ANNEX I

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

‘2011 EU CONTRIBUTION TO THE CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH (CGIAR)

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>2011 EU contribution to the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Total cost | EU contribution: EUR 32.5 million

Cris n°: 2011 / 260-204 |
| Aid method / Management mode / ref. | Joint management with IFAD and World Bank |
| DAC-code | 52010 | Sector | Food Security |

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

Multiple crises – triggered by food and energy price volatility, economic turmoil and concern about global climate change – have opened a new era of challenge and opportunity for agriculture and natural resource management. While affecting people everywhere, the crises have imposed particularly harsh consequences on the approximately 2.1 billion people who live on less than USD 2 a day – three-fourths of whom live in rural areas and depend directly or indirectly on agriculture for their livelihoods. Technological advances in agriculture are recognised as one of the key factors for successful rural and economic development.

It is therefore essential that stronger investments in agricultural science at the national and international levels are made available for addressing these new and complex challenges. Adequately funded research can deliver the innovations needed to achieve sustainable increases in agricultural productivity, benefiting both the rural poor and urban consumers while preserving or even enhancing agricultural externalities, in particular the conservation of natural resources, such as water, forests, soils and fish stocks.

The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) is recognized worldwide for generating global and regional public goods, including new crop varieties, knowledge and other products. CGIAR maintains international gene banks which preserve and make available a wide array of plant genetic resources. CGIAR’s research is carried out in collaboration with individuals and organizations working for sustainable agricultural development throughout the world.

In December 2009, the CGIAR adopted a new institutional model designed to improve its delivery of research results in a rapidly changing external environment. The reforms which are underway should give rise to a more results-oriented research agenda, to clearer accountability across the CGIAR and to streamlined governance and programs.
The new model consists of a balanced partnership between donors and researchers. A new CGIAR Fund has been created to harmonize donor contributions, while a new Consortium unites the Centres under a single legal entity and provides the CGIAR Fund with a single entry point for contracting Centres and other partners to conduct research.

The European Commission 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 and is committed in supporting its reform process. Shifting to a more programmatic approach, the CGIAR Centers will operate within a Strategy and Results Framework, aimed at strengthening collaboration for greater efficiency and development impact. A portfolio of CGIAR Research Programs is being developed, providing CGIAR scientists and partners with new means to deliver international public goods that address major global issues in development.

While the new CGIAR system is being put in place, a new contribution of €32.5 million is planned under the present Annual Action Programme (AAP) to co-finance agricultural research projects and Challenge Programmes with an emphasis on impact on poor smallholders.

2.2. Lessons learnt

Lessons can be drawn from the 2007 evaluation of the contribution to CGIAR and from the annual monitoring exercise carried out by the Commission to assess EU co-financing of CGIAR activities. Some of the key conclusions include: i) the high quality and relevance of CGIAR research; ii) the "value for money" of investing in ARD and iii) the need to strengthen support for ARD as developing countries face challenges that are unprecedented in their nature and magnitude (e.g. climate change, natural resource scarcity, emerging pandemic diseases). Some of the associated 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 and support for reform of the CG system.

The CGIAR is also subject to independent reviews, at the system wide level and at the level of individual programmes. Lessons from these reviews are taken into account in the ongoing CGIAR reforms, highlighting strategic partnerships that lead to results and greater impact.

It should be highlighted however that due to an apparent absence of close collaboration between the respective CGIAR-Centres too many single recommendations have been brought as messages to the small holder, but never in a real integrated and diversified approach to solve the problems of the small-holding as a business-entity. A more coherent and integrated approach from CGIAR Centres is therefore needed. Real constraints for the small holder (man or woman) in the application of messages from the research, such as lack of certified seeds, absence of an affordable agricultural credit system for the purchase of needed farm inputs, absence of an adequate marketing (most importantly storage) system prevented these initiatives from achieving their full potential in poverty alleviation for the rural poor or to food security. These real constraints, even though not directly under the responsibility of the CGIAR-system, need to be solved if the results of the CG-system are not to be jeopardised.

1 A revitalised CGIAR – A new way forward: the integrated reform proposal.
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With an objective of better understanding the constraints and the missing link between agricultural research and its uptake from smallholder farmers, the European Commission recently launched the evaluation on "Practical Application of CGIAR Research Results by Smallholder Farmers" whose final report is expected by April 2011. Its objective is to assess to what extent the EU interventions through the CGIAR have had an impact (or are likely to generate positive impacts) on food security, poverty reduction and sustainable development of the partner countries by improving the agricultural practices and livelihoods of smallholder farmers. The evaluation should also help 1/ identify key transmission mechanisms of global research products to end beneficiaries, serving the future reinforcement of linkages between research results and development objectives, and 2/ indicate complementary areas, in particular in the field of innovation and extension, having a high leveraging potential on the impact of the CGIAR research activities supported by the EU.

The results of this evaluation can be compared with the findings of joint European Commission-IFAD monitoring missions to several CGIAR Centres, which highlighted the importance of moving beyond a single-commodity based research, towards placing agricultural research for development within the whole-farm context, taking into account the multi-functionality of smallholder farming systems. The ARD investments, thus, require working in an inter-disciplinary manner with multi-stakeholder participation, towards developing effective integrated, sustainable and diverse options developed through an innovations-system approach to problem-solving addressing small-holder farming systems as business-entities, also building on the knowledge and aspirations of farmers.

Through embedding research in the development context, there is also increasing recognition of the need for Rehabilitation and Development (R&D) links for increasing the span of adoption and impact through scaling-up via links to development programmes targeting the smallholder men and women - as a part of the agricultural value chain and the continuum from research, input-delivery systems through to marketing as a part of the rural system, beyond the farm-gate.

2.3. Complementary actions

The EU policy framework to assist developing countries in addressing food security challenges\(^2\), adopted by the Council in 2010, highlights the need for publicly funded research and innovation in supporting food availability. This conclusion is supported by previous policy papers such as the Communication on 'Advancing African Agriculture'\(^3\), which sets out a specific approach to support agricultural research at continental level, which is reflected in the Africa-EU Joint Strategy\(^4\). The 2008 European Commission Non-Paper 'Guidelines on Agricultural Research for Development'\(^5\) explains the rationale and approach to ARD in more detail. In the African context all these policies confirm the relevance and usefulness of CAADP\(^6\) as a framework for advancing agriculture. One of CAADP's four pillars refers to research, technology dissemination and adoption.

Under the present Action Programme, strong synergies and complementarities are ensured with other global and regional activities supported under component one of the FSTP such as:

\(^2\) COM (2010) 127
\(^3\) COM(2007) 440.
\(^6\) Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme.
• The Global Programme on Agricultural Research for Development (GPARD), a call for proposals targeted at organisations and consortia outside the CGIAR system. GPARD projects address six themes which are complementary to the research programmes of the CGIAR.
• Support for the International Treaty for Plant Genetic Resources, in which CGIAR is a partner.

Such synergies and complementarities will also be pursued with:
- actions in support of innovation and extension, falling under the same component of the Food Security Thematic Programme,
- actions falling under the other two components of the Food Security Thematic Programme, at the global and at local level, in favour of the emergence of a stronger enabling environment for innovation uptake and research impact,
- actions of other European Programmes, and in particular the EU 7th Research Framework Programme

2.4. Donor coordination

In recent years there has been growing collaboration between European governments and the European Commission in harmonising policies on agricultural research for development and on coordinating support to international research institutions and programmes, including CGIAR, GFAR, and regional and sub-regional research organisations. 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 outputs7. The European Commission supplies the Executive Secretary for EIARD and has participated with other donors in the working groups conducting the CGIAR review.

The CGIAR Fund Council is the mechanism for coordination of donor support to the CGIAR. The Fund Council is chaired by the World Bank, at Vice-President level, It is an executive body, meeting two or three times per year and taking decisions on the approval or rejection of research proposals submitted by the CGIAR Consortium and on the prioritisation of funds among research programmes and supporting activities. The Fund Council receives technical support from the Independent Science and Partnership Council. The Commission currently occupies a seat on the Inaugural Fund Council, which runs until the end of 2012. Three other EIARD members, Sweden, the United Kingdom and Switzerland, also currently occupy seats in the CGIAR Fund Council.

It is anticipated that 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.

