, infrastructure development and social development. Finally, at sectoral level Sector Working Groups focus on practical policy formulation and programmatic coordination, and pursue greater integration of donor projects with Palestinian Authority priorities defined in the Palestinian Reform and Development Plan (PRDP) as well as much closer harmonisation of donor procedures.

The EU has been supporting sustainable agriculture in Palestine, and has implemented several projects such as the Olive Oil Promotion Programme (FSTP/LRRD 2007), where rain-fed agriculture was promoted and a pilot action developed to re-use wastewater from pressing in the orchards. This also involved land reclamation projects through the collection of rain-water in cisterns. In 2009 (FSTP LRRD 2009), the Commission is going to launch a call for proposals for setting up small-scale wastewater treatment plants in rural areas and promoting the re-use of treated effluents for agriculture. Such innovative approaches will provide an excellent opportunity to explore the possible transfer of technologies for optimising water consumption in agriculture, fully complementing previous EU-funded actions.

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 cooperation\(^{131}\).

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, locally owned and sustainable solutions, which can be scaled up and mainstreamed.

Main expected **results**: (i) innovative and 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 EU Delegations.

Under the present AAP, the following countries will receive assistance:

**Africa**

In Chad, the food and financial crisis of 2008 and its consequences have increased the need for reliable and timely information on food security for government, development partners, and bilateral and multilateral cooperation. As the food situation was poorly known, it has been difficult to ensure a rapid response both nationally and locally.

The lack of information has prompted the Government of Chad, the French cooperation agency and the European Commission to finance a component of the National Programme for Food Security (NPFS) to provide the Committee of Action for Food Security and Crisis Management (CASAGC) with a functioning early warning system. This national action complements the regional early warning system implemented by the CILSS.

The aim of the AAP 2010 is to improve the food security early warning system at national and local level in order to cope better with food insecurity in Chad.

The expected results are:
- Increased knowledge of food insecurity at national and local level
- National and local authorities able to ensure food security more efficiently and rapidly.

The target districts will be identified though vulnerability profiles (prepared in July 2009 by FAO/WFP with EU financial support) and from malnutrition surveys funded by ECHO in Kanem.

An innovative aspect of this project is the integration of new implementing partners at local level to establish a small-scale information system in an area known for its high degree of vulnerability. This local and participative approach will also allow better targeting of appropriate responses. Relying on new partners at local level is not only innovative but also difficult considering the often weak capacity of basic services. However, the involvement of communities at local level in defining food security indicators, gathering information, and designing strategies for access to food will lead to greater awareness of the need for sustainable environmental management and long-term structuring actions.

In Ethiopia, the ‘graduation model’ constitutes a unique sequence of safety-net interventions in technical and microfinance service provision aiming to create and support pathways for the poorest out of extreme poverty. It progressively introduces entrepreneurial activity through training, asset grants and savings services. The object is to link Productive Safety Net Programme beneficiaries to market-led livelihood options (including off-farm opportunities) and financial services, to increase household assets and thus to support graduation to permanent food security.

The main activities under the programme will be: i) providing training and capacity building to MFIs, RUSACCOs and cooperative promotion staff, whereby training will focus on building capacity to provide sustainable financial services and products that meet the needs and capacities of food-insecure households; ii) supporting the implementation of an appropriate regulatory and supervisory framework for grassroots financial institutions; iii) building financial literacy among households and increasing their confidence in financial management (savings and credit) and managing cash flows, with female-headed households
and women’s groups receiving special attention; iv) developing farmers’ knowledge and skills in producing and selling inputs; v) building household skills and confidence in undertaking value-adding activities through the demonstration of innovative technologies and training.

The action proposed for Ethiopia is innovative in the national context in that microfinance services are still at a very basic stage. The Ethiopian experience could provide indications for those countries where microfinance services are not yet fully implemented and a progressive process of learning by doing is required. This particularly concerns the involvement and strengthening of new partners such as local MFIs, rural savings associations, etc., particularly in rural areas. The extension of services in rural areas to address in particular the needs of chronically food-insecure households, which are usually not able to provide the type of guarantees requested by commercial banks, can provide valuable lessons for other countries.

Par sa situation géographique et son climat, la Guinée-Bissau dispose d’un potentiel agricole qui, en principe, la met à l’abri de famines à grande échelle. Néanmoins, le pays n’atteint pas l’autosuffisance alimentaire et son secteur agricole est très vulnérable, pour différentes raisons:

- manque de diversification de la production: l’agriculture vivrière est essentiellement centrée sur le riz et il y a une trop grande proportion des terres arables consacrée au cajou pour exportation
- malgré un savoir-faire traditionnel (riz d’eau salée et riz de bas-fonds), la production est déficiente, de sorte que le pays doit importer quasi la moitié de sa consommation en riz ;
- réseau de communications en mauvais état et difficile acheminement de la production alimentaires aux marchés
- fragilité institutionnelle du Ministère de l’Agriculture (MADR) essentiellement dans ses bureaux décentralisés.

Dans l’analyse de la vulnérabilité alimentaire en Guinée Bissau récemment publiée à travers le projet SISA, les activités identifiées comme prioritaires sont la réhabilitation de ‘bolanhas’ (bas fonds inondés), la mise en place de petites industries de transformation et conservation, la réhabilitation des pistes rurales, l’appui et la formation des techniciens et des secteurs du MADR.

Les priorités d’intervention sont les suivantes: 1) encourager la recherche, l’innovation et la diffusion des informations en matière de sécurité alimentaire; 2) lier l’information et la prise de décision afin d’améliorer les stratégies de réponse à l’insécurité alimentaire; 3) répondre à l’insécurité alimentaire dans les États fragiles et défaillants et 4) encourager l’avancement du programme de sécurité alimentaire, son harmonisation et son alignement avec les partenaires de développement, la société civile et les donateurs.

En Guinée-Bissau, il est nécessaire de partir de la base de chaque communauté jusqu’au niveau de village car les micro-actions doivent être privilégiées pour adapter, territoire par territoire, les interventions de terrain. L’attention doit se focaliser sur les exigences de chaque communauté.

Malawi’s status as a least developed country (LDC), with recurrent food insecurity combined with a number of other factors, makes it an ideal country for piloting innovative approaches, or, where a pilot has already proved successful, for moving to longer-term or broader support. Therefore, this component will focus on actions relating to smartcards with biometrical data (for example for cash transfers, food distribution, subsidy schemes, cash for work, etc.), which could include possible emergency cash for work programmes. Smartcards with biometrical data can be used for a variety of actions. Their potential uses include: voter registration, good governance, heath and education, access to savings and credit, and agriculture and food security (for food distribution, subsidy schemes, and extension and other services).
Smartcards have emerged as a very versatile tool for aid delivery of all kinds. They are similar to normal bank cards but include a microchip to make them ‘smart’. The chip links the card to biometric data (fingerprints) of the card holder, so that the card can only be used by the owner, and stores credit/money. Recent innovations mean that smartcards can, and are, used in remote parts of rural Africa, even without permanent power or telephone connections.

This intervention is innovative in that the activities to be funded provide an opportunity to test automation of the delivery of development aid to the final beneficiaries at grassroots level. Using smartcards for food distribution, subsidy schemes, and extension and other services would benefit all stakeholders, as it offers an open and transparent method of providing aid to the targeted population with the aim of improving their food security. Small-scale pilots using smart cards have been launched and the lessons learnt will be used to test the use of smart cards as a mechanism for delivering aid to the final beneficiaries on a larger scale.

Furthermore, if smartcards were to be used, for example, for providing input subsidies under the national Farm Input Subsidy Programme (close links with food security improvement), they could later be used to provide extension services or possibly to record the provision of anti-retro-viral drugs to HIV/AIDS patients. They could thus be used in other sectors as well for aid delivery to final beneficiaries.

En Mauritanie, l’objectif spécifique de l’appel concernera la qualité, l’accessibilité et l’utilisation de l’information sur la sécurité alimentaire. Les résultats attendus seront les suivants:

- les données sur la sécurité alimentaire sont fiables;
- la confiance entre acteurs participant dans la collecte/élaboration des données sur la SA est rétablie;
- des nouvelles données utiles à compléter l’analyse de la SA en Mauritanie sont disponibles à différentes échelles;
- les informations sur la SA sont disponibles et accessibles aux utilisateurs finaux;
- la société civile et les autorités locales sont capables d’utiliser les informations sur la SA.

A travers l’appel à proposition la DCE envisage d’appuyer des interventions pilotes qui:

- complètent les systèmes nationaux (par des relations avec les institutions nationales ou par ancrage local) afin de créer des relations de confiance et de travail autour de la collecte des données et du traitement de l’information;
- permettent de rendre disponibles des données utiles à compléter l’analyse de (et les prévisions sur) la sécurité alimentaire (par ex. donnés sur les flux commerciaux transfrontaliers, etc.);
- permettent d’atteindre une échelle plus fine que celle de la région. Actuellement la plupart de l’information s’arrête à ce niveau;
- permettent de produire des données de SA répondant aux besoins des acteurs de terrain (producteurs et consommateurs en premier lieu mais aussi les autorités locales);
- rendent facilement accessible aux utilisateurs finaux, y compris la société civile et les autorités locales, les principaux données concernant la SA (prix des aliments, flux commerciaux y inclus les transfrontalier, données nutritionnels, etc.);
- renforcent les capacités d’analyse des données de SA et de plaidoyer de la société civile et des autorités locales pour une politique de SA efficace et durable.

Cette approche est innovante en produisant l’information au niveau local et en la rapprochant des bénéficiaires, c’est-à-dire les utilisateurs de l’information, tout en en améliorant la qualité. En effet, il est important de favoriser la production d’information là où elle est cruciale et où les systèmes d’information existants ne donnent rien aujourd’hui (les données nationales sur l’insécurité alimentaire sont sans utilité pour les acteurs agissant au niveau local comme les
producteurs, les commerçants, les éleveurs, les ONGs de développement pour leur ciblage). En évitant l’écueil de la création d’un contre-système d’information, favoriser l’implication et la coordination entre les différents producteurs d’information est important pour assurer la fluidité des informations sur la sécurité alimentaire, dans un cadre cohérent.

In Sierra Leone, the specific objective of the proposed programme is the long-term improvement of food security among the most vulnerable populations (rural and urban) through the development of sustainable small-scale and/or commercial-scale production schemes for livestock and inland fisheries.

The expected results are the following:

a) Increased availability of affordable high-protein meat/fish products on local and national markets through improved livestock/fish production, processing and marketing systems;

b) Increased and more regular sources of income for the most vulnerable rural and urban populations through livestock and freshwater fish production;

c) Improved nutrition among the most vulnerable rural and urban populations through education and more efficient use of available meat/fish products.

This can be achieved through several types of interventions:

- Integrated backyard and/or small-scale small livestock/fish production schemes for complementing households’ daily food intake, improving nutrition and allowing complementary incomes;
- Larger-scale production schemes, mainly in rural settings, aimed at increasing producers’ income while improving the local supply of fresh meat/fish products;
- If feasible, development of specific livestock/fish value chains at regional or national level;
- Development of small/medium-sized enterprises supporting livestock/fish production;
- Development of integrated livestock/fish/agricultural production systems;
- Development of small and/or medium-sized enterprises for processing meat/fish products.

In Somalia, the specific objective of this action will be to support the market for cereal produced in the high-potential areas of Somalia (Shabele and Juba).

The donor community and emergency operations buy large quantities of cereals at an estimated cost of €200 million per year. The proposed innovative approach would stimulate markets and food production, benefiting agricultural producers, traders and consumers in the high-potential areas.