Recognising their close inter-relationship the Commission intervention will address all three system level outcomes in the CGIAR Strategic Results Framework, which are i) increased productivity and reduced poverty; ii) reduced hunger and improved nutrition and iii) sustainable and efficient use of natural resources. These outcomes are reflected in CGIAR Research Programmes (CRPs). The first two of these – the Global Rice Science Partnership (GRIiSP) and the Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS) – were approved and launched in November 2010. Others are under development for possible approval in 2011. Existing programmes, including the Challenge Programmes, in which the Commission has invested heavily up to 2010, will either be incorporated into the new CRPs or phased out. In the latter case the outputs of the Challenge Programmes will be used in the new research portfolio.

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

1. The delivery of pro-poor scientific, technological and institutional innovations, knowledge and policies;
2. The development/enhancement of pro-poor agricultural research 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 development, 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. CGIAR research projects (or programmes) selected for support under this EU contribution will be aligned with the CGIAR reform, and in particular with the decisions of the CGIAR Fund Council regarding CGIAR Research Proposals.

The present allocation also includes a specific allocation to GFAR, as the umbrella
organisation for international ARD, to support follow up activities from the first GCARD (Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development) and to organise the subsequent GCARD in 2012.

Finally, to ensure IFAD can meet its high-level technical management responsibilities, a Programme Management component (EUR 150.000) will cover the direct costs of specific IFAD staff assigned to the programme (see 3.6).

3.3. Stakeholders

The main stakeholders in the programme are the CGIAR Consortium and its component 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-generation, 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 associated with this intervention are as follows:

i) Mechanisms and linkages to transmit enhanced ARD knowledge to end users, particularly smallholders, might not work effectively;
ii) The diverse, fragmented and pluralistic demand and visions for agricultural research may not be translated into relevant and effective research outputs;
iii) Lack of attention to complementary investments in rural infrastructure or micro-finance may inhibit uptake or upscaling of research results.
iv) Developing country governments promote policies that provide an enabling environment for farmers to make a living.
v) The NARES will continue to be underfunded and not be able to bridge the information and demonstration gap between research and small holders.
vi) The CGIAR reform process is not implemented smoothly and there is a loss of efficiency and reduction of donor support for the new CRPs.

The programme will address the above risks by:

i) Ensuring that all research programmes to be supported have clearly defined development pathways to deliver results of research to users and clearly defined mechanisms to monitor results and measure pro-poor outcomes. This will involve adequate consultation with NARS, farming communities and other civil society actors, so that results are in a form that have the potential to be readily taken up by the appropriate actors along the delivery chain, with clear financial gains to the primary producer;
ii) Ensuring that CGIAR research programmes are demand driven and based on the priority needs of beneficiaries;
iii) Ensuring that CGIAR governance mechanisms operate efficiently and effectively. The Commission is well placed to do this, both as a member of the Fund Council and through building coordinated European positions and support through EIARD.

iv) Ensuring that adequate and sound rural investments are in place to help in enhancing the development impact of research, including capacity development of National Agricultural Research System (NARS) and enabling price policy reforms which will maintain farm gate prices at levels which ensure the feasibility of and returns to farm investments by smallholders.

3.5. Cross-cutting issues

Research priorities will be determined in the context of important global challenges and trends, many of which cross-cut the overall objectives of food security and poverty reduction. These include climate change, the global financial crisis and food price volatility. In addition, the globalisation of agricultural commodity markets, environmental degradation, rapid urbanisation and pandemics such as HIV-AIDS need to be considered. The gender dimension is important as many poor smallholder farmers are women, and given the particular role of women in household food security and nutrition.

The programme will address some of these issues – such as climate change and some aspects of environmental degradation (soil degradation, efficient use of water resources, loss of agricultural biodiversity) directly. It will ensure that programmes to be supported have a clear strategy on gender. While issues such as globalisation, food prices and pandemics are largely beyond the scope of programme activities, the design will be mindful of these externalities in defining priority areas of intervention.

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

3.6. Implementation method

The CGIAR is a Consortium of 15 international agricultural centres, which will receive a share of the European financial contribution for specific, selected ARD programmes. 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 55(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 European Commission-IFAD Partnership includes elements of donor alignment on the research agenda to orient the CGIAR towards pro-poor, impact-driven innovations systems and capacity-building of NARS partners (including civil society organisations and farmer groups);
• IFAD was strongly involved in the dynamic CGIAR Change Programme, by co-leading the Change Steering Team (CST) and as a member of the Working Group that proposed the new funding modalities for the financing of the CGIAR agenda. Together with the EC, IFAD has closely monitored developments in the "newly reformed" CGIAR to identify the most relevant and efficient modalities for supporting the work of the Consortium of CGIAR Centres and their partners, including through CG Research Programmes (CRPs)/Mega-programs involving thematic project clusters and inter-center activities to improve pro-poor outcomes and impact.

• The Agreement to be concluded by the Commission will provide that IFAD’s management fee is limited to a minimum (2%) 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 CGIAR Fund, the various CGIAR centres as well as GFAR.

• In the design and implementation of the action, IFAD will be responsible for:
  o Assisting the European Commission in the selection of projects to be funded, and subsequently guiding the preparation of the research/programme proposals. IFAD and the European Commission 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 EU-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.

Moreover, the present action also foresees a direct contribution to the newly created Trust Fund of the reformed CGIAR, managed by the World Bank, to cover the 2% payable for non-research system costs.

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 relevant international organisation.

---

8 Non-research systems costs are mainly for covering the costs of CGIAR Institutions such as the Consortium, Fund Office, Office of the Trustee, and Independent Science and Partnership Council. At the Fund Council Meeting in November 2010 it was agreed that all CGIAR donors would be required to contribute to non-research system costs. A rate of 2% was agreed for 2011. This rate will be reviewed in future years.
3.8. **Budget and calendar**

The total budget will be EUR 32.5 million. The operational duration will be 36 months. The source of funding is the food security budget line 21 02 01.

The indicative budget breakdown in EUR is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC CONTRIBUTION TO CGIAR 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGIAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/evaluation &amp; supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme management/technical backstopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total direct costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs 2% (IFAD management fee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total budget IFAD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| WB                                           |
| EC quota to CGIAR Fund Trustee (2% of CGIAR contribution) | 605,400.00 |

| GRAND TOTAL                                   | 32,500,000.00 |

3.9. **Performance monitoring**

A sample of EU-funded programmes will be monitored in accordance with the present Contribution Agreement. Joint monitoring arrangements with other CGIAR donors will be considered through EIARD.

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 Fund Council and its regular meetings.

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’.
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 (e.g. regional and sub-regional ARD fora), and donor coordination platforms (e.g. EIARD).
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ACTION FICHE FOR FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME II

STRATEGIC PRIORITY 1: RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND INNOVATION TO ENHANCE FOOD SECURITY
"SUPPORT FOR THE ASSOCIATION FOR STRENGTHENING AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH IN EASTERN AND CENTRAL AFRICA"

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>Support to “Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa” (ASARECA) Operational Plan 2009-2013 –CRIS 2011/259-809</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>EU contribution: € 5.0 million (and € 14 million already committed under EDF, and € 4 million committed under FSTP I) Interinstitutional style guide. Other donors: DFID (€19.288 million) and CIDA (€8.207 million) through Multi DonorTrust Fund, USAID (€8.559 million), AfDB (4.04678), SIDA (€5.147 million), IFAD (€ 0.436 million), CIAT (€0.248 million) and Harvest Plus direct (€0.736 million)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method / Method of implementation</td>
<td>Project Approach-Joint management with the World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC-code</td>
<td>52010 Agriculture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

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

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

Agricultural research can make a substantial contribution to a long-term strategy to increase productivity and pro-poor growth, and enable evidence-based policy making. Weaknesses in the agricultural research systems of ECA include limited financial support, inadequacy of human
resources, weak communications, poor coordination and internal linkages among actors, structural impediments to collaboration and coordination problems. Opportunities centre on shared themes—such as technology and institutional foresight, socioeconomic analysis, communications and information, and monitoring and evaluation—where coordinated regional efforts or common facilities may be useful. Moreover, the research results uptake by farmers and the dissemination of agricultural research results are essential in order to have the expected impact on agriculture productivity, value addition and competitiveness.

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

2.2. Lessons learnt

ASARECA’s previous performance was assessed through several evaluations, notably (a) The Mid-Term Review (in 2005) of the EU funded “Programme for Regional Support to Agricultural Research in East Africa” (implemented by ASARECA), (b) reports of the External Programme Review and Monitoring Panel (PRMP) from 2005-2006, and 2009-2010, and (c) the End-of-Programme Review of ASARECA Networks, Projects and Programmes in 2007. All evaluations confirmed the significant contributions that ASARECA is making to agricultural research in the sub-region, in particular to fostering sub-regional exchange and cooperation, and in addressing some of the most pressing agricultural constraints through its networks and grant scheme. The 2007 End-of-programme review of ASARECA networks, projects and programmes supported the re-organisation of networks into seven programmes, and an increased emphasis on organisation development and capacity building.

The main lessons drawn by ASARECA from experience made with programme implementation so far have led to (1) a revised constitution to better reflect the CAADP Pillar IV mandate, better stakeholders inclusion and improve accountability, (2) reorganisation into 7 programmes to simplify implementation and promote a more strategic approach, (3) development of a 10 years strategic plan and 5 years operational plan to clarify and guide implementation, monitoring and partners cooperation, (4) a re-organized Secretariat aligned to the implementation of the Operational Plan (5) a harmonized financial support to the implementation of the Operational Plan through the WB Managed Trust Fund enabling ASARECA to operate with one set of procedures, (6) a new portfolio of bigger, more strategic research projects fully in line with the Framework for African Agricultural Productivity (FAAP) principles.

Research implemented during the last years has shown that the methodology adopted has had a significant impact in the sub-region, not only on technology development but also on technology adoption on a wide scale. Adoption of orange flesched sweet potatoes, and high protein content maize is now already significant in several member countries and a market for such products has reached a significant level. This has positively impacted farmer's revenue, food security and improved nutrition.

2.3. Complementary actions

This programme is one component of a series of global, continent-wide and regional programmes focussing on the Research&Development component of the CAADP, to be supported by the EU and other development partners. These include support to the CGIAR and other providers of global public goods (€153 million is allocated from FSTP 2007-2010) the Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa FARA (€10 million), the other Sub-Regional (agricultural research) Organisations (CORAF and SADC MAPP), research centres with a regional mandate (CARBAP -2.5M€ 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, and farmer organizations, and to PAEPARD (the Platform for African-European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development—€5.5 million). ASARECA is also playing a coordination and support role for the implementation of the regional dimension of the EAAPP (East Africa Agriculture Productivity Programme) in 4 of the ASARECA member countries. ASARECA also maintains close relations with the Technical Centre for Agriculture and Rural Cooperation (CTA) using it as a tool for wider outreach to the farming and marketing community in the sub-region and beyond.

2.4. Donor coordination

The ASARECA Development Partner Group provides a platform for coordination among development partners supporting ASARECA programmes and activities. The overall objective of the Group is to increase the effectiveness of development partners’ efforts to support ASARECA in the delivery of its objectives on agricultural innovation in support of the CAADP agenda, as described in the FAAP (Framework for African Agricultural Productivity). Development partners have agreed on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The EU, CIDA and DFID are contributing to an existing World Bank managed Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF). The EU contribution is €14 million financed under the 8th EDF (ended 31st December 2010) and €4 million under Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTIP). The MDTF will end in June 2014.

3. Description

This action will support regional agricultural research in Eastern and Central Africa through ASARECA. As a not-for-profit organisation, with membership comprising National Agriculture Research Institutes, Universities, Farmer's Organisations, private sector and NGOs of 10 ECA countries, ASARECA implements its programmes through and in collaboration with the member NARSS (National Agricultural Research Systems) and interested stakeholders. ASARECA developed an Operational Plan (OP) for the period 2009-2013, spelling out objectives, results, activities and indicators. Results are to be achieved through seven programmes: (1) Staple food crops, (2) Non-staple crops, (3) Livestock and fisheries; (4) Agro-biodiversity and biotechnology, (5) Natural resources management and forestry, (6) Policy analysis and advocacy, and (7) Upscaling and knowledge management. This additional funding will be fully allocated to new research programmes in the 10 member countries. Budget for secretariat activities is already secured and allocated.

3.1 Objectives

The overall objective is "Enhanced sustainable productivity, value added and competitiveness of the sub-regional agricultural systems". The action supports the ASARECA's operational plan 2009-2013 (logframe in Annex I). Its purpose is "Enhanced utilisation of agricultural research and development innovations in eastern and central Africa". The Operational Plan is in support to pro-poor and demand driven agricultural research and technology, including outreach and dissemination.

3.2 Expected results and main activities

The specific results and indicators are shown in annex 2.

3.3 Risks and assumptions

Assumptions and risks for outputs and purpose level refer primarily to the availability of resources and existence and functioning of appropriate services and policies. At the purpose level, assumptions are:

---

1 Development of centres of excellence on Wheat in Ethiopia, Dairy in Kenya, Cassava in Uganda and Rice in Tanzania.
2 Members include the AfDB, CIDA, DFID, EU, IDRC, IFAD, SIDA, USAID and the WB.
3 Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda
presence of effective innovation platforms in the ECA region, availability of inputs, targeted financial services for agriculture exists. The risks of a lack of functional agricultural advisory systems and an efficient marketing system in place are recognised. Output level assumptions are regional and national mechanisms for approval of technologies/innovations/policies exist, adequate stewardship and oversight provided by the governance body; the adoption of an agricultural innovation paradigm by ASARECA member countries; Government, non government, regional and national organisations operate effectively at appropriate level. The risks identified are related to the adequate human, financial and physical resources maintained within the NARS and other partner organisations, and partnerships with adequate capacity for generation and uptake of technologies and innovation exist.

The Governments of the Eastern and Central African countries' support to agricultural policies is essential and the lack of this support could represent a risk for the project.

3.4 Crosscutting Issues

ASARECA has developed specific approaches to mainstream cross-cutting issues, such as environment, gender and governance in its Strategy, including a designated programme on Natural resources management and forestry. ASARECA has developed and is now implementing its Gender Mainstreaming Strategy across all its activities. Specific indicators are in place in the results framework to reflect gender mainstreaming at Secretariat, programme and project levels.

3.5 Stakeholders

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

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1 Method of implementation

In accordance with article 43 of the Implementation Rules of the EU Financial Regulation, the implementation method will be Joint management through the signature of an Administration Agreement with the World Bank. A MoU between ASARECA and its Development Partners (DPs) has been signed in 2008. The MoU is an expression of a common understanding among the parties on general principles and procedures for harmonized support to ASARECA. The existing World Bank managed Trust Fund is the channel for the EU, CIDA and DFID funds to ASARECA. The EU contribution to the Trust Fund will be reflected in an amendment to the existing Grant Agreement between ASARECA and the WB.

No financing agreement is foreseen

4.2 Procurement and grant award procedures

All contracts implementing the action are awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents laid down and published by the International Organisation concerned (as indicated in the Trust-Fund and Co-financing Framework Agreement of 20 March 2009).
4.3 Budget and calendar
The overall budget for the 2008/09-2013/14 ASARECA Operational Plan is €75 million, as presented in Table 2 below. Current funding is €64.667 million. The action will make a substantial contribution towards filling the funding gap.

The operational duration will be forty two months from the signature of the Administration Agreement.
### Table 1: ASARECA costs by component a space or a comma for EN decimalisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Cost (M€)</th>
<th>Proportion of total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Research</td>
<td>39 889</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis and Advocacy</td>
<td>6.377</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up-scaling and Knowledge Management</td>
<td>11.178</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Support and Technical Assistance</td>
<td>11.178</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASARECA Governance and Management</td>
<td>6.378</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75.000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Table 2: Donor contributions (in €m)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Amount M€</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU (Under FSTP II)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU (under FSTP I)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU (under EDF)</td>
<td>14.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>19.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>8.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>8.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>4.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sida</td>
<td>5.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>0.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIAT</td>
<td>0.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest Plus</td>
<td>0.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.667</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4 Performance monitoring

ASARECA has set up a M&E unit which monitors the performance on the basis of the indicators presented in Annex 2. As per the World Bank (WB) Trust Fund Agreement, ASARECA shall monitor and evaluate the progress of the project and prepares six monthly project reports. These reports are presented to Development Partners and Board of Director meeting. In addition, performance monitoring will be carried out jointly by the Development Partners, according to the principles of the MoU and the conditions set out in the Joint Financial Agreement. Joint monitoring mission occur twice a year and findings and recommendations are presented to the following Board of Directors meetings for decision making. In order to prepare the Completion report, ASARECA shall employ consultants whose qualifications, experience and terms of reference are acceptable to the World Bank.