The approach will be two-pronged. Firstly, specifically in Nairobi, an office will be opened to support international agencies wanting to buy food locally (in Somalia). In addition, support will be provided to traders and farmers in Shabele and Juba. Activities will include promoting the market, organising farmers before the harvest, sharing market information, quality control, monitoring the crop, distributing agricultural inputs, analysing bottlenecks in transport and providing possible solutions. In other words, the project will stimulate production by linking Somali traders and farmers to a market environment that will enable them to plan ahead and expand their productive area to satisfy the increasing demand for cereals.

The proposed action is innovative because it focuses directly on the problem with food production in Somalia: unstable and low prices for maize and other cereals produced in Somalia. It is worth noting that untimely and unfair competition from imported food aid is one of the main disincentives to food crop production. The approach is also innovative in that it will target traders excluded from previous interventions and because it will use implementation methods that involve other aid agencies, particularly those that are importing...
and distributing food. The coordination mechanism will have an important role in the project and will favour alignment: it will link emergency operations to development programmes.

In conclusion, this innovative approach will build trust between farmers/traders and international aid agencies (buyers). It will greatly benefit all sectors of Somalia because it will introduce a civil economy based on producing and rewarded from production, instead of a war economy based on military control of key areas (port and roads).

In Zimbabwe, an integrated multi-sectoral programme could be developed based on best practices that seem have benefitted HIV/AIDS-affected people and at the same time represent the most cost-effective combination of options. It should be possible, within one programme, to offer a range of inclusive support packages through partnerships, covering several different aspects such as:

- Health (referral, opportunistic disease + ART);
- Education (vocational/skills training, school fees, uniforms, education material, etc.);
- Livelihood support (agriculture production, food and nutrition intervention, income-generating activities, etc.);
- Legal support;
- Material support (clothes, hygiene, additional food, shelter, financial, cash transfer, etc.);
- Water & sanitation;
- Psycho-social and counselling support.

The main objectives of the project will be: 1) to come up with a catalogue of best practices in different sectors, which in combination will reduce the vulnerability of people living with HIV, especially among HIV-positive mothers, in the most cost-efficient way, and; 2) to define a package and its minimum duration to contribute to the future sustainability of household livelihoods.

The proposed approach will be based on new implementation methods and will use innovative coordination mechanisms, for example with sectoral ministries and decentralised administrations. Furthermore, this innovative consultation process will allow a more holistic understanding of household needs and ensure complementarity with existing activities.

Asia

In Myanmar, the programmes under this call for proposals will aim to contribute to developing, testing and disseminating best practices and innovations to address the main determinants of poverty and food insecurity.

Priorities and activities will include:

- Pro-poor agriculture (e.g. crop production, fisheries, livestock, forestry) development, with an emphasis on low-external-input agriculture and appropriate technology transfer;
- Sustainable management of and access to natural resources and no-timber forest products (NTPFs);
- urban and outskirts food security support, including activities supporting and promoting urban agriculture, vocational training and income-generating activities and employment (including micro-enterprises and credit/saving schemes support);
- Nutrition (including activities to end micronutrient deficiencies), in particular mother and infant hygiene education;
- Support for well-targeted social nets and cash transfers (conditional or not) to address food insecurity and malnutrition at house level;
• Activities supporting the capacity development of technical government bodies, NGOs and local organisations (including Community based Organisations, farmers’ associations, etc.);
• Activities supporting population adaptation to changes in climate patterns and/or crisis;
• Support for drafting food security policies or strategies.

The programme is meant to cover the whole country with particular attention to the most food-insecure parts. The overall result expected is that food-insecure households will have better access to better food throughout the whole year.

This approach is innovative in that it allows applicants to propose actions addressing landless and urban populations, thus supporting the ‘access pillar’ of FS. In past FS calls, landless and urban populations and the ‘access pillar’ were not the main targets and purpose. Also, the call emphasises the promotion of low-external-input agriculture, which also supports pro-poor agriculture development. Finally, the call prioritises nutrition, especially mother-infant nutrition, and is open to the use of conditional cash transfers to provide support. Applicants intending to implement actions in these areas will test and further develop experiences that can be used in future programmes.

In Timor Leste, in order to achieve rapid and sustainable food security impacts, the action will support innovations that address the problems of inadequate seed and water supply, increase food production and food supply throughout the year, replace inadequate storage mechanisms, and reduce the high levels of post-harvest losses currently experienced by many farming households, particularly at the most vulnerable points of the year. By addressing these issues in an integrated way, the action will give people the resources and capacities they need to improve their household food security. The action will therefore support replication and scaling-up of:
• seed production (including for cocoa) & seed banks — to empower farmers through increased control over seed supply;
• water harvesting — to increase the water available for food production, particularly in the dry season;
• airtight storage drums — to protect seeds and food from pests and reduce post-harvest losses.

The action will help farming households to experiment and learn in order to change and adopt innovative solutions to address the constraints they currently face in terms of inadequate seed and water supply and high post-harvest losses. The technologies concerned have proven to be highly effective and in high demand by farmers when accompanied by appropriate information and capacity building processes.

The production and improvement of cocoa also has very good potential for the income of households in suitable areas, which have already been mapped in the country. The action can enhance cocoa cultivation through intercropping and by supporting the reproduction of genetic material, scaling up its use through support for agricultural extension.

Support for civil society and farmers’ organisations to innovate, learn, experiment and share experiences remains limited in Timor Leste, and this action will provide much needed, well-directed strategic support for the development of civil society and its ability to provide effective food security support to vulnerable households. By supporting sharing and coordination mechanisms, community-led inclusive approaches, and proven and appropriate technologies, the action is expected to have the following results in Timor Leste:

1) Farmers, government and NGOs demonstrate increased levels of partnership and collaboration, contributing to an enabling environment for improving food security at
community level by promoting and supporting proven, appropriate labour-saving technologies;
2) Network of national/local NGOs and government extension agents promote equitable uptake of innovative approaches and technologies, leading to improved food security;
3) Farmers/entrepreneurs share and replicate innovative approaches and technologies, leading to increased agricultural productivity, food security and income diversity at community and household level.

The proposed approach will extend the successfully tested schemes, usually limited to 3000 households per project, to a larger geographical unit in cooperation with the government. The success replicated in a few communities can then be scaled up to enable the government to make it national policy and practice.

**Latin America**

In Nicaragua, the overall objective of this call will be to improve food utilisation and access among targeted vulnerable groups in order to alleviate chronic prevalent malnutrition and contribute to achieving Millennium Development Goal 1 ‘Eradicating extreme poverty and hunger’.

The main expected results are: (i) institutionalisation of food security at national level and new ways of participation at national and local levels; (ii) innovative sustainable solutions to food insecurity, especially in adapting to climate change risks, and for information systems and land management.

The fields of intervention and priorities will be as follows:

- dissemination of best practices for a food security early warning system in all municipalities;
- promoting adaptation of agricultural systems to climate change;
- implementation of a new law on sovereignty and food security (strengthening of networks and efforts by civil society to improve food security and incorporate social organisations);
- Issue of land management / identifying and disseminating best practices and innovations at local level (territorial management/cadastres/mapping).

**ENPI**

In the West Bank and Gaza (occupied Palestinian territories – oPt), innovative approaches to food security could contribute to improving the current state of play in agriculture, firstly by optimising existing resources, particularly water and energy, and secondly by re-orienting agriculture outputs to local markets. This will have a positive impact on the food security situation in the occupied Palestinian territories (oPt)\textsuperscript{132}, by increasing the incomes of smallholder farmers, increasing the local supply of food items and preserving existing natural resources.

The objective is to introduce new technologies at a pilot scale to optimise the use of water in agriculture where this has good potential in the fight against food insecurity. Three innovative approaches in the field of food security can be envisaged at this stage within the available budget of €2.2m:

- Optimising water consumption in greenhouses (optimising water consumption through tensiometers, computerised systems, collection and storage of rainwater, control of humidity, production of solar energy and hence production of water, etc.)

\textsuperscript{132} At the end of 2008, 50% of the population was estimated to be food insecure in the Gaza Strip compared to 25% in the West Bank.
• Desalinisation of brackish water using solar energy
• Fish farming using brackish water

The action will be innovative because:

i) it will support new technology (greenhouse coupled with solar panel for energy production and water condensation) to rationalise and optimise the quantity of fresh water used in greenhouses;

ii) it will address a concern not sufficiently taken into account in previous interventions: the quantity of water available for agriculture. Due to occupation policy, only a limited quantity of water is available overall. Up to 50% is used for agriculture. Meanwhile, there is not enough drinking water for human consumption. Demographic pressure increases the problem. In addition, climate change, in Palestine resulting in 3 successive years of drought, increases the pressure on water. The action will constitute a concrete measure to adapt to climate change and show the way forward for the next few decades.

### 3.3 Risks and assumptions

Risks and assumptions vary depending on specific local conditions.

In Chad, it is assumed that information is available to stakeholders and donors in time and is relevant, targeted and useful at national and local level. National and local instruments must be based on the guidelines produced by the information system in a stable political and social environment.

To reduce the risks inherent in the implementation of the action, a system for coordinating and strengthening the capacity of public actors involved in the collection of information on food security will be implemented. In addition, advocacy activities will be undertaken to promote national guidelines as a legitimate and efficient source of information on food security.

In Ethiopia, the action will contribute to and be integrated with other safety net and development interventions in PSNP areas. The proper implementation of these activities is a condition for the present action to succeed. Risks and assumptions are as follows:

- Markets provide sufficient livelihood opportunities for food-insecure households. Market promotion interventions such as the Growth Agenda will be critical in ensuring this.
- Technical assistance from the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development extension service, in setting up appropriate household business plans (including analysis of market, technical and financial viability), access to inputs and innovative technologies, will be critical in getting households to accept and engage in new income-generating activities, both on-farm and off-farm.
- Sustainable support services exist to enable assets to continue to be productive. Complementary institutions and programmes providing animal health services, technical advice and maintenance/spare parts, where necessary, will play an important role in ensuring the sustainability of the assets acquired by households.
- Protection from transitory shocks through the PSNP is sufficient to prevent significant asset depletion. The PSNP is a critical foundation for the household asset building activities under the HAB component.
- The enabling environment — including infrastructure and government policy — allows assets to be productive and generate sufficient returns for households to make additional investments.
• The FSP budget and its implementation allow operations with a sufficient scale, quality and coverage.

En Guinée-Bissau, un risque majeur est la retombée du pays dans l’instabilité politique que toutefois d’autres interventions de l’UE vont essayer de prévenir. D’autres risques sont les effets d’une catastrophe naturelle importante telle qu’une inondation ou une sécheresse.

Les hypothèses sont surtout liées à une plus grande stabilité du personnel et de la direction du MADR surtout au niveau local.

• In Malawi, for the adoption of smartcards for food distribution, subsidy schemes, extension services or other interventions under the innovative approaches programme, the assumption is that the Government of Malawi accepts this as a tool to deliver aid to those needing it and that an institutional home is agreed for this with the involvement of the Ministry of Finance. Interest on the part of the private sector is also assumed.

En Mauritanie, l’instabilité politique est un risque concret qui s’est traduit en l’arrêt la coopération européenne décidé par le conseil de l’UE suite au coup d’état d’août 2008. La crise politique est actuellement en voie de résolution et les activités de coopération devraient progressivement redémarrer à partir de l’automne 2009.

Mais c’est le manque d’appropriation qui pourrait jouer négativement sur la pérennisation des actions et de leurs bénéfices. Ce risque trouve une réponse ‘préventive’ dans le choix des groupes cibles: ONG, OI, société civile en générale, autorités locales. Les autorités centrales ne seront pas directement responsable des la mise en ouvre des actions, bien qu’elles seront appelées à y collaborer.

In Somalia, insecurity has been and continues to be the main constraint. However, the European Commission and its implementing partners have been able to operate in Somalia during the last 19 years despite the continuing unrest and civil strife. Implementing partners have developed considerable capacity on the ground with the support of local staff and NSAs to ensure a relatively satisfactory level of implementation, even when the security situation in Somalia does not permit the permanent presence of expatriate staff.

In Zimbabwe, the main risk at this stage comes from the political situation in the country and the possibility that negative developments may force the project to close. The new political arrangements make this risk less probable than before.

Another risk is the complete disappearance of health services, which are key to any programme dealing with HIV/AIDS. This risk is again minimised, as major support is being planned under the new political setup.

Access to money, services, inputs, health services, etc. is improving, as the general economic situation has stabilised and even improved under the new inclusive government.

The main assumption is that the economic and political situation will not collapse.

In Myanmar, the main risks and mitigation measures are the following:

Political risks: fluctuating relationships between the Government of the Union of Myanmar and donors may influence the implementation of programmes under this call for proposals. Risk level: medium. Mitigation measure: regular dialogue between donors and the line ministries concerned.
Extreme weather conditions, insecurity and/or population movements may hamper project implementation. Risk level: medium. Mitigation measure: None.

In Nicaragua, the perceived risks for this project include:

- the political situation in the country does not favour support for civil society;
- the allocation of cash and in-kind transfers to beneficiaries at field level, especially because governmental institutions and local governments respond to political criteria;
- official land management policies are not adequate to cope with poverty and food insecurity issues;
- government agriculture institutions and local partners do not have sufficient funding to provide adequate technical assistance and training to beneficiaries.

Assumptions include:

- inter-institutional coordination;
- interest on the part of beneficiaries;
- real demand for civil society.

It is clear that escalation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict could impact on movement and access conditions and therefore on the economy. In such situations (which have already happened repeatedly in the past), farmers face difficulties working and even transporting or selling their production. The fact that the project will encourage locally consumed production will mitigate this risk.

Climate change and successive severe droughts in the oPt also represent a major risk to agricultural production. Different mitigating measures will be implemented by this project to decrease the risk of failure of agricultural projects (drought-resistant varieties, collection of rainwater, irrigation techniques, etc.), but will not remedy the existing water deficit that Palestinian agriculture has to face.

### 3.4 Eligibility conditions

All legal persons that are non-profit making bodies — such as non-governmental organisations, public sector operators, local authorities, or international (inter-governmental) organisations as defined by Article 43 of the Implementing Rules of the EU 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 selected mainly on the basis of a call for proposals launched by the EUCommission Delegations in the different countries.

The Delegations, where appropriate with support from European Commission headquarters, will define the administrative and technical selection criteria to be included in the guidelines for 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 actions133.

The maximum possible rate of co-financing for grants should not normally exceed 80%, so as to allow specific countries to apply different (higher) rates as required. Full financing may only be provided in the cases provided for in Article 253 of the Implementing Rules of the

---

Financial Regulation 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 calls for proposals is the second half of 2010.

3.7 Indicative amounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Amount in €</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>1100000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2200000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea Bissau</td>
<td>2200000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>3300000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>1100000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>2200000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia and region</td>
<td>2200000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>2200000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>22000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor Leste</td>
<td>2200000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>2200000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENPI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Palestinian Territories</td>
<td>2200000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>25300000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. SUPPORT MEASURES

Annual audits and visibility activities will be covered by the budget for the grant contracts to be awarded under the calls.
1. **Identification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Armenia — Food Security Programme 2010 — CRIS No 2009/021-845</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>€2.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method / management mode</td>
<td>Sector budget support (centralised management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC-code</td>
<td>16010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Rationale and Country Context

#### 2.1 Economic and Social Situation

Continuing the double-digit growth trend of the past half-decade, Armenia’s GDP grew at an annual rate of 13.8% in 2007 with a robust performance in construction, services and agriculture. This stellar growth record has led to Armenia’s emergence as the ‘Caucasian Tiger’. Construction and services output increased significantly and, thanks to more favourable weather, agriculture expanded by 9.6%, marking a surge in the output of fruit, vegetables, tobacco and wheat.

Strong inflows of worker remittances and higher wages fuelled private consumption. There was significant private investment in several industries: real estate, mining, gas supply, transport and communications. Public investment increased by over 40%, most of which went on developing and rehabilitating public infrastructure.

Although the economic recession eased somewhat by December, with the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) posting a 16 percent reduction, an improvement from the country's peak decline of 18.5 percent registered for the first six months of the year, Armenia has still suffered from a dramatic economic declines. And despite reassurance by Armenian officials, the economic downturn has been worsened by declining remittances and lower foreign investment.

More troubling, the Armenian Government has significantly increased its external debt, after borrowing $1.3 billion in emergency financing for this year alone, and is now turning to the Russian-led Eurasian Economic Community (Eurasec) for a fresh influx of $500 million in new loans for 2010. Structurally, this has resulted in a dramatic surge in Armenia's level of foreign debt, to about $3 billion or roughly 37 percent of GDP for 2009. Even without the next year's $500 million in new lending the country's debt-to-GDP ratio is projected to account for between 46-50 percent of GDP by 2010. Consequently, the Armenian government may now face mounting of socio-economic pressure (especially in rural areas and among the most vulnerable groups of population, including children).
Fiscal revenue decreased by 14% year-on-year and tax revenues dropped by 18.8%. However, the budget deficit in the period amounted to 4.5% of GDP, well below the allowed limit of 7.5% of GDP. This, combined with credits from International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank (WB), Asian Development Bank (ADB), and other donors, will allow the current level of expenditure to be maintained.

The government has made solid progress in improving the general business environment, as demonstrated in the World Bank’s Doing Business survey for 2008, where Armenia’s ranking climbed to 39 in 2007 from 46 in 2006. The Doing Business survey for 2010 has demoted Armenia to 43 out of 183 countries.

In spite of the growth rate recorded before the global economic crisis, the government recognises that the economic base is still too narrow and that, in order to ensure a more diversified and sustainable development path, it needs to introduce other production activities, broaden its energy sources and develop new areas such as information technology.

In general, international donors remain satisfied with the response by the Armenian authorities to the global economic crisis and expect Armenia’s economy to resume its growth in 2010.

2.2 Cooperation policy of the beneficiary country

The Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP 1) was approved in August 2003 for the period 2003-2015. Arrangements for revision of the PRSP were adopted in 2006. The process was finalised with the adoption of PRSP 2, renamed the Sustainable Development Programme (SDP), by the government of Armenia on 30 October 2008.

The SDP stipulates that policy to address the problems of children in difficult living situations will continue to remain high on the agenda.

Particular attention will be devoted to:

- strengthening the child care and protection system and improving the quality of childcare institutions
- decreasing the number of children in childcare institutions
- preventing new inflows into childcare institutions (gate-keeping)
- ensuring that children who leave institutions are integrated within society
- creating alternative care services for disabled children

Reforms to child protection in Armenia started in 2001-2002, aiming to improve the child protection system inherited after the collapse of the Soviet Union as well as to define the main focus of government action to protect the rights of children.

The ‘Strategy on Reforms in the Social Protection of Children in Difficult Situations 2006-2010’ was drawn up with the support of the EU Food Security Programme in Armenia in 2005. Reforms were initiated centrally at the level of the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (MoLSA), so the strategy does not yet provide a detailed needs assessment at Marzes (regional) level.

This was due mainly to the absence of a structured network of services and institutions for children and families in difficult situations and to the poor field experience available at that time. The strategy therefore concentrates on the objectives to be pursued by the government and the action it should take to implement reforms in child protection.

2.3. Government sector programme

(1) Assessment of sector policy

2
The key policy paper is the ‘Strategy on Reforms in the Social Protection of Children in Difficult Situations 2006-2010’ (‘the Strategy’), which was officially approved on 12 January 2006 by the Government of Armenia\(^\text{134}\).

The Strategy was developed in a participatory way, with consultation of all main stakeholders. It contains the main features of a sector programme, namely:

- it sets the key priorities for the sector;
- it includes an action plan with objectives, expected results, a detailed list of activities related to each priority sector, and some monitoring indicators;
- the action plan also presents a time frame for its implementation and a list of actors involved.

As part of ongoing reforms in the ‘social protection of children in difficult situations’, the Strategy introduced a new three-level child protection system: at national, regional (Marz) and community levels. At the public management level, the system is intended to ensure a unified and structured child protection policy, to be implemented at regional level through a specialised system.

One of key objectives of the first two levels of the child protection system (‘community level’, through guardianship and trusteeship bodies, and ‘Marz level’, through the CPUs) is to ensure proper and effective targeting of services for vulnerable children. MoLSA is responsible for allocating budget funds to service providers through the relevant budget programmes.

In the domain of childcare and child protection, MoLSA has 3 target groups:

a) Children in residential institutions: orphanages and boarding institutions;

b) Children from socially vulnerable families and children with behaviour problems: attending day care centres and the ‘Fund for Armenian Relief’ centre for street and vagabond children.

c) Children living in ‘risky’ families: poor, conflicted, alcoholic, addicts, etc.

The next step will be a unified system with decision-making based on the results of professional and qualified assessments. Decisions on the future lives of children will draw on a unified database (containing the main information on children at risk) and will be carried out by specialised childcare structures.

At present, the weakest point in childcare seems to be the early identification of children and families in difficult situations and the provision of prevention services. This is why at present it is extremely important to:

- build professional capacity at community and Marz level;
- design and approve mandatory referral mechanisms (to be done by MoLSA and the Ministry of Territorial Administration);
- promote the development of social services at community/Marz level.

Recently, the Government of Armenia has also set up a Steering Committee, under the authority of the Prime Minister, in order to tackle nutritional deficiencies among children in the country.

In particular, the 2005 Armenian Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) reported an increasing prevalence of anaemia among preschool children (from 24% to 37%) and women of childbearing age (from 12% to 25%). The problem is thought to be primarily related to

\(^{134}\) Decree No: 206-N.
iron deficiency, and could be solved by the mandatory introduction of some nutrients in common flour, i.e. fortification. The ‘Steering Committee on Implementation of the Programme on Fortification of Wheat Flour with Micronutrients’ will coordinate activities under the flour fortification initiative in the country.

(2) Assessment of institutional capacity

Some weaknesses remain in the sector, in particular as regards institutional capacity. In fact, despite the support received and the political will on the part of the Armenian Government, reform faces a number of constraints.

In particular, financial and human resources limitations at MoLSA reduce the capacity of the government to implement the key measures of the ‘Strategy on Reforms in the Social Protection of Children in Difficult Situations 2006-2010’.

In addition, opportunities to learn from international practice are still limited, while national institutional capacity to deal with the issues raised by the reform (management and professional capacity at national, regional and local level, development of alternative services, etc.) will require further efforts and assistance.

Many of the above constraints were overcome during 2006-2009 with the assistance of EU budget support and its TA component (e.g. policy advice on the development of alternative services in child protection, training needs assessment, development of a public awareness campaign, etc.). However, these efforts still do not cover the entire system, which involves many ministries and agencies, so follow-up and a wider approach will be required.

In consequence, the main focus should be on improving cooperation between the ministries and agencies involved in child protection. This should aim to:

1) Improve the performance of the National Commission on Child Protection (‘National Commission’);
2) Facilitate a more active dialogue among different ministries in order to ensure coordinated operation (e.g. cooperation between MoLSA and the Ministry of Territorial Administration (MTA));
3) Improve the quality of the operation of the Child Protection Units (CPUs);
4) Enhance cooperation between MoLSA and the Ministry of Education and Science (MoES) for reforms in the special education sector;
5) Strengthen the capacity of the child protection system at regional level, in particular by supporting the CPU system in all 11 regions of Armenia.