### 4.5 Evaluation and audit

Under the Joint Financing Agreement, the development partners and ASARECA take joint responsibility for the external evaluation. A mid-term joint review will be carried out by ASARECA and the DPs in May 2011. Terms of reference are currently jointly developed. An external final evaluation will be carried out by end 2013. ASARECA has developed an Operations Manual and maintains a financial management system meeting World Bank's standards. Audited Financial Statements for one fiscal year are provided to the WB not later than six months after the end of the year. ASARECA has contracted independent auditors to conduct financial audits. ASARECA has developed a Governance Manual that sets out the roles and responsibilities of its governing body, including its audit committee.

### 4.6 Communication and visibility

A multi-donor communication and visibility action plan will be elaborated by ASARECA in collaboration with the World Bank within the first three months of implementation of the action. The plan will identify key audience and target groups, objectives, activities, indicators, financial and human resources. The plan will be drafted using to the extent possible the "Communication and Visibility Manual for EU External Actions" (April 2008), taking into account the complexities of multi-donor support.
### ANNEX I: ASARECA LOGICAL FRAMEWORK (2009 – 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results Framework</th>
<th>ASARECA Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa</th>
<th>Name: ASARECA Results Framework Period: 2009-2013 Revised in: October 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective statement</th>
<th>Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased economic growth and improved livelihoods in the ECA while enhancing the quality of the environment</td>
<td>1. Percentage annual change in GDP from agricultural sector 2. Percentage change in people living on more than 1$ per day 3. Percentage change in biodiversity and forest cover</td>
<td>Government statistics - FAO and World Bank, ADB, Economic Commission for Africa statistics and reports - COMESA and other regional organization reports - UN COM-TRADE statistics and reports - UNEP statistics and reports - CBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EN**

VII  

**EN**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Objective statement</th>
<th>Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced competitiveness of sub-regional agricultural system</td>
<td>1. Rate of change in Total Factor Productivity 2. Percentage change in the value of agricultural output 3. Percentage change in yield of selected crops and livestock</td>
<td>Government Statistics  - FAO Statistics  - COMESA &amp; Other regional organization reports  - Selected GGIAR Reports  - UN COM Trade Statistics  - Economic Commission for Africa Statistics and Reports  - External Evaluation and Impact Assessment</td>
<td>Relevant regional and national policies are implemented  - Governments continue to support agriculture and poverty reduction as priorities  - Equitable distribution of benefits occurs  - Agricultural transformation occurs in the ECA region occasioned by technical change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASARECA LOGICAL FRAMEWORK (2009 – 2013) … CONTINUED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Objective statement</th>
<th>Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced utilisation of agricultural research and development innovations in eastern and central Africa</td>
<td>1. Percentage of stakeholders adopting new technologies and management practices in selected development domains. 2. Number of policy options adopted by Stakeholders.</td>
<td>ASARECA Reports  - Govt Statistics  - COMESA AND OTHER REGIONAL ORGS  - FAO Statistics  - FARA, EAC, ReSAKSS</td>
<td>Presence of effective innovation platforms in the ECA region  - Availability of inputs  - Targeted financial services for agriculture exists  - Appropriate knowledge and technology delivery mechanisms operational  - Functional advisory systems in place  - Efficient marketing systems in place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data collected will include area planted, milk and crop production, etc. Yield will be calculated as: Total Production (Mt)/Area (Ha)

* "Adopted" refers to the formal acceptance of a policy or regulation by the party responsible for overseeing implementation of that policy (e.g. parliament)
1. **Strengthened gender responsive governance and management systems in ASARECA**

1.1 Pluralistic decision making processes
1.2 Compliance with organizational operational procedures and standards
1.3 Percentage increase in funding from development partners and/or private sector

- Management Minutes of Meetings
- Program Mgt Meetings
- Operational Manual
- Governance Manual
- Review Reports
- HR Register
- ASARECA Annual Report
- Client Satisfaction Survey Reports
- ASARECA Evaluation Reports
- Financial & Internal Audit Reports

- Adequate human, financial and physical resources are maintained within the NARS and other partner organisations
- Agricultural innovations paradigm is adopted by ASARECA member countries
- Adequate stewardship and oversight provided by the governance body
- Regional and national mechanisms for approval of technologies/innovations/policies exist.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective statement</th>
<th>Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **2. Enhanced generation of Gender Responsive demand driven agricultural technologies and innovations.** | 2.1 Number of demand driven technologies and innovations generated  
2.2 Number of demand driven gender responsive technologies made available to uptake pathway  
2.3 Number of stakeholders accessing the technologies and innovations  
2.4 Level of stakeholder satisfaction with the technologies and innovations | - ASARECA performance reports  
- Evaluation reports  
- NARS reports  
- Program Annual Reports  
- Government Reports  
- Survey Reports | - Partnerships with adequate capacity for generation and uptake of technologies and innovations exist.  
- Adequate human, physical and financial resources are maintained within NARS and other partners.  
- Government, non-government, regional and national organisations operate effectively at appropriate levels. |
| **3. Enhanced adoption of Policy Options by decision makers to improve performance of the Agricultural sector in ECA** | 3.1 Number of Policy options that enhance access to and use of resources analyzed  
3.2 Number of Policy options presented for legislation of decree  
3.3 The perception of stakeholders on the adopted policies | - Government Reports  
- High Government officials  
- Other stakeholders | |
| **4. Strengthened capacity for AIS in ECA sub-region** | 4.1 Number of ASARECA projects that have incorporated gender responsive AIS  
4.2 Number of stakeholders whose capacity building needs have been addressed  
4.3 Number (and type) of infrastructure developed  
4.4 Number of public-private partnerships formed | - Reports (Previous)  
- Survey reports  
- Discussion groups  
- Interviews  
- Observations  
- Fact finding missions  
- Beneficiaries  
- Various reports | - Partnerships with adequate capacity for generation and uptake of technologies and innovations exist.  
- Adequate human, physical and financial resources are maintained within NARS and other partners.  
- Government, non-government, regional and national organisations operate effectively at appropriate levels. |
| **5. Enhanced availability of information on agricultural innovation in ECA** | 5.1 Number of information packages produced  
5.2 Number of appropriate information delivery pathways used  
5.3 Level of satisfaction of stakeholders accessing disseminated information | - Projects & Programs reports | |
### Annex 2 – Results and indicators for ASARECA Operational Plan 2009-2013

**Super Goal: Increased economic growth and improved livelihoods in the ECA while enhancing the quality of the environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Unit of Measure (Disaggregation)</th>
<th>Baseline value (2008)</th>
<th>Off Target (2013)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Resp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Percent annual change in GDP from agricultural sector | Percentage | TBD | 6% increase | Government statistics  
FAO and World Bank, ADB,  
Economic Commission for  
AFRICA statistics and reports  
COMESA and other  
regional organization reports  
UN COMTRADE statistics and reports  
UNEP statistics and reports  
CBD |  |  |  |
| 2. Percent change in people living on more than 15 per day | Percentage | TBD | 50% increase |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Percent change in biodiversity and forest cover | Percentage | TBD | 10% increase |  |  |  |  |

**Goal: Enhanced competitiveness of Sub Regional Agricultural System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Unit of Measure (Disaggregation)</th>
<th>Baseline value (2008)</th>
<th>Off Target (2013)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Resp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Rate of change in Total Factor Productivity | Percentage | TFP of 2008 – TBD  
TFP - 1.3% (2000) | 4.4% per year (MDG targets) | Government Statistics  
FAO Statistics  
COMESA & Other regional organization reports  
Selected CGIAR Reports  
UN COM Trade Statistics  
Economic Commission for Africa Statistics and Reports  
External Evaluation and Impact Assessment | Desk study review  
Surveys  
Focus Group Discussions  
PRAs  
Filling out and collection of productivity logs |  |  |
| 2. Percent change in the value of agricultural output | Percentage | Value of selected agricultural commodities (2008) – TBD | 4% per year |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Percent change in yield of selected crops and livestock | Type of commodity | Poor performance of agricultural production in ECA region (2008) | 6% per year |  |  |  |  |

1 Baselines for most output indicators have been set at zero, considering the commencement of the Operational Plan in 2009. However, for some indicators, data is available from current ASARECA programs of their achievements in 2008

2 Following principles of subsidiarity, ASARECA will not track these indicators, rather will rely on activities of partner organizations such as ReSAKSS, COMESA and NEPAD

3 Data collected will include area planted, milk and crop production, etc. Yield will be calculated as Total Production (Mt)/Area (Ha)
## Purpose: Enhanced Utilization of agricultural research and development innovations in ECA