(3) Framework for monitoring the implementation of policy

MoLSA is one the pilot ministries for the introduction of programme budgeting, with a system of financial and non-financial indicators. This pilot scheme has been extended to the entire sector. The MTEF process for 2009-2011 was seen as an opportunity to start more strategic expenditure planning for the sub-sector, but has since been suspended due to the economic crisis.

A starting point for performance measurement is provided by the Strategy on Reforms in the Social Protection of Children in Difficult Situations 2006-2010, in the form of outputs presented on an annual basis.

Monitoring and assessment of the Strategy is also carried out by the Monitoring Team established by the National Commission and it is based on the annual plan for monitoring and assessment.

(4) Macroeconomic framework

The international economic crisis hit Armenia, as in many other eastern European and CIS countries, in 2009. Even though growth was strong in 2008 registering at 6.8%, the latest
assessment by the IMF in September 2009 projects GDP contraction in 2009 as high as 15.6%. Low international copper and molybdenum prices, weak international demand for metals and dramatic cuts in construction contributed to this severe downturn. The economy also suffered from the decrease in remittances, in particular from Russia, which up to that time have been financing the construction boom. Construction activity, which accounts for almost 30% of GDP, decreased by 42% in the first months of 2009 relative to the same period of 2008. This had a devastating effect on overall economic activity. In spite of the severe impact, the outlook is more encouraging as it is expected that economic growth will turn positive in 2010 with a projected growth rate of 1.2%.

GoA economic policies for 2009, together with large external support, helped to somewhat mitigate the impact of the crisis on the Armenian economy. Loans received from Russia and WB (under the Development Policy Operation framework) financed the large shortfall in government revenues in 2009 and allowed relative stability in social spending. A large loan is also expected from the Asian Development Bank. The IMF Stand-by Agreement was approved on the 6th of March 2009 for the amount of SDR 368 million (USD 540 million). In June 2009 the IMF executive board approved an increase in the IMF financial support to an amount equivalent to SDR 533.6 million (USD 822.7 million). Two tranches have been released so far amounting to SDR 264.2 million. The external assistance also helped mitigate the consequences of the dramatic worsening of the current account.

(5) Assessment of PFM system

The most recent studies of the Armenian PFM system are the PEFA assessment released at the end of 2008 and the World Bank study ‘Integrating budget reforms in Armenia’, issued at the end of 2006.

Both studies confirm general assessments in earlier reports (PER, CPAR and CFAA) that Armenia has all the basics in place and is in a position to move to more sophisticated reforms in PFM. In fact, Armenia already has a solid overall public finance system with a reliable and consistent budget process, a modern treasury system, and an adequate public procurement system.

Therefore, the main focus of Armenia’s new PFM reforms is on complex technical issues such as: the introduction of a government financial management information system (GFMIS), public sector accounting reform, improvements in internal audit, and performance measurement in the state budget.

Perhaps the most important systemic weakness is the absence of a functional external and internal auditing system. The challenge lies in the lack of a proper understanding of the nature and value of having an auditing system, which stems from a narrow interpretation of auditing as an investigative and repressive mechanism, rather than as a way to address deficiencies of systems per se. However, the government is committed to rectifying this promptly, and has secured international expertise from the US Treasury to this end. The World Bank and IMF have included external/internal auditing and control as part of their programmes.

The first MTEF was drafted for years 2004-2006 in parallel with the development of the PRSP. This is a significant step, and provides a good overall framework for budget support operations. Substantial work remains to be done to raise capacity in budgeting and planning, to improve efficiency in resource allocation, and to introduce some form of results-based programming. Due to the financial and economic crisis, the government has temporarily suspended updates of the MTEF, which will be resumed once the macroeconomic outlook improves again.

Since 2005-2006, Armenia, supported by DFID, has started introducing programme budgeting in four pilot ministries, including MoES (introduction of strategic budgeting, performance monitoring and application of indicators).
More work is necessary throughout the PFM system, so it is advisable to focus future PFM-related assistance on areas such as: linking policy objectives with the budget, improving budget structure/format, preparation and planning, and the introduction of performance measurement in the sectors and line ministries supported.

(6) Eligibility for budget support

(6a) While a sector policy is in place, it needs some improvements, especially to the action plan, which at present cannot be considered completely realistic and credible (indicators, outcomes, time frames and costing all need to be improved).

(6b) Due to the recent economic and financial crisis, the Armenian macro-economic situation has deteriorated during the last 12 months (see section 2.2.4). However, macroeconomic stability has been maintained by adequate government policies\(^\text{135}\) and actions and thanks to the help of international donors.

In particular, the IMF has approved a USD 540 million Stand-By Arrangement for 28 months to help Armenia deal with the worsening economic environment and to ensure a smooth transition to the floating exchange rate regime. On 22 June 2009, the IMF Board approved an increase in Armenia’s access to Fund resources under the SBA by about USD 250 million (180% of quota), following a request by the Armenian authorities.

The European Commission has also proposed to provide macro-financial assistance (MFA) to Armenia for a total of € 100 million (€ 35 million in grants and € 65 million in loans), given the country’s eligibility for concessional (IDA) financing.

(6c) The Armenian PFM system is credible and undergoing continuous improvements, also thanks to international technical assistance. Relevant programmes to improve PFM are being implemented, and MoLSA is one of the pilot ministries introducing performance-based budgeting, with a system of financial and non-financial indicators. This pilot scheme has been extended to the entire education sector.

Armenia is therefore considered eligible for Budget Support.

2.4 Lessons learnt

The lessons learned from the Food Security Programme 2007 have been taken into account in the design of this programme, particularly the need to improve government ownership and the need to recognise that adequate local capacity and personnel resources are a priority if the programme is to achieve its objectives.

International cooperation has addressed only some of the important and urgent technical topics and policy issues prompted by the recently launched childcare reforms. In particular, the TA provided under the EU-funded Food Security Programme has concentrated on inputs to the Ministry of Agriculture and MoLSA, but given the implications for many different sectors a more comprehensive approach is needed to include and coordinate all actors.

The concept and ideology of the childcare and child protection reforms were consolidated in the ‘Strategy on reforms in social protection of children in difficult situations for 2006-2010’. One of the key objectives of the overall reforms and the efforts of all stakeholders was, and still is, the de-institutionalisation of children, removing them from residential institutions, and the prevention of new placement in institutions.

So far, the main achievements of the reforms have been:

a) creation of a three-level child protection system;

\(^{135}\) Such as the 2009 Memorandum of Economic and Financial Policies.
b) improvements to the welfare of children in residential institutions;

c) creation of services that provide an alternative to residential institutions (day-care centres);

d) reorganisation of special schools for orphans and children from poor families;

e) assistance to young people leaving orphanages;

f) improved partnership between government and civil society.

Further, the family benefits and child allowance schemes have been improved to target children in poor families. However, Armenia has reached a point where it is necessary to examine the further development of reforms, taking into consideration: lessons learnt during the implementation of the ‘first stage’ (2006-2010), the considerable achievements to date, financial constraints, and so on.

Finally, another important lesson learnt is that: the financial, staffing and monitoring capacities of MoLSA are still inadequate for completely autonomous policy development and for comprehensive performance monitoring. Therefore, further aid is needed from the international donor community.

2.5 Complementary actions

the Ministry of Labour and Social Issues was previously involved in a 5-year USAID project in the field of social protection. The main partners of MoLSA are now: UNICEF and the EU (the TACIS project ‘Support for Implementation of Reforms in Childcare and Child Protection’ finished in August 2009).

The European Commission and UNICEF have selected Armenia as a pilot country for EU children’s rights activities. From October 2009 a country situation analysis funded by the EU will be carried out in close cooperation with UNICEF.

Complementarity will be also ensured with activities by the Government of Armenia and other donors in the field of nutrition, this being an extremely relevant and important aspect of food security with an enormous impact on the development and health of children.

If needed, specific support could be provided to the recently established Steering Committee on fortification of wheat flour, in order to find the most appropriate and suitable mechanism to support the fortification initiative and to define enforcement mechanisms.

2.6 Donor coordination

The PRSP is the major forum for dialogue and coordination among donors on the overarching Armenia’s socio-economic development programmes. After adoption of the PRSP, several donors, in particular UN organisations, DFID and USAID, have aligned their country strategies in close coordination with the government.

The Ministry of Finance and Economy (MFE) was in the past the leading institution coordinating donors’ financial support (grants and loans), and the National Coordinating Unit reported to this ministry. Following the appointment of a new government in 2008, this unit will be transferred from the Ministry of Finance to the Ministry of the Economy, so new capacities for donor coordination will have to be developed.
Leadership and ownership of the government in the effective coordination of donor strategies has improved, in particular within the Department of Child Protection, whose management capacities and commitment improved during implementation of the 2007-2009 EU Tacis project ‘Support for the implementation of reforms in childcare and child protection in Armenia’.

3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectives

Key elements of the government sector programme (2006-2010) include: a) establishment of a unified child protection system; b) rationalisation and reforms in residential childcare institutions; c) development of social services providing an alternative to residential care; and d) formation of a state policy and strategy to prevent the placement of children in institutions and promote the deinstitutionalisation of children living in residential care; e) flour fortification component in order to overcome nutritional deficiencies among children.

The overall objective of this programme is to support the Government’s Poverty Reduction Strategy by improving the quality of the childcare and child protection system, in order to reduce the number of children in residential care.

At the same time, the programme will prevent the inflow of children into childcare institutions and ensure the integration of those leaving institutions within society. On the other hand, the institutions themselves will have to be rehabilitated or renovated where necessary: not only at infrastructural level but also at the methodological and pedagogical level (including care provision for disabled children).

The objectives of this programme are directly linked to objective 4.3 under ENP AP which covers measures addressing economic and social reform, poverty reduction and sustainable development.

3.2. Expected results and main activities

(i) Governance and empowerment — Improved operation of the child protection system

- Strengthening the capacity of the National Commission in order to improve coordination between the ministries involved in child protection and to ensure the coordinated operation of various structures answering to the different ministries (e.g. cooperation between MoLSA and MTA to improve the operation of the Child Protection Units (CPUs), and cooperation between MoLSA and the Ministry of Education and Science to carry out the reforms in the special educational sector)
- Strengthening the performance of CPUs in providing childcare services to children in need
- Increasing the quality of CPU services

(ii) Implementation of policy — revised and updated strategy

- Analysis of actual needs in each of Armenia’s 11 Marzes
- Revision of the overall strategy for child protection in line with the goals of the state child protection policy and based on the results of the Marzes analysis
- Provision of flour fortification as a measure for overcoming nutritional deficiencies among children.

3.3. Stakeholders

MoLSA is the most important stakeholder at institutional level. Its key functions as the main body responsible for the development and administration of child protection are:
• managing the system;
• formulating and supervising a unified state child protection policy;
• formulating the national programme and overseeing its implementation;
• overseeing the implementation of state childcare standards;
• carrying out licensing and accreditation of establishments (public and private, in all legal forms);
• preparing model charters for alternative services;
• developing and adopting rules and principles for admission to public orphanages and development of alternative services.

At the same time, the Ministry of Territorial Administration (in charge of the local Child Protection Units), the Ministry of Education and Science (specialised institutions) and the Ministry of Justice (responsible for child abuse) are also responsible in their particular fields. They are working very closely with MoLSA on the development of an overall system of child protection.

The ultimate stakeholders will be civil society, including local and international NGOs, and in particular vulnerable children and their families.

The EU Delegation and UNICEF will provide concrete input (and further details for conditionalities) via the ongoing ‘Children’s Situation Analysis’, in order to ensure adequate implementation of the overall objectives of the programme.

3.4. Risks and assumptions

The proposed programme is based on a number of assumptions, which are considered valid:

• Regained economic stability and overcoming of any adverse impact of the current economic crisis with the support of donors and through development of new markets
• Continued progress in improved governance and collection of taxes and other revenues
• Transparent government expenditure programmes in support of clearly defined priorities based on national and sectoral policies and strategies
• Continued commitment by government to establishing a family-based childcare system for children at risk.
• Commitment to maintaining international obligations, including those under ENPI, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, etc.

• Given the budgetary difficulties of the Armenian Government resulting from social and economic crisis, there is a risk of non-availability of funding for the current social programmes, including implementation of the Strategy for the Protection of Children 2006-2010.

Risks mainly relate to the possibility that the required institutional development and training, necessary to successfully implement the programme, will be curtailed by government actions and changing priorities.

3.5. Cross-cutting issues

By definition, the implementation of this programme will have a positive impact on the overall situation of vulnerable families and children, including gender equality, good governance and human rights. The programme will also supplement the cooperation between the EU and UNICEF, which have singled Armenia out as a pilot country for EU Children’s Rights.
4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Implementation method

Centralised management.

4.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

All contracts implementing the TA component of the programme 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.

4.3. Budget and calendar

The budget of this sector programme is of €2.2 m, indicatively broken down as follows:

- sector policy support €2.00 million
- technical assistance/evaluation, audit, visibility €0.20 million

Indicative disbursement calendar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned date</th>
<th>September 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>€2.00 m (fixed tranche)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of Financing Agreement: February–March 2010

Duration, from the signature of the Financing Agreement: 24 months

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 Armenian Government. General conditions will relate to stability of the macroeconomic framework, improvement in public financial management, and development of a National Sector Strategy. Specific conditions will concern the expected results set out in Article 3.2.

4.5. Evaluation and audit

Standard evaluation and audit arrangements will be applied.

4.6. Communication and visibility

Communication and visibility activities will be organised in conjunction with the MoES and other relevant ministries, in accordance with the EuropeAid visibility guidelines.

In addition, appropriate public relations and information activities may be considered so as to keep the general public informed of progress in childcare and child protection. In particular, stakeholders will be informed about the consequences of institutional care and the services available to assist children and families in difficult situations.

So far, awareness raising activities have been carried out mainly to inform stakeholders and professionals engaged in the child protection system. Given the situation of child protection in Armenia, it is recommended that communication activities focus on the following groups:

a) general public;

b) stakeholders and professionals at community level;

c) donors and sponsors involved in child protection.
ACTION FICHE FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME  
STRATEGIC PRIORITY 5: PROMOTING INNOVATION TO ADDRESS FOOD INSECURITY  

‘INCREASING FOOD SECURITY AND PROMOTING LICIT CROP PRODUCTION AND SMALL FARMER ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT IN HOUAPHAN PROVINCE, LAO PDR’

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/number</th>
<th>UNODC — Increasing food security and promoting licit crop production and small farmer enterprise development in Houaphan province, Lao PDR (DCI-FOOD/2009/223-271)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Total cost   | Total cost of the project: €2 200 000  
EU contribution: €1 900 000 (86.36%)  
UNODC: €300 000 (13.64%) |
| Aid method / Method of implementation | Project approach — Joint management through the signature of a Contribution Agreement with an international organisation: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) |
| DAC-code     | 52010  | Sector | Food Security |

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

Background

In 1998, Lao PDR ranked as the world’s third illicit opium producer, after Afghanistan and Myanmar. At the time, Lao PDR also had one of the highest opium addiction rates in the world. From 1998 to 2005, opium cultivation was reduced by 93% and opium addiction by 68%. In 2005, opium cultivation was officially prohibited by the Lao PDR government (GoL).

Despite the rapid reduction in illicit drug cultivation and abuse, more needs to be done in order to make these results last. The drastic reduction in opium cultivation has increased food insecurity in former opium farmer villages because opium has traditionally played an important role as a cash crop, allowing farmers to purchase essentials items and to cope with regular rice shortages.

The UNODC Post-Opium Socio-Economic survey of 2008 showed that 59% of former opium farmers were in need of alternative livelihood support, and that 15% of this population was living under the extreme poverty line, on an income of less than $1 per day. With poor basic services, leading to health problems and high illiteracy rates, former opium farmers are facing a very difficult situation. In combination with an evident lack of non-agriculture income opportunities, low soil fertility and high dependency on a single crop, e.g. maize, this promotes socio-economic instability and pushes farmers into a relentless poverty cycle that is difficult to break. The problem is further aggravated by unsustainable ‘slash and burn’ cultivation techniques. Falling commodity prices are also increasing the vulnerability of many former opium farming communities and reducing their already very low living standards.
Abject poverty among the ethnically and linguistically diverse populations living near the Vietnamese border in north-eastern Laos allows drug and human traffickers to take advantage of the situation to spread drugs, induce over-consumption and, in some cases, maltreat local populations. For example, women are increasingly used as ‘mules’ to carry drugs across borders. In parallel, the use of amphetamine-type stimulants (ATS) is rising, triggering vicious circles of dependency, impoverishment, drug trafficking to earn income, worsening sanitary and physical conditions, etc. This further contributes to the deterioration in living conditions.

The lack of steady and reliable sources of income and job opportunities in rural areas has led to large-scale population movements from remote rural villages to district and provincial urban centres, where limited basic infrastructures, public services, and job opportunities do not provide migrants with the expected increase in living standards.

In addition, remaining opium addiction in former opium growing villages is still severely affecting household productivity — with opium addiction leading to social indigence and reducing the labour force available, which directly impacts on food production and food security. Since most opium addicts are men, mainly the head of household, the workload of women is further increased.

Although Lao PDR has significantly reduced opium cultivation and consumption, the factors described above may explain why there have been several indications since 2008 that the area under opium cultivation has started to grow again.

### Situation in the target area

Houaphan is one of the poorest and most remote provinces of Lao PDR. In 1998, Houaphan province had about 3500ha under opium poppy cultivation, accounting for 13% of national total production, and an addiction rate of 2.9%.

Although opium farming has strongly decreased following the official ban on opium poppy cultivation and consumption, Houaphan remains one of the major provinces growing the crop. Without meticulous implementation of an alternative sustainable livelihoods project, many of the ex-poppy growing communities may revert to illicit cultivation, for the lack of other solutions to their poor living standards, generally well below the poverty line.

### Policy context

The project will contribute to meeting the EU’s objective in Lao PDR as set out in its Country Strategy Paper, namely poverty reduction in line with GoL’s National Growth and Poverty Eradication Strategy (NGPES). More specifically, this project comes under the first non-focal cooperation area ‘Support for Sustainable Development in the Uplands and Policy Dialogue on Relocation’. It will also offer opportunities for synergies with the Northern Uplands Development Programme, currently being developed by GoL, the EC, SDC, AFD and GTZ. In addition, it complements EU-funded initiatives in Lao PDR and neighbouring countries for the eradication of opium and human trafficking. The project is closely aligned with the development priorities of the Lao Government as set out in the National Socio-Economic Development Plan (2006-2010), and contributes to the goals of the NGPES. It directly supports implementation of the Alternative Development and Poverty Reduction pillar of the National Drug Control Master Plan (2009-2013), which aims to ‘negate the socio-economic needs to produce opium and address special needs of communities involved’. In addition, it contributes to enforcement of the national Law on Drugs, adopted in December 2007.

### 2.2. Lessons learnt

Despite the positive results achieved, Lao PDR still faces significant threats from illicit drug trafficking and drug cultivation. This is due to the fact that drug trafficking and cultivation is perceived as a coping mechanism in the face of poverty and food insecurity. On the other hand, opium eradication results in a significant increase in development inequalities between
former opium farmers and non-opium farmers. Furthermore, drug trafficking is also closely linked with human trafficking. Finally, increasing levels of addiction to amphetamine-type stimulants encourage petty crime.

Efforts to combat drug cultivation and use have to be matched by efforts to replace income and other benefits that used to come from opium. There is also a need to ensure fair and sustainable economic growth nationwide. Falling commodity prices are increasing the vulnerability of many former opium farming communities.

2.3. Complementary actions

UNODC Lao PDR has more than 20 years of experience in providing alternative and sustainable livelihood assistance for former opium farmers. This project incorporates lessons learned from several past projects, such as the Village Based Development Components implemented by UNODC in the ADB Shifting Cultivation Stabilisation Pilot Project in Houaphan Province (2000–2006) and the UNODC & ADB’s Alternative Development Project in Houaphan Province (2007–2010), along with other UNODC projects in other provinces in Lao PDR.

The EU has a long-standing involvement in food security, agriculture and rural development in Lao PDR. Support for food security comes from several thematic budget lines. In total, the EU co-finances 18 NGO rural development and food security projects, mostly in the Northern provinces, for a total amount of €13.4 million. In addition, €10.8 million have been allocated to Lao PDR from the EU Food Facility.

Improved access to social services forms an integral part of rural development, and the EC supports health and education at i) macro-level through the PRSO (€3 m) and via its involvement in the Education Sector Development Framework (ESDF).

Other development partners (DPs) involved in the areas of drugs control and rural development include Luxembourg and the United States of America, which have supported UNODC for several years.

2.4. Donor coordination

The National Illicit Drug Sector Working Group (IDSWG) brings together representatives from the government, DPs, and NGOs to discuss and build consensus on development priorities, and improve sectoral aid coordination and effectiveness within the drug and crime sector as set out in the Vientiane Declaration Country Action Plan. The IDSWG is chaired by the Minister for the President’s Office and co-chaired by the UNODC representative and the chairperson of the mini-Dublin Group, which brings together various embassies and international organisations interested in narcotics issues in Lao PDR.

At provincial level, implementation is closely coordinated with the Asian Development Bank (ADB), which has taken on the task of implementing essential community infrastructure, such as water supply systems, latrines and roads, which in turn will result in the desired synergies towards achieving the goals of the National Growth and Poverty Eradication Strategy (NGPES) within the target villages.

UNODC closely coordinates with other international agencies such as Care International, the German Agro Action and the Danish Red Cross to strengthen the impact and outcomes of the project.
3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectives

The overall objective of the project is to sustain the post-opium arrangements in one of the poorest districts of Lao PDR, while the specific objective is to increase the food security and agricultural production of ex-poppy farmers.

3.2. Expected results and main activities

R1: Food security and licit agricultural production increased in former and current opium-growing communities

Indicators:

i) Number of households facing food insecurity is reduced by 50% at the end of the project in comparison with the baseline survey;

ii) Period of food insecurity for the poorest and most vulnerable target villages is reduced from six months to three months by the end of the project; and

iii) Licit agricultural and food production in the target communities is increased by 10% per year.

Activities:

Data collection at community level and analysis for monitoring and evaluation purposes; participatory planning and introduction of innovative cultivation practices and environmentally friendly production technologies, including post-harvesting processing techniques, identification and distribution of high-yield seeds, and establishment of revolving seed banks; provision of training on how to increase food production; identification and construction of village infrastructure.

R2: Small farmers’ associations and cooperatives, enterprises and local entrepreneurship developed

Indicators:

i) Number of new local enterprises and business initiatives;

ii) Number of new farmer associations/cooperatives;

iii) Number of new marketing channels; and

iv) Number of farmers and local villagers trained and possessing improved management and entrepreneurship skills.

Activities:

Strengthening of villagers’ management and entrepreneurial skills through training in cooperative and association management; development of investment proposals and action plans; micro-credits and investment loans; networks of production and community cooperatives, periodic meetings with farmers and cooperatives, and farmer field visits.

R3: Opium production and consumption prevented through intensive awareness campaigns, provision of treatment services and local capacity building for drug prevention and monitoring

Indicators:

i) Surface area under illicit opium poppy cultivation has not increased and/or is further reduced to less than 33.8 ha by the end of the project;
ii) Number of opium users has not increased and/or is further reduced to fewer than 666 new addicts by the end of the project;

iii) Number of opium addicts receiving treatment increased;

iv) Percentage of female opium addicts receiving treatment increased; and

iv) Number of community volunteers having received training in gender-sensitive drug prevention and monitoring.