### 4. Percent of stakeholders adopting new technologies and management practices in selected development domains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of stakeholder</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>TBD</th>
<th>20% increase at outcome level over the baseline</th>
<th>ASARECA Reports</th>
<th>Govt Statistics</th>
<th>COMESA AND OTHER REGIONAL ORGS</th>
<th>FAO Statistics</th>
<th>FARA, EAC, ReSAKSS</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Surveys</th>
<th>Commissioned studies</th>
<th>Key informants</th>
<th>Analysis Reports</th>
<th>Minutes of Meetings</th>
<th>Workshop Reports</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Mid Term Reviews</th>
<th>Seasonal</th>
<th>M&amp;E Unit</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>DED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 1. Number of policy options adopted by Stakeholders.

| Number & Policy Type | 3 policies | 5 new policies |

---

### Result 1: Strengthened gender responsive governance and management systems in ASARECA

#### 1.1. Pluralistic decision making processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio (Category of stakeholder)</th>
<th>10 NARIs in the Board (all men)</th>
<th>Effective representation of both men and women in decision making as well as involvement of different stakeholder categories at all levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 1.2. Compliance with organizational operational procedures and standards

| Percentage | No operational Manual | No governance manual | Governance structures and procedures operationalized | Constitution endorsed by ministers of Agriculture | 100% adherence to the standards and procedures |

#### 1.3. Percent increase in funding from development partners and/or private sector

| Percentage | (2008) ASARECA Portfolio = USD 7,436,620 | 50% [Total Portfolio] |

---

* "Adopted" refers to the formal acceptance of a policy or regulation by the party responsible for overseeing implementation of that policy (e.g. parliament)
### Result 2: Enhanced Generation of Gender-Responsive Demand Driven Agricultural Technologies and Innovations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1 Number of demand driven technologies and innovations generated</th>
<th>Type of technology by gender and socioeconomic categories</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>• 35 new technologies &amp; innovations [2010 - 5; 2011 - 10; 2012 - 10; 2013 - 10]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.2 Number of demand driven gender responsive technologies made available to uptake pathway | Number & Type of Technology | • 17 new technologies & innovations | • ASARECA performance reports  
• Evaluation reports  
• NARS reports  
• Program Annual Reports  
• Government Reports  
• Surveys  
• Literature search  
• Statistical data  
• Extrapolation  
• Direct information collection |
| 2.3 Number of stakeholders accessing the technologies and innovations | Gender and socioeconomic categories | • | • Annually  
• Seasonally  
• PMUs  
• M&E Unit |
| 2.4 Level of stakeholder satisfaction with the technologies and innovations | • Number of product users by gender, age and location  
• TBD | • 2010 - 25%  
• 2011 - 40%  
• 2012 - 60%  
• 2013 - >75% | • Survey Reports  
• Statistical Data showing number of people accessing the technologies and innovations  
• Annually  
• Mid-Term  
• Country PIs  
• Program Managers |
### Result 3: Enhanced Adoption of Policy Options by Decision Makers to improve performance of the Agricultural sector in ECA

| 3.1. Number of Policy options that enhance access to and use of resources analyzed | Number & Type of Policy Options by categories | 4 | 16 |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |  |  |  |  |
| Women, men and youth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| 3.2. Number of Policy options presented for legislation of decree | Number & Type of Policy Options | 4 | 10 |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |  |  |  |  |

| 3.3. The perception of stakeholders on the adopted policies | Sex disaggregated across socioeconomic differences | Fairly Strong | Strong |  |  |  |  |

### Result 4: Strengthened Capacity for AIS in ECA sub region

| 4.1 Number of ASARECA projects that have incorporated gender responsive AIS | Number | [Category stakeholder] | 0 | 1,200 [300 annually] |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |  |  |  |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| 4.2 Number of stakeholders whose capacity building needs have been addressed | Number of stakeholders and Capacity building needs addressed | 0 | 35,469 |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |  |  |  |  |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| 4.3 Number (and type) of infrastructure developed | Number & Type of Institution | 0 | 119 [70% of 170] |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |  |  |  |  |

| 4.4 Number of public-private partnerships formed | Number and type of PPPs formed | TBD |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |  |  |  |  |

- Government Reports
- High Government officials
- Other stakeholders
- Review reports
- Annual
- Quarterly
- Programme Manager
- M&E Unit
- PIs
- Surveys
- Interviews
- Literature review
- Annual
- Mid term
- End of Project
- Terminal Report
- Scientists
- Stakeholders
- ASARECA Programs
- Beneficiaries
- Various reports
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.1 Number of information packages produced</th>
<th>Number [Stakeholder category by gender and other socio-economic differences]</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>• 210 [3 packages per project]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Number of appropriate information delivery pathways used</td>
<td>Number [Stakeholder category by gender and other socio-economic differences]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>• 2 delivery pathways per target audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Level of satisfaction of stakeholders accessing disseminated information</td>
<td>Percentage [Stakeholder category by gender and other socio-economic differences]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>• 80% of target users</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTION FICHE FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
COMPONENT 1: RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND INNOVATION TO ENHANCE FOOD SECURITY

"LEADING THE FIELD" – THE INTERNATIONAL TREATY ON PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>&quot;Leading the Field&quot; – The International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (PGRFA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Total cost | EU Contribution: EUR 5 million  
Cris n°: 2011 / 260-148 |
| Aid method / Method of implementation | Project approach — joint management with an international organisation (FAO) |
| DAC-code | 52010  
Sector  
Food Security |

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

Over the last 100 years, more than three quarters of all crop diversity has disappeared. Crop diversity provides the raw material for plant breeding, the tools for adaptation. These unique attributes, acquired over millennia including the ability to survive hot summers or cold winters, to thrive in dry conditions or in areas prone to flood, to withstand pests and disease – are being irrevocably lost, putting global food security and economies at risk.

Although the known agro-biodiversity is bigger than ever before, as breeders constantly bring new varieties to the market, with improved yield and often improved disease resistance, two-thirds of the world's food is generated from only 12 plants and five animal species. Within species, as a result of neglect and ignorance, we are now dangerously reliant on only a few varieties, for instance for rice, potatoes, maize, wheat, and other staple foods. The loss of global crop diversity has become a major threat to food security and health globally.

The global exchange of genetic material ensures nations can adapt to environmental and socio-economic changes. Nations are already interdependent in terms of their crop diversity; all depend on the genetic diversity in crops from other countries and regions. The current rate of climate change heightens this interdependence between countries. Coupled with the loss of diversity of crops it threatens our ability to feed a growing population. Never before has the need for exchange and use of genetic material been more important.
The loss of crop diversity endangers agricultural productivity, food security and our ability to adapt to the pace of environmental change. Conservation and use of crop diversity globally strengthens farmer’s capacity to adapt to a changing climate and to feed a growing population.

The International Treaty on Plant Genetic resources for Food and Agriculture ("the Treaty") has been established as a direct international response to these global challenges. It directly contributes to the achievement of Millennium Development Goals, 1 and 7 of Ending poverty and hunger and ensuring Environmental Sustainability.

The Treaty sees 126 Governments and the European Commission working together as Contracting Parties to promote crop diversity for enhanced food security in the context of climate change. ‘Leading the Field’ is an initiative led by the Governing Body of the Treaty, creating a multilateral Fund (hereunder "the Fund"), supported by member governments, the private sector and international foundations, which invests in high impact projects aimed at helping farmers to face the impact of climate change and at ensuring food security.

The initiative addresses food security and preservation of on-farm biodiversity in the context of adaptation to climate change, by supporting smallholder farmers and their communities in developing countries.

The Fund issues calls for proposals supported by the Treaty’s extensive network in more than 126 countries. The primary beneficiaries of the calls are vulnerable smallholder farmers. Investments are channeled to projects meeting the criteria established by the Treaty’s Governing Body, to which the EU is a member and which is supported by international respected scientific counsel.

2.2. Lessons learnt

Progress has been made by moving from a supply-based approach to a demand-based approach, building partnerships between scientists, extension services, smallholder organisations, as well as 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. These partnerships have worked in the joint generation, application and evaluation of knowledge, building on the innovation capacities of the poor themselves so as to maximise outreach and impact.

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, 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.

Furthermore, an important evaluation exercise has been launched in Autumn 2010 to assess to what extent the Commission interventions through the CGIAR have impacted (or are likely to generate in coming years positive impacts) on food security, poverty reduction and sustainable development of the partner countries by improving the agricultural practices and livelihoods of smallholder farmers. The evaluation should also identify key transmission
mechanisms of global research products to end beneficiaries. These findings will improve the alignment between research results and development objectives.

Launched in 2009, the Treaty Fund is already working in 11 countries. ‘Leading the Field’ has grown ten-fold over the last 12 months. The call for proposals 2010 will fund more than 30 projects that focus on the food security needs of smallholder farmers in developing countries facing climate change challenges. While around 30 projects will be funded, more than 400 project proposals were received through the call for proposals 2010, illustrating that there is a real need for this field of action. The Treaty aims to raise more than $100 million by the end of 2014 to serve the huge demand the Treaty’s call is experiencing to contribute to food security for more vulnerable people in the context of climate change and adaptation.

2.3. Complementary actions

The EU has substantially contributed to global research for development through the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research for Development (CGIAR). In 2008, the EU allocated to the CGIAR EUR 67.5 million for the co-financing of 15 international centres for the period 2008-2010 (including Bioversity, the centre dedicated to researching agricultural biodiversity) and four Challenges programmes (including EUR 6 million for the Climate Change Challenge Programme and EUR 10.8 million for the Generation Challenge Programme). Agricultural research has also been supported through 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), the Association for Strengthening Agricultural research in Eastern and Central Africa (ASARECA), International centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE) and the Platform for African-European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development (PAEPARD).

Furthermore, the Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP) has financed a global call for proposals, targeting global public goods in the field of agricultural research to be provided by organisations other than the Centres of the CGIAR. This call has resulted in several contracts for a total amount of EUR 25.5 million. One of the main objectives was to build on the long-established cooperation with the CGIAR while opening it up to new global partners to improve the outreach and impact of research at field level.

The EU 7th Research Framework Programme (FP7) is also supporting activities of international cooperation contributing to the Millennium Development Goals, in particular through collaborative research projects targeting food security and the impact of climate change on agriculture, with a total financial endowment of around EUR 190 million by 2010. An example of such project is the FUNCITREE project, addressing functional diversity in agro-forestry systems in semi arid and arid eco-regions.

‘Leading the Field’’s specific focus is on supporting smallholder farmers in developing countries to conserve and use crop diversity to enhance food security in the context of climate change. Yet ‘Leading the Field’ acknowledges and complements existing initiatives, bodies and programmes in the field of plant genetic resources. These include the Global Crop Diversity Trust (GCDT) which is an essential element of the Treaty’s Funding strategy. The Trust is the only funding mechanism with a signed cooperation agreement with the Treaty’s Governing Body which recognizes the Trust’s unique role in relation to ex-situ conservation and availability of PGRFA. This role is complementary to the Fund on the sustainable use of crops at farm level and the Fund’s focus on high impact projects supporting smallholder farmers in developing countries. The Treaty and its Fund are also complementary to CGIAR’s
mission, not with the objective to financially support the CGIAR system, which has other mechanisms for funding but to work in close collaboration with the CGIAR centres and particularly Bioversity. The investment strategy of the Benefit-sharing Fund, and particularly the design of the next call for proposals, was developed in wide consultation with stakeholders, including Bioversity, to avoid overlap.

2.4. Donor coordination

The Governing Body regularly monitors the financial resources targeting the conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture at national, regional and global levels. It regularly receives reports on the financial resources not under its direct control, including information on bilateral and multilateral funding dedicated to crop diversity. Such information allows the Governing Body to be aligned with other funding sources, avoid duplication of efforts and prioritize funding on areas in which it has a comparative advantage and unique positioning.

The development of the ‘Leading the Field’ initiative provides substantial opportunities for cooperation and synergy with other global institutions (CGIAR, GCDT, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), UNDP, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)) that will enable alignment of donor’s support to different multilateral institutions.

Within the framework of a Strategic Plan adopted by the Treaty Contracting Parties at a Governing Body meeting in 2009 in Tunis, the ‘Leading the Field’ initiative relies on the financial support of the Treaty members, the private sector, international Foundations as well as other sources of funding.

Below is a list of all donors to the initiative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>$344,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$344,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>$374,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$610,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>$2.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>$1.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>$870,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>$101,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>$4.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>$1.5 million (pledge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10.37 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Description**

3.1. **Objectives**

*Leading the Field* is an initiative aimed at supporting smallholder farmers whose food production and livelihood is affected by the threat posed by climate change in developing countries. Its aim is to promote plant genetic diversity to enhance food security in the context of climate change adaptation by supporting farmers to conserve and use crop diversity in their fields.

The Fund has three priorities:

1. **The management and conservation of plant genetic resources on farm**
   Supporting on-farm management and conservation of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture is the most direct way of reaching farmers, indigenous and local communities in developing countries to whom benefits should flow. It forms a strong contribution to the maintenance of on-farm diversity of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture. Only by strengthening these efforts can on-farm management of diversity complement ex situ conservation.

2. **The sustainable use of plant genetic resources**
   Expanding the characterization and evaluation of collections is necessary to promote and facilitate their use. More complete characterization and evaluation will increase the relevance of germplasm held ex situ and on farm for breeding.

   Diversification of crop production, genetic enhancement and broadening the genetic base of crops will directly contribute to increasing the sustainability of agricultural production and the resilience of farming systems. This will lessen dependence on external inputs, increase productivity, and respond to the challenges of climate change.

3. **Information exchange, technology transfer and capacity-building**
   Building strong national programmes is essential for capacity-building in developing countries and furthering the implementation of the Treaty. It is a prerequisite for the sustainability of efforts to strengthen and develop national capacities in the conservation and utilisation of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture.

   Expanding and improving education and training in developing countries is a sine qua non condition, in order to build capacity. Education and training is a long-lasting investment in the sustainable management of the diversity of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture in developing countries.

3.2. **Expected results and main activities**

*Leading the Field* has two major outputs:

1. To increase smallholder farmers food production and enhance the quality of food production in areas affected by climate change;
2. To build institutional linkages to develop plant genetic resources strategic action oriented plans at national and regional levels.

**Output 1:** To increase smallholder farmers food production in areas affected by climate change
The ‘Leading the Field’ initiative contributes to sustainable food security by supporting farmers to adapt to climate change through a portfolio of immediate action projects. Through this portfolio, the initiative will demonstrate the value of crop diversity at a time of climate change and generate a global knowledge base on innovative successful approaches and mechanisms to address the intertwined food security and climate change challenges. The Call for Proposals 2010 will support around 20 immediate action projects in 6 regions.

Farmers, as managers of genetic diversity, have much to offer both their own communities and the world at large as a result of their efforts to conserve plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, improve it through breeding and selection and through making it available for use by others actors. A range of activities will be supported including, *inter alia*:

- the on-farm management of local and introduced genetic diversity (varieties bred by professional plant breeders), both "within" crop diversity (different varieties for the same crop) and "between" crops (mixed cropping, including agro-forestry, and introduction of new crops);
- farmer participatory breeding and selection;
- rescuing farmer varieties threatened by climate change;
- conserving and making available local and indigenous knowledge;
- developing outlets for local crops and varieties;
- adding value to local crops and varieties;
- and linking farmers nationally, regionally and internationally to promote material and information sharing relating to climate change.

These activities need to be consistent with national strategies and priorities and rely on existing scientific and policy back-up.

**Output 2: To build institutional linkages to develop plant genetic resources strategic action oriented plans at national and regional levels**

The role of plant genetic resources in adapting to climate change needs to be addressed strategically, and through advanced planning that articulates and structures practical and effective action plans and policy responses. This will require the development of a consensus on priorities within a wide stakeholder community, and the progressive build-up of skills, knowledge and information bases and technologies.

The ‘Leading the field’ initiative supports the development of strategic action plans for climate change adaptation of key food crops. The first phase of strategy development supports a variety of approaches to the management of plant genetic resources in adapting to the effects of climate change. Strategic action plans will set out clear priorities and action plans on a regional, sub-regional, eco-regional, or other basis. In this way, national and international resources can be mobilised to effectively and sustainably support the progressive development and implementation of effective adaptation measures in developing country agriculture.

Strategic action plans should be developed and implemented through existing national, regional and international institutions, including effective networks or other multi-stakeholder groupings, and should take due account of countries legal commitments linked to existing international agreements on use and exchange of genetic resources.

As far as possible, the strategic action plans will be integrated or coordinated with broader global, regional or national strategies and action plans for food security and adaptation to climate change and be implemented as part of a broader policy framework, to leverage synergies in both action and financial resources.
The strategic action plans will play an important and catalytic role in guiding funding priorities of the benefit-sharing Fund, beyond the next two funding cycles, as well as of other multilateral funds, bodies and mechanisms. Similarly, the lessons learnt gathered through the monitoring of projects funded under output one will be disseminated and feed the strategic action plans.