**Activities:**

Awareness raising campaigns on the dangers and problems of opium production and consumption; assessment and identification of male and female drug abusers in each target community; treatment services for drug addicts, support for and establishment of new community-built drug treatment centres, provision of training and advice on drug rehabilitation; building of local authority capacity for planning and managing community drug prevention and monitoring; creation of community drug prevention and monitoring groups comprising the community leader, an administrative committee and drug prevention and monitoring volunteers; participatory planning meetings with the groups to develop strategies, plans and responsibilities for drug prevention and monitoring in their communities.

### 3.3. Risks and assumptions

The most critical factor for the success of the project is the ability of villagers to comply with the national opium poppy elimination plan, as this is key to eliminating opium production. Former opium-growing villages will have to agree to support efforts to eliminate opium poppy production during the project. Any deviation from these commitments will disqualify the villages from receiving support under the project. UNODC, along with local authorities, will ensure that the national plan is widely disseminated and thoroughly explained so as make the stakes and risks clear to villagers. The project aims to provide farmers with support to offset loss of revenue or counter possible tendencies to revert to opium cultivation or consumption.

A second critical assumption for the success of the project concerns the capacities that need to be built among partners at village, district, provincial and national levels. One of the main aims of the project is to build the capacity of local authorities to deal with opium-related issues. The project will mentor local authorities and help them gain a better understanding of opium issues and locally adapted ways of contributing to implementation of the national opium poppy elimination plan.

### 3.4. Cross-cutting issues

**Human rights:** the project contributes to the prevention of human/drug trafficking by increasing economic opportunities for the targeted populations. In addition, it specifically addresses ethnic minority groups, who are the most involved in drug cultivation and trafficking because of their remoteness, their lack of economic and social opportunities, and the explicit/implicit discrimination they face in Lao PDR.

**Gender equality:** this will be mainstreamed in all project activities. Drug demand reduction decreases the workload of women and improves the social climate in households.

**Environmental sustainability:** this will be mainstreamed through the promotion of sustainable innovative agricultural practices and sustainable use of forest products.

**Good governance:** with its emphasis on one of the poorest districts of Lao PDR, the project will build capacity at provincial, district and village levels to properly address extreme poverty issues in an ethnic minority environment.
3.5. Stakeholders
The project will use the existing institutional and legal frameworks: the Lao National Commission for Drug Control and Supervision (LCDC) will be the main partner at central level while its local representations will support project implementation. UNODC will be responsible for project execution and management. The government will provide the project with a National Project Director and other technical support staff from local government agencies free of charge (with per diem expenses paid by the project). Every effort will be made to ensure gender balance and that suitable female candidates are recruited for project management and other technical and professional posts under the gender equality policy of United Nations. The project will benefit more than 15000 villagers in over 2000 households spread among 50 farming villages in the Xamtai District of Houaphan Province.

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Method of implementation
The method of implementation will be joint management through the signature of a Standard Contribution Agreement as per FAFA with the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). UNODC was chosen because the organisation could demonstrate that it has achieved positive results in combating illicit drug use and cultivation as well as improving the food security of vulnerable populations through an integrated approach in rural Lao PDR. The organisation has also had an important role in highlighting the susceptibility of ex-opium farmers to revert to this illegal activity, which can have devastating social consequences for the rural populations. Furthermore, UNODC has been able to show that this tendency can be halted only by investing in securing livelihoods and food security.

During project implementation, UNODC will work in close collaboration with the provincial and district authorities. A Steering Committee will be established.

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 UNODC.

4.3. Budget and calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In euros</th>
<th>EU Contribution</th>
<th>UNODC Contribution</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>CA/PA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Joint Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 CA with UNODC</td>
<td>1900000</td>
<td>300000</td>
<td>2200000</td>
<td>EU/EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1900000</td>
<td>300000</td>
<td>2200000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project duration will be 36 months from the signature of the Standard Contribution Agreement.

4.4. Performance monitoring

A performance monitoring system with specific targets is part of the logical framework matrix. In consultation with the local authorities and the villagers, a baseline survey will be conducted at the start of the project, against which progress will be measured throughout the
course of the project. A final study will be conducted at the end of the project, again against the baseline indicators to measure progress and achievements. Most performance indicators are linked to improved food security for villagers, increased sources of revenues, enhancement of traditional cultivation techniques and reduced use and cultivation of opium.

4.5. Evaluation and audit

Project monitoring will be carried out by the project team to ensure that implementation progress is measured and accounted for. Developments that would affect the successful outcome of the project or cause it to drift from its stated goals and objectives will be monitored and corrective action taken in consultation with the major stakeholders at provincial, district and village levels. The UNODC project team will play a central role in monitoring and reporting on progress through its Semi-Annual Project Performance Report (SAPPR), Annual Project Performance Evaluation Report (APER) and other reports to donors and to the project steering committee. 

**Mid-term and final project report:** UNODC will prepare a specific project report after the first year of project implementation (mid-term report) and another report three months prior to termination of the project (final report) for consideration at the final project meeting and for the use of the final evaluation mission. This report will follow the guidelines of chapter 7 (7.3.5) of the UNDP programming manual.

**Independent evaluation report:** The project will be subject to evaluation at any stage during implementation and up to twelve months following completion. The organisation, terms of reference and timing of any evaluation will be decided after consultation with the stakeholders. The project will be the subject of a final in-depth evaluation approximately two months prior to the end of activities. An independent expert will conduct the final evaluation in order to verify whether the project has achieved its goals and objectives. The findings will be reviewed by the various stakeholders. Provision has been made for evaluation (both internal and external) in the project budget and may not be reduced or removed except by written agreement of all parties to the project document or its subsequent revision.

**Audit:** The project is subject to examination/audit by the United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services and the United Nations Board of Auditors. UNODC will coordinate with the relevant stakeholders in order to facilitate such audits as necessary and to follow up the implementation of agreed audit recommendations.

4.6. Communication and visibility

As agreed in the Joint EU-UN Action Plan on Visibility, UNODC acknowledges the need for visibility actions and will take all appropriate measures to publicise the fact that the project is receiving funding from the European Union, and will strongly endorse the positive results of the partnership.

During the inception phase of the project, a communication and visibility plan highlighting the related communication activities will be discussed and agreed between the UNODC Country Office and the EU Delegation in Lao PDR.

The project coordinator will be responsible for establishing and developing the visibility action plan. (S)he will also closely liaise — by acting as a focal point for the contracting authority — with the European authorities to ensure the suitability and efficiency of project activities in terms of EU policies.
ACTION FICHE FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
STRATEGIC PRIORITY 5: PROMOTING INNOVATION TO ADDRESS FOOD INSECURITY

‘PREVENTING AND ADDRESSING UNDERNUTRITION IN YOUNG CHILDREN AND WOMEN IN BANGLADESH’

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>Preventing and addressing undernutrition in young children and women and its underlying causes FOOD/2009/255-285</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>EUR 3.6 million (100% EU contribution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method / Method of implementation</td>
<td>Project approach Joint management with an International Organisation (World Food Programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC-code</td>
<td>52010 Sector Food security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

The prevalence of malnutrition in Bangladesh is one of the highest in the world. More than 9 million under 5 children suffer from chronic malnutrition and around 2.5 million children suffer from acute malnutrition. The country has a high prenatal, neonatal, infant and under-five mortality rate. About 14 children per 1000 live births and 71 children per 1000 live births die before reaching the age of one. In addition, malnutrition among women is high. More than 13 million women suffer from chronic energy deficiency. Micronutrient deficiencies among children and women, particularly iron deficiency anaemia, are major public health problems.

Food insecurity is the main direct cause of the high rates of undernutrition in Bangladesh. Households (HHs) lack access and resources to grow or purchase a sufficient, diversified food basket, resulting in energy- and nutrient-deficient diets. However, the nutritional status of households in Bangladesh is not only affected by the shortage of food. Recurring disasters further exacerbate the situation, along with other factors such as a limited knowledge of the importance of nutrition, poor hygiene practices, inappropriate behavioural patterns, an unequal distribution of food at household level, and limited access to health services.

According to the Household Income and Expenditure Survey (2005), extreme poverty rates are very high (30-48%) in the areas currently targeted by the EU-funded Food Security for the Ultra-Poor (FSUP) programme. In particular, a number of nutrition indicators point to conditions below the national average in the target districts of Sirajganj, Bogra and Pabna:

- Acute undernutrition among under-five children is higher in Sirajganj (16.4%) compared to the national average (13.5%)
• Two of the three districts (Sirajganj and Pabna) have breastfeeding rates below the national average\textsuperscript{136}

• All three districts have low rates of exclusive breastfeeding for infants aged 0-5 months; the rate is particularly low for Sirajganj (14.6\%) compared to the national rate (43.7\%)

• Sirajganj has a particularly low rate of ‘appropriate complementary feeding’ for children aged 6-11 months (23\% versus 44\% at national level)

Therefore, it is crucial to address undernutrition through an innovative combination of treatment and preventive measures integrated within livelihood development programmes. The proposed intervention directly addresses 3 of the 26 key areas of intervention identified in the National Food Policy Plan of Action: balanced and nutritious food for vulnerable people, food supplementation and fortification, and nutrition education on dietary diversification.

Both the government and several UN agencies (and NGOs) have recently acknowledged that nutritional problems in Bangladesh are a major concern and need to be addressed on a larger scale and in a more coordinated manner. In this regard, the National Nutrition Programme plans to expand its activities over the coming three years to reach a geographical coverage of 100\% as compared to 25\% now.

2.2. Lessons learnt

The World Food Programme (WFP) has been implementing supplementary feeding activities, along with nutrition education, under its current Country Programme. The beneficiaries include children under two years of age, adolescent girls, and pregnant and lactating women suffering from undernutrition, who are selected from the poorest areas and typically belong to ultra-poor households. The intervention package provides fortified blended food supplements (6 kg per child or adolescent and 7.5 kg per woman per month) to beneficiaries together with nutrition education and growth monitoring. Such interventions have proven to be effective, particularly in addressing the nutritional problems of women and children. The growth monitoring reports indicate a 90 per cent recovery from undernutrition.

The 2009 mid-term evaluation of the WFP Country Programme recommends the integration of nutrition interventions in other livelihood support activities in order to maximise the benefits for members of ultra-poor households. In addition, the Lancet\textsuperscript{137} series on maternal and child undernutrition reported that supplementation for food-insecure populations and large-scale conditional transfer programmes (such as FSUP) have been found to be effective in improving nutritional status, and that the period from pregnancy to 24 months of age (-9 to 24 m) is a crucial window of opportunity for reducing undernutrition and its adverse effects. These findings are confirmed by a recent UNICEF report\textsuperscript{138} describing nutrition profiles for 24 countries, which shows that a marked reduction in child undernutrition can be achieved through improvements in women’s nutrition during their pregnancy and breastfeeding period and during a child’s first two years of life. For ensuring the survival, optimal growth and development of children, proven nutrition interventions include fortified or supplementary foods and good-quality complementary foods with appropriate micronutrient supplements.

\textsuperscript{136} MICS 2006.
Numerous studies have tested the effectiveness of micronutrient powder (MNP) and demonstrated that MNP is effective in the treatment and prevention of iron deficiency anaemia. The effectiveness of MNP in large-scale programmes has been demonstrated by its positive impact in reducing anaemia and overall undernutrition. A follow-up study on Bangladesh refugees and an evaluation of MNP provision to beneficiaries of WFP’s Emergency Operation after cyclone Sidr suggested a reduction in anaemia among women with the highest MNP consumption.