3.3. Crosscutting Issues

‘Leading the Field’ spans several cross cutting issues. Central to the Treaty is food security and adaptation of crops to the effects of climate change. Each lends itself to other global agenda issues such as environmental sustainability, poverty alleviation, human rights and the entire Treaty pivots on the central issues of good governance, transparency and accountability.

3.4. Stakeholders

The primary beneficiaries of the benefit-sharing Fund will be the vulnerable rural communities in developing countries facing food insecurity and the challenges of adaptation to climate change. The guidelines of the call and the individual project will present a more detailed presentation of stakeholders.

3.5. Method of implementation

This action is to be implemented 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 Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) 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 FAO takes into consideration its specific expertise in agricultural research and biodiversity conservation and that it hosts the Secretariat of the Treaty and provides an administrative and financial support to its operation;

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

The Treaty has set up a core group of high level experts in the fields of food security, climate change adaptation, plant genetic resources, programme management and international development to design the Call and the programmatic approach for the Fund using a participatory approach that has involved all relevant stakeholders at country, regional and institutional levels. In the context of the multi-regional consultations, representatives of the European Commission will participate to the elaboration of the guidelines to applicants as well as to the selection of projects to be financed.

Grants are approved following a rigorous quality, scientific and impact based assessment as set out in the guiding resolutions of the Governing Body of the Treaty. Any governmental or non-governmental organization, including gene banks and research institutions, farmers and farmers’ organizations, and regional and international organizations, based in countries that
are contracting parties to the International Treaty, may apply for grants under the benefit-sharing Fund. In order to ensure a fair and equitable process, as well as the quality and balance among proposed projects, the Secretariat has established a helpdesk for the Call for Proposals 2010 with which applicants can seek free advice from experts in the field by email, phone and also by attending a series of workshops to be held in different regions.

3.6. **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 FAO.

3.7. **Budget and calendar**

The source of funding is the food security budget line 21 02 01. The total EU contribution to the benefit-sharing Fund will be EUR 5 million and will finance relevant quality projects selected as a result of the next call for proposals to be launched under the initiative "Leading the Field". Projects will mostly have a budget between USD 200,000 and USD 400,000. Indicatively, financial resources will be equally divided between both outputs, although flexibility might be required depending on the quality and relevance of submitted projects.

3.8. **Performance monitoring**

The Treaty has established a panel of experts who are responsible for the appraisal of full project proposals ensuring that high quality projects are selected and that Funds are invested in order to achieve maximum effectiveness and efficiency. Applicants of the Call for Proposals need to prepare a concrete monitoring and evaluation plan, of which costs will be covered by the budget under the grant contracts to be awarded, to be included into the full project proposal by the time the proposal is submitted for appraisal. A terminal independent evaluation will be carried out for projects or project portfolio funded by the Call for Proposals 2010 and future rounds of the project cycle. Such evaluation will assess achievement of outputs and outcomes, and the likelihood of sustainability of such outcomes after project termination.

Financial transactions and statements will be subject to the internal and external auditing procedures as laid down in the financial regulations, rules and directives of the international organisation concerned, FAO, which will submit a copy of the audited financial statements to the European Commission. Project evaluation will be undertaken by the Treaty staff as appropriate during the course of the project.

3.9. **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’\(^1\). During the inception phase of the project, a communication and visibility plan highlighting communication activities will be discussed and agreed between the Treaty staff and the relevant European Commission services.

---

\(^1\) For information about the call for proposals 2010: [http://www.planttreaty.org/funding_en.htm](http://www.planttreaty.org/funding_en.htm)
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ACTION FICHE FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
PRIORITY AREA 2: STRENGTHENED GOVERNANCE APPROACHES FOR
FOOD SECURITY
"IMPROVED GOVERNANCE FOR HUNGER REDUCTION"

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>Improved governance for hunger reduction 2011/262-399</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>EUR 640 million joint co-financing EU + Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU contribution: €30 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAO contribution : €10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method / Method of implementation</td>
<td>Project approach – Joint Management with FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC-code</td>
<td>52010 Sector Food Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Rationale

2.1. Sector context

The number of hungry people in 2010 is higher than at the time of the 1996 World Food Summit, when global targets to halve the number of hungry people by 2015 were set. The lack of sustained progress in reducing hunger has renewed attention on the need to develop appropriate means to reduce hunger and malnutrition more effectively. Stakeholders generally agree that a key means to this end is better governance at the global, regional and national levels.

The European Union (EU) Food Security policy framework approved in May 2010 highlights the importance of better governance for improved food security at all levels. It is a priority in the EU’s Food Security Thematic Programme for 2011-13 (priority 2 - Strengthened governance approaches for food security) and in the new framework for programmatic cooperation between the European Commission and the three Rome-based food and agriculture agencies (FAO, IFAD and WFP).

The new cooperation framework aims to capitalize on the comparative advantages between the European Commission and the three Rome based agencies (RBAs) and shift from project-by-project decision making towards a longer-term, programmatic multilateral approach and partnership. This should foster greater coherence between the respective programmes of work and budget of the Rome-Based food and agriculture
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 Agencies, build on existing and trigger new joint actions, reduce duplication of effort, generate cost savings, and allow more strategic and predictable cooperation and funding by the European Union.

The Action herewith proposed and to be implemented by the Food and Agriculture Organization in close collaboration with the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the World Food Programme (WFP) and other stakeholders would contribute to operationalization of selected areas of the European Commission-RBA framework. The proposed Action aims to address four critical issues/problems:

1. The need for enhanced global coordination of food and nutrition security initiatives through a strengthened Committee on World Food Security (CFS). The CFS should become the pivotal policy forum on food and nutrition security. CFS conclusions should be effectively communicated at the regional and national levels and be informed by inputs and feedback from these subsidiary levels.

2. The need for improved hunger statistics and other information as well as food and nutrition security analysis to provide for better informed actions at all levels.

3. The need for better policy instruments to trigger relevant actions in critical areas such as land tenure, sustainable agricultural investment, climate change, protracted crises, food price volatility, and the Right to Food.

4. The need to enhance individual and institutional capacities in the most vulnerable countries to effectively respond to food and nutrition security crises. In this regard the role of regional organizations such as the CILSS - Comité permanent Inter-États de Lutte contre la Sécheresse (CILSS), Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), the NEPAD Planning and Co-ordinating Agency (NPCA), and Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) will be emphasized.

2.2. Lessons learned

The proposed Action will build on previous and ongoing initiatives related to food security and nutrition. The following lessons are most relevant:

- At the 36th Session of the CFS members agreed that non-state actors including UN agencies, NGOs, civil society organizations and the private sector should become active members of the CFS. The effectiveness of this global governance mechanism would rely on the presence of similarly inclusive arrangements at regional and national levels. Furthermore, independent and knowledge-based advice such as that provided by the High-Level Panel of Experts to the CFS has a key role to play for better informed decision-making.

- Adequate food security governance ultimately depends on the political will to shape national, regional and global policies. Without this, financial and technical assistance support will not be able to bring about the necessary changes to address critical issues. Governance and political economy analysis should thus become an integral part of the planning and implementation of relevant actions.
ANNEX IV

- Adequate food security information systems play an important role to prevent and tackle food insecurity. However, these systems are often externally driven, uncoordinated, fragmented and lacking in long term perspective and structure.
- There is often no consensus on the food security situation in the absence of a common and generally accepted methodology and terminology.
- The Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) has proved to be a useful tool for building effective multi-stakeholder action and inter-agency collaboration.
- Effective action towards food security requires strong individual and institutional capacities at all levels.
- Improved agricultural and food security statistics at global, regional and national levels will require important investments at each of these levels, preferably from available public budgets, rather than from external aid.

2.3 Complementary actions

The Action will build on existing experiences and activities. Outputs will be mainstreamed into the policy assistance and programmatic actions and investment support of FAO and to the maximum extent possible in the operations of the other Rome Based Agencies International Financing Institutions with whom FAO works. It is through the association with complementary programmes and projects that the proposed Action will aim to achieve clearly identifiable and measurable results at all levels and especially in food insecure countries. Suitable initiatives for this will be identified for the development of complementary activities that should make relevant programmes and projects more effective in their respective contributions towards the achievement of MDG-1 in the countries concerned.

Supporting food security information systems for improved decision-making has been a key area of collaboration between the Commission and FAO in the last decade. The ongoing EC/FAO Global Programme on Linking Information to Decision Making to Improve Food Security, as well as two ongoing regional programmes covering ENPI countries and South East Asia, have generated experience that will provide the basis for the proposed action, especially its component 2 (Food Security Information Systems) and component 4 (Capacity development).

The proposed Action will further look for synergies with the multi-resource partner initiative (European Commission, CIDA, DFID and others) developed under the Integrated Food Security Classification (IPC) programme, which will run in parallel with this action and with which new tools for food security analysis will be developed.

The new Action will also build on existing collaboration on food security analysis and policy between the European Commission and NPCA/CAADP initiated under the aforementioned European Commission/FAO Global Programme so as to pave the way for the establishment of long term partnership with NPCA in this area of work.

In the last 5 years, 15 e-learning training modules have been developed in the context of FAO-EU cooperation and they have been used by over 48,000 professionals. Institutional
partnerships have been established with several Universities (e.g. University of Cataluña and Africa Open University) and Regional institutions such as NPCA, CILSS and SADC, also thanks to the support received from other donors such as Germany. Such wealth of technical materials and technical collaborations will serve as a solid basis for the implementation of the capacity development axis of the proposed action.

2.4 Partners’ coordination

Several frameworks at different levels will help ensure properly coordinated action:

• The Immediate Plan of Action for FAO renewal 2009-2013 is the most comprehensive reform undertaken in the UN system and comprises a number of major initiatives. A key element is managing for results to ensure clear and measurable impact of FAO’s products and services on beneficiaries. To accomplish this benefit FAO’s work under all sources of funds must be planned, implemented, measured and monitored using results based management principles, and a strategy to mobilize, allocate and manage resources from partners for agreed priorities. Many benefits will materialize only after the results based frameworks have been in place for the four-year period of the Medium Term Plan (2010-13). A simultaneous and complementary action includes a new Organization-wide Strategy on Partnerships to enhance FAO’s collaboration within the UN system, with the other Rome based agencies, with non-governmental and civil society organizations and with the private sector.

• It follows that FAO’s Programme of Work and Budget (PWB), which covers activities financed from the integrated application of both assessed and voluntary contributions, will be the principal mechanism for integration of the proposed Action with other relevant FAO work;

• The proposed PWB for 2012-13 is USD 2.4 billion, of which USD 1.4 billion in delivery of voluntary contributions is planned, somewhat less than forecast delivery in 2010-11. Most voluntary contributions finance upstream technical assistance to FAO Members (including programming of agricultural investment by the International Financing Institutions – e.g. FAO helped programme over USD 5 billion in approved investments in 2010) and downstream emergency and rehabilitations operations. The proposed Action will leverage translation of relevant food security governance outputs from the knowledge arm of FAO into the operations and investment support of the Rome based agencies at the regional and national levels.

• The new framework for Programmatic Cooperation on Food Security and Nutrition between the European Commission and the three Rome based Agencies is expected to be signed during the 37th Session of the FAO Conference in June 2011. It will be instrumental in achievement of greater collaboration between the Commission and the three RBAs;

• The joint WFP/FAO strategy on Information Systems for Food and Nutrition Security should provide an effective implementation framework, especially for
activities in component 2 of the proposed Action (Food Security Information Systems or ISFN);

- The ongoing EU-US dialogue on development cooperation launched in 2010 and including food security as one of the priority areas may result in enhanced EU-US cooperation in food security;
- The follow-up to the September symposium on International Food Security Network (ISFN) may eventually result in a network of ISFN actors (European Commission, FAO, new acronym IFPRI, WFP and Regional Organizations) to forge closer coordination between all agencies active in ISFN.

3. DESCRIPTION

The new Action will contribute to improved food security governance at global, regional and national levels by delivering four interrelated results that will address different dimensions of the issue. In line with the scope of the Food Security Thematic Programme (i.e. intended to complement related work supported through other EU funding instruments and thus making this work more effective in its contribution to the achievement of MDG 1 at global, regional and national levels) and to ensure that results respond to real needs and demands, the proposed Action will seek and promote close collaboration between selected projects, programmes and processes supported by FAO and the EU in collaboration with partners. Consultations will be held at headquarters and in the field, as appropriate, between the European Commission, FAO, IFAD and WFP for the selection of activities to be supported by the proposed Action. Regional and national development frameworks such as existing and planned Regional and National Programmes for Food Security, CAADP, the UNDAF and FAO’s Country Programming Framework will guide the selection process.

3.1. Objective and purpose

The objective of the proposed Action is to contribute to more inclusive, better coordinated and better informed food and nutrition security governance at global, regional and national levels and to assist in translating relevant information and knowledge into actions in support of the achievement of MDG-1 in selected countries. The purpose of the proposed action is to improve hunger reduction policies, programmes, as well as relevant individual and institutional capacities.

3.2. Expected results and main activities

1. By the end of the Action, the CFS multi-stakeholder participation process and the High Level Panel of experts (HLPE) will be firmly established in accordance with their respective agreed new mandates and in coordination with other relevant bodies at global level, such as the Standing Committee on Nutrition, at global, regional and national levels. The HLPE will be providing independent and knowledge-based policy advice to the CFS by drawing from different sources, including food security analysis and policy instruments developed by the proposed action. This result will be of critical importance for the successful implementation of other components of the proposed action and to
ensure that the analysis and tools developed (e.g. Integrated Food Security Phase Classification) will be used in relevant policy development processes. To this end the proposed action encourages the participation of non-state actors in CFS decision-making processes.

The HLPE is intended to become for food security what the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is for climate change. Price volatility and land tenure have been identified as priority issues, requiring urgent attention from the HLPE.

2. Food security decision making processes at global, regional and national levels use better information to prevent and/or mitigate the effects of food crises to more effectively address chronic hunger and malnutrition. The proposed Action will contribute to better quality and quantity of reliable and up to date food security data and other information, required for adequate decision making as defined by the FAO Corporate Strategy on Information Systems for Food and Nutrition Security (ISFN). This will include more accurate data collection and hunger statistics to support MDG monitoring and related decision making, as well as improved food price monitoring. Information systems informing national and regional policy and programme interventions by tracking policy decisions, mapping food security investments and actions, and facilitating exchange of experiences and lessons learnt will have been strengthened. The proposed action will also increase the understanding of determinants of food insecurity and malnutrition by improving and harmonizing tools for food security assessment and analysis, in particular with respect to emerging issues such as climate change, price volatility, resilience of food systems and shocks, livelihood adaptation, global financial crises and underlying governance and political economy factors that facilitate and/or challenge food and nutrition security. To facilitate the use of information in decision making, the proposed action will increase the comparability of existing food security assessments, through the further development of joint assessment tools, the integration of governance and political economy analysis and through the institutionalization and roll-out of the Integrated Phase Classification protocol. This result will contribute to informing the CFS and the HLPE for improved global-level decision making and support the development and translation into action of improved policy instruments in selected countries. Furthermore, this result will include follow up to the International Symposium on Information System for Food Security (ISFS), organized by the Commission in Brussels (September 2010), which should lead to enhanced coordination between all relevant actors in the field of ISFS and hence, increased effectiveness of all EU supported ISFS interventions. The Joint WFP/FAO strategy for strengthening ISFNS (currently under finalization) will facilitate interagency collaboration in this area of work based on the comparative advantages of FAO and WFP.

3. Improved instruments for food security policy and programme design and implementation. The proposed Action will deliver instruments for better design and implementation of food security policies and programmes. These will include analytical tools to measure ex-ante and ex-post impact of policy interventions on food security as well as norms, standards and voluntary guidelines for addressing food security. Policy briefs will be used for building awareness on topical policy findings and related
instruments. A number of policy areas relevant to food security have been already identified in accordance with the scope and nature of the FSTP and they will be further defined during the formulation process and the inception phase of the Action. Relevant areas could include governance and political economy, nutrition, gender, climate change, land tenure, management and use, the Right to Food, livestock, food safety and sustainable crop production intensification. The CFS with its HLPE and civil society participation and the improved understanding of food security will inform the definition of policy priorities. These improved tools will also inform policy discussions of the CFS and HLPE. In addition, the proposed action will support the production and policy outreach of major food security related publications such as the State of Food Insecurity and will support the development of a web-based platform for mapping food security actions at country and regional levels.

4. By the end of the proposed action the human and institutional capacities of relevant global, regional and national organizations will have been strengthened for them to be able to better identify and plan relevant food security policy and investment interventions. Furthermore, key agencies and resource partners will have joined hands in a number of actions in the area of capacity development for food security. To achieve this result, the proposed action will develop e-learning courses based on existing guidance material (e.g. Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land and other Natural Resources) and