2.3. Complementary actions

The European Commission and other development partners are implementing a large number and wide range of projects in the area of food security. In most cases, improved nutrition is not the main objective, but is rather considered an indirect result of project activities. Under the EU-funded FSUP, large grant contracts are currently being implemented by WFP, ICCO, Care and Islamic Relief, targeting a total of 135,000 ultra-poor households. Under the ongoing WFP FSUP project (EUR 12.6 million of EU funding) a total of 30,000 households are targeted in the Sirajganj, Bogra and Pabna districts.

The overall objective of the WFP FSUP project is to improve the food security and nutritional well-being of ultra-poor households in disaster-prone areas by promoting sustainable livelihoods. The WFP FSUP project seeks to address food insecurity through non-food assistance combined with entrepreneurship skills development, asset grants/transfer of productive assets, and increasing crisis-coping capabilities for ultra-poor households. To this end, the project focuses on two principal drivers of food insecurity: poor access to food and inadequate nutritional security. It also aims to promote improved nutritional practices among ultra-poor households.

The activities proposed under this action would directly complement the WFP FSUP project by contributing to its nutritional objective: women and children will be provided with fortified blended food and MNP while the provision of nutrition education/counselling will enhance the capacity of women to translate their improved nutritional knowledge into sustainable practice. In-kind input support for homestead gardening and poultry rearing will increase the capacity of ultra-poor households to grow their own vegetables and obtain protein, both of which will contribute to a more diversified diet.

The recently initiated EU-funded nutritional surveillance project will provide regular information on nutritional status at district level throughout the country. It will serve as a reference to assess the impact of this intervention.

Other projects with a nutrition link are currently ongoing in the same target area:

- The Char Livelihoods Project (CLP) provides satellite health clinic support to rural communities. This comprises basic health care consultancy services, with complex cases referred to the designated Upazila and District referral centres. When cases of severe undernutrition are detected through growth monitoring, this referral system offers the opportunity of medical care for children with medical complications.

- Under its Country Programme, WFP supports the rehabilitation of community infrastructure (embankments, irrigation/drainage canals, raising of homesteads, rural roads, etc.) to enhance the disaster resilience of extremely poor people in these areas. These activities render ultra-poor households less vulnerable to
natural disasters and reduce their exposure to one of the causes of food insecurity in the area.

- Several NGOs operate non-formal primary education centres within the target areas. A large number of extremely poor households tend to enrol their children in these NGO-run schools, who thus have access to primary education.

Under the FSTP 2010, UNICEF is proposing a regional intervention. Five countries in Asia are covered by this intervention, including Bangladesh. One component is the distribution of MNP in the Barisal and Chittagong areas as well as in Dhaka slums.

2.4. Donor coordination

The WFP and the European Commission participate in a number of multi-agency fora to coordinate activities relating to food security and nutrition, like the nutrition working group, the Health, Population and Nutrition Sub-Group, and the Agriculture and Rural Development Sub-Group of the Bangladesh Local Consultative Group (LCG).

Consultations among stakeholders have just started on the new USAID initiative to support a global partnership on food security. The main goals of this endeavour are to raise incomes of the poor, to reduce poverty and to reduce child undernutrition.

In support, and with the approval of the Ministry of Health, the four UN agencies UNICEF, WHO, FAO and WFP have introduced the REACH approach (Renewed Efforts Against Child Hunger and Undernutrition) in Bangladesh. REACH is a country-led approach to scale up proven and effective interventions addressing child undernutrition through the coordinated action of UN agencies, civil society, donors, and the private sector, under the leadership of national governments.

WFP will use the lessons learnt from the implementation of the integrated FSUP/nutrition intervention for the design of its next Country Programme to commence in 2012.

FSUP has its own mechanism for coordination among the four implementing partners, in the form of a separate Programme Coordination Unit. This mechanism will also be used for activities involving all FSUP partners.

3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectives

The overall objective of EU support is to contribute to national initiatives for the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger (MDG 1) with a particular focus on rural ultra-poor households in disaster-prone areas.

The specific objective of EU support is to improve the food security, nutritional status and overall well-being of ultra-poor households in disaster-prone areas by integrating nutrition interventions within sustainable livelihood development programmes.

3.2. Expected results and main activities

Result 1: Reduced acute under-nutrition (including micronutrient deficiencies) among women and young children of ultra-poor households participating in FSUP.
Activity 1.1: Community-based supplementary feeding

Supplementary feeding involves providing fortified blended foods to WFP FSUP beneficiaries known to be most at risk of undernutrition due to limited access to nutritious food and insufficient knowledge about balanced diets. This activity will focus on reducing acute undernutrition among pregnant and lactating women, adolescent girls and children aged 6-24 months receiving assistance under the WFP FSUP project. Supplementary feeding will be provided together with nutrition education to promote improvements in feeding and caring practices.

Within WFP FSUP households, three groups will be identified: Group 1 contains moderately malnourished children aged 6-24 months, identified through weight-for-age measuring techniques; Group 2 contains pregnant and lactating women (PLW) with a child less than one year of age considered to be undernourished (Body Mass Index (BMI) <18.5); Group 3 is composed of adolescent girls with a BMI <18.5. All three groups will be eligible for supplementary feeding.

WFP will utilise the services of Community Nutrition Workers (CNWs), who will be trained in the identification of beneficiaries and will monitor their growth throughout the period of the action.

Fortified blended food will be used in the feeding programme to provide supplementary levels of energy, protein, vitamins and minerals appropriate for the recovery of undernourished women and young children. The food will be provided as ‘dry’ take-home rations. Such a ration is (a) more convenient for ultra-poor women, whose heavy workload prevents them from participating in daily on-site feeding sessions; and (b) is more manageable by communities, who will be responsible for organising and managing this component.

The fortified blended food is easy to prepare, has a short cooking time and has good keeping qualities. It has little or no market value, is eaten mostly as porridge (halwa) and chapati and has only limited appeal to men in the household. It is therefore likely to be consumed by the intended beneficiaries. The fortified blended food should be eaten by the undernourished family members in addition to normal family meals and should not replace family food.

Each of the selected children aged 6-24 months and adolescent girls will receive 200g/day (6 kg/month), providing around 800 kcal/day, for 6 months. Pregnant and lactating women will receive 250g/day (7.5 kg/month), equivalent to around 1000 kcal/day, for 6 months. The ration will be distributed twice a month. Communities will contribute storage facilities for the food supplements and will be responsible for collecting the blended food from the nearest delivery point.

Growth Monitoring (GM) will be an integral part of this supplementary feeding component. Lessons learned from growth monitoring in other countries will be taken into consideration to ensure effective implementation. The objective of bi-monthly growth monitoring is to track recovery rates among participants and adjust implementation, if and when needed. Anthropometrical measurements will be taken using standard equipment and techniques, and the resulting data will be converted into appropriate nutritional indices to compare with the standard cut-off levels for determining progress/improvement or otherwise. These data will help in analysing the project’s effectiveness. NGO partners will recruit nutrition focal points, growth monitoring is crucial to monitor the evolution of the nutritional status of undernourished children. Mixed international results are mostly due to implementation problems and do not prevent using this method in Bangladesh, where hardly any services are available for children suffering from moderate/acute malnutrition.
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CNWs, which will be trained to implement GM at community level. WFP will develop the GM monitoring checklists/registers and provide technical assistance to the NGO partners on the use of these technical procedures.

**Outputs:**
- 5500 undernourished PLW, 5000 children (6-24 months) and 7500 adolescent girls provided with fortified blended food.

**Activity 1.2: Distribution of Micronutrient Powder (MNP)**

MNP will be distributed to vulnerable members of WFP FSUP beneficiary households (PLW and children), comprising 30000 households under the WFP FSUP project and 40000 households from other FSUP projects. Of the total of 70000 HHs (approximately 350000 beneficiaries), an estimated 10500 PLW and 17500 children (6-24 months) will be provided with 15 MT MNP.

MNP sachets will be provided for six months. The allocation of MNP to beneficiaries will be 180 sachets for PLWs and 90 sachets for children. Ongoing assessments will determine if the dose and distribution arrangements need to be adjusted. It is assumed that MNP distribution will be gradually phased out once households display overall improvements in their nutrition status and increased income, including increased availability of nutritious food from homestead gardening, poultry rearing or other sources.

The MNP will be distributed through WFP FSUP partner NGOs and the networks of other FSUP projects. WFP will organise comprehensive training on the dose, distribution arrangements, storage and overall management of MNP distribution activities for all participating NGOs/partners under this activity.

WFP will incorporate lessons learned from its previous MNP distribution activities in implementing this component (see under 2.2). WFP will closely monitor its efficiency and effectiveness, which will inform implementation strategies through the project life. Under WFP FSUP, WFP will carry out social mobilisation and advocacy for MNP through several sub-activities involving different stakeholders, including local government authorities, social elites, other opinion leaders in the community, and, importantly, the project participants. Different information, education and communication materials (e.g. brochures, posters, leaflets, etc.) will support these activities. Under other FSUP projects, similar activities will be implemented by the respective NGOs and their partners with technical assistance from WFP in project areas where MNP will be distributed.

**Outputs:**
- 10500 PLW and 17500 children (6-24 months) provided with MNP;
- Community Nutrition Workers (CNWs) trained in MNP dosage and distribution arrangements;
- Partner NGO staff of other FSUP implementing organisations provided with training of trainers (ToT) on MNP dosage and distribution arrangements;
- Advocacy for MNP held in WFP FSUP project areas;
- Community meetings held on MNP and overall nutrition awareness in 8 *upazilas* under FSUP.
Result 2: Increased consumption of micronutrient- and protein-rich food through home production of vegetables and rearing of poultry

Activity 2.1: Input support for homestead gardening and poultry rearing
The WFP FSUP project has provision for training in vegetable and homestead gardening but does not include input support and related technical assistance. All suitable WFP FSUP beneficiary households will be provided with complementary inputs (seeds, saplings, fertilisers, etc.) for individual or community-based homestead gardening. The households will be trained in vegetable cultivation and receive input support to establish homestead gardens. WFP will ensure continuous follow-up and monitoring of gardening activities, yields and use of produce for household consumption.

WFP FSUP beneficiaries will receive input support and related technical assistance through this component. It is assumed that they will either use some of their production for household consumption or sell the produce to purchase more nutritionally diverse food items for the household. The WFP FSUP NGO partners will provide the inputs and training to the beneficiaries and assist with preparing the gardens. The field officer of the partner NGO under the WFP FSUP will oversee and monitor homestead gardening activities at field level with help from the CNW. WFP field officers will supervise the NGO’s project activities. Inputs (chicks or ducklings, feeds, etc.) and training for small-scale poultry rearing will be given to suitable WFP FSUP beneficiaries. The partner NGO field officer will monitor the poultry activities and follow up vaccination and other protective measures for the poultry. WFP field officers will supervise the NGO’s project activities.

Outputs:
- Interested households run homestead gardens
- Interested households rear poultry on a small scale

Result 3: Increased nutrition knowledge leading to improved nutritional behaviour/practices

Activity 3.1: Nutrition education/counselling at community level
The aim of nutrition education and counselling through Behaviour Change Communication (BCC) is to increase the project participants’ awareness, knowledge, skills and motivation for appropriate dietary choices and introduce improved practices for better nutrition. The approach will be as follows:

- Innovative nutrition education

Nutrition education will be provided through clear practice-oriented communication, with feedback on understanding and commitment, to help participants take home realistic/practical messages.

The project will employ community nutrition educators (with technical knowledge or background in nutrition) as master trainers and multi-purpose community nutrition workers (CNWs) to provide the above services. The WFP-FSUP project includes a limited budget for nutrition education, which will be complemented and strengthened by this component. A total of 1200 CNWs will be recruited, each to serve approximately 25 households.

Training of trainers (ToT) will be provided to CNWs to hold nutrition sessions with ultra-poor households at community level. Additionally, training and IEC materials, (e.g. banner, leaflets, posters, manuals, etc.) will be prepared on important nutrition messages to help with BCC activities by the CNWs and other project personnel. The
IEC materials will also be distributed to other FSUP-implementing organisations for use in their project areas.

- **Motivational counselling for a positive attitude and ideal nutritional behaviour**

Participants will receive both individual and group counselling to motivate actions and help them choose practical nutrition improvement options. A comprehensive BCC strategy, including curriculum and guidelines, will be developed and innovative approaches will be used to identify and promote existing ideal practices that facilitate change at community level for education/counselling purposes.

- **Follow-up of change in nutrition behaviour or practice**

Change in nutrition behaviour or practice will be followed up through home visits, which will be an integral part of the proposed BCC.

**Outputs:**
- Comprehensive BCC strategic manual developed
- 1200 CNWs recruited and trained to mobilise/educate/counsel/follow up the 30000 households
- Education sessions/meetings conducted monthly (at sufficient intervals) by CNWs, followed by essential counselling and follow-up visits to beneficiaries.

### 3.3. Risks and assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of risks</th>
<th>Mitigation strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical/geographical risks:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- project participants may be located in hard-to-reach remote Char areas</td>
<td>- the motorboat purchased under FSUP by the NGOs will be used to reach those areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- severe flooding may destroy homestead gardens or overflow fish ponds</td>
<td>- seasonal analysis will be carried out and strictly followed to avoid loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic risks:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households may opt to use the outputs from homestead gardening, poultry or fish cultivation for commercial purposes instead of household consumption</td>
<td>- Participants will be made aware of the fact that they can use the nutrition inputs only for household consumption, and can use FSUP support for commercial purposes only through social mobilisation activities - Close supervision by CNWs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social risks:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- acceptability of MNP in the community, as this is a relatively new intervention/product</td>
<td>- Advocacy and awareness meetings on MNP with local government and community leaders - CNWs will be selected from the community and will be trained and educated in CNW work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- availability of suitable women in the community to work as CNWs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4. Cross-cutting issues

Ultra-poor households will be trained in vegetable cultivation and provided with input support, including for eco-friendly homestead gardens in the community. The nutritional component of the project will primarily target pregnant and lactating mothers, children and adolescent girls, who suffer the most from moderate undernutrition and chronic energy deficiency. Ultra-poor women typically receive the smallest proportion of the meals prepared
at home (unequal intra-household distribution of food). The project therefore aims to improve access to essential nutritional services for disadvantaged groups.

3.5. Stakeholders

The key stakeholders of the project are NGO partners, vulnerable women, children and adolescent girls, local government, local communities and other government agriculture extension and health officials at Upazila level. During implementation, the project will promote active participation and collaboration between various stakeholders. Various capacity building and self-help development interventions have been planned to trigger active participation by those targeted by this project. NGOs with extensive field experience in the project areas will play a key role in implementing the proposed activities in the field. The active involvement of NGOs will be instrumental in ensuring cost-effective delivery of services, accountability for project resources, continuity in project activities, and monitoring and evaluation. The local government authorities and community leaders will be involved in the various stages of the decision-making process, and will provide support to implement the project activities.

4. Implementation Issues

4.1. Method of implementation

The innovative feature of this intervention, introducing a new approach linking direct nutrition activities with livelihood support, requires specific technical skills that cannot be found within the government system. Although UNICEF is the leader in nutrition, WFP has a significant role in nutrition where it relates to household food security. Homestead gardens have been successfully implemented in collaboration between WFP and FAO in other parts of the country, and will come under a joint programme in the south of Bangladesh in 2010. As WFP is already implementing a livelihood support project and has the necessary nutrition expertise, the logical choice is to use this UN agency as the implementer.

The method of implementation for this action is joint management through the signature of a Standard Contribution Agreement with WFP.

WFP will deliver services to the project participants in partnership with NGOs involved in the implementation of the WFP FSUP project. These NGOs, selected for the WFP FSUP project, have programming experience in the field, with outreach coverage in the proposed project areas. These NGOs will be responsible for undertaking nutrition activities in addition to the FSUP activities. WFP will coordinate NGO partners and provide technical assistance/training to implement nutrition-related activities.

When selecting these NGOs, FSUP applied a set of eligibility criteria through intensive physical and qualitative assessments. As evident from the assessments, the NGOs selected possess the required competences in human and life skills services, nutrition services and micro-economic activities for the ultra-poor. These NGOs are: Gram Unnayan Karma (GUK) in Bogra district; the Association for Socio-Economic Advancement of Bangladesh (ASEAB) in Pabna district; and the National Development Programme (NDP) in Sirajganj district.

The project will receive guidance from the Project Performance Group set up under WFP FSUP. This group includes all stakeholders and meets every six months. In addition, the FSUP Project Coordination Unit organises monthly coordination meetings, attended by the
four FSUP implementing partners and the European Commission. As a complementary action to WFP FSUP, project monitoring is included in the meeting agenda.

4.2. **Procurement and grant award procedures**

All contracts implementing the action will be awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents laid down and published by WFP.

4.3. **Budget and calendar**

The total cost of the programme is estimated at EUR 3600000, of which the EU contribution is EUR 3600000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Breakdown</th>
<th>EC (EUR)</th>
<th>Total (EUR)</th>
<th>Contracting Authority</th>
<th>Paying Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution Agreement with WFP</td>
<td>3600000</td>
<td>3600000</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3600000</td>
<td>3600000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The duration of the programme will be 36 months as from the signature of the Contribution Agreement with WFP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff recruitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of FBF, MNP and home gardening inputs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of growth monitoring equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of areas and beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and procurement of IEC materials and guidelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToT for cooperating partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of FBF, MNP and home gardening inputs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. **Performance monitoring**

The performance of the project will be closely monitored by WFP on the basis of key indicators established in the Logical Framework Matrix. The EU Delegation will supervise monitoring, analyse and approve progress reports, and participate in relevant meetings/committees.
WFP will implement a systematic project cycle management approach, fully adhering to the ‘managing for results’ concept. The monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan includes an M&E plan matrix with indicators and corresponding methods for tracking achievement against indicators. The specific activities under this project are the following:

**Formative research**

In order to design the proposed complementary intervention package and develop the comprehensive BCC strategy, formative research will be conducted to collect information on the existing/available nutrition services, knowledge, and specific practices. This will facilitate the effective implementation of interventions.

**Monitoring of service delivery by NGO partners**

Overall, NGO partners are responsible for monitoring and reporting on the achievement of the project outputs. WFP staff will facilitate and monitor the implementation of field activities by NGO partners. They will conduct regular visits to assess the efficiency of project implementation and the quality of project activities and provide on-site technical assistance to NGOs. WFP staff will undertake Participatory Rural Appraisal exercises with randomly selected self-help groups to assess their level of acceptance and satisfaction with the services provided by NGOs, the utilisation of services by targeted beneficiaries and changes in their livelihoods.

**Operational research**

Complementary to the built-in monitoring and evaluation system, at least one operational research study will be undertaken (in the project operational environment) to examine the assumptions that link each level in the logical progression of the project activities and events that are thought to bring about expected outputs/impacts. This will ascertain whether the services are delivered as planned and achievement of the outputs can be substantiated.

**Assessment/evaluation of outcome or impact**

The FSUP project will undertake a baseline survey of the selected participants on issues including food insecurity and nutritional well-being. It will also undertake yearly outcome surveys to track the results of the project, preferably in combination with FSUP. The baseline assessment for this intervention will be combined with the FSUP baseline to focus more on the nutrition status of beneficiaries. Comparisons will be made with the baseline benchmark and the yearly outcome surveys to determine changes and the impact of the intervention. The final evaluation will be carried out in conjunction with the FSUP final evaluation.

WFP will outsource the research, outcome monitoring and evaluation activities to competent external independent research agencies or universities.

**Project Coordination Meeting (PCM)**

Project Coordination Meetings will be held on a monthly basis to discuss progress in project implementation, identify problems and take corrective measures to ensure efficiency. Coordination meetings will be held with FSUP staff members and the project staff to ensure synergy between activities.

**Quarterly Progress Reviews (QPR)**
WFP will conduct a quarterly progress review of NGO partners to assess progress in project implementation. Quarterly reports prepared by the NGO partners on project activities will be analysed and discussed at these meetings.

**Semester Project Review Workshop**
As with the FSUP project, the Project Performance Group will organise project review workshops involving NGO staff at field level responsible for project implementation, beneficiary group leaders, WFP and Government officials. The Group will discuss overall progress in project implementation, problems, challenges, notable successes, significant changes, lessons learnt and various implementation issues that deserve immediate attention and an action plan for corrective measures.

**Reporting**
Project planning and reporting will be coordinated by the central Project Coordination Team established by WFP at its Country Office with inputs from WFP Sub-Offices and NGO partners. The project management team will prepare a detailed Annual Operation Plan (AOP) based on the project agreement and results framework, including planned activities, inputs required, expected outputs, activities, indicators and targets, in consultation with NGO partners. The project management team will prepare reports on the utilisation of inputs, activities implemented and outputs achieved in comparison with targets set in the AOP, based on reports submitted by NGOs and monitoring findings.

4.5. **Evaluation and audit**

WFP will undertake a baseline survey of the selected participants before implementation to obtain a benchmark for food insecurity, nutritional well-being and livelihoods among the project participants for future comparison. A yearly outcome survey will be conducted to track the results of the project. It will compare the pre-project status/conditions (captured during the baseline survey) of targeted ultra-poor women to determine the extent of changes and attainment of the graduation thresholds established. The final evaluation of the project will be carried out at the end of the project by independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission in accordance with EC rules and procedures under specifically established terms of reference agreed between the WFP and the European Commission. WFP will outsource the outcome monitoring and evaluation activities to competent external independent research agencies. These will be closely linked to the monitoring and evaluation activities undertaken under the overall FSUP programme by the FSUP Project Coordination Unit (an independent service provider).

4.6. **Communication and visibility**

Strong emphasis will be placed on the visibility of EU funding, both among the beneficiary population and among the wider international community in and beyond Bangladesh. A communication and visibility plan will be prepared during the inception phase, complying with the communication and visibility manual for EU external actions, which incorporates joint visibility guidelines for European Commission-UN actions. An update on visibility activities will be included in each project report. Communication and visibility activities will include:

**Targeting the community:**
- Banners bearing the EU logo put up at distribution centres
- EU logo printed prominently on training and IEC materials
- EU logo printed on placards, where these are mounted at project sites

**Targeting the wider national and international community:**
• Press release at Dhaka level upon confirmation of the contribution
• Photo bank featuring photos of the project’s schemes and beneficiaries
• Journalist visits to project sites
• Brochure of success stories on how the lives of participants have been changed by the project.
• Features on WFP Bangladesh’s website and on the Bangladesh page of WFP’s international website: www.wfp.org
ACTION FICHE FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
‘SUPPORT MEASURES’

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>Support measures (under Priorities 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5) CRIS DCI-FOOD/2010/…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>€ 564 172.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method/ Management mode</td>
<td>Direct centralised management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC code</td>
<td>N.a.  Sector  N.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.), not exceeding € 200,000 each, might be implemented under 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

For centralised direct management, the procedures to be followed are laid down in the European Commission’s ‘Practical guide to contract procedures for EC external actions’.

2.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

The relevant procurement and grant award procedures set out in the ‘Practical guide to contract procedures for EC external actions’ will apply.

3. Basic act and financing source


The budget line is 21 02 01 for food security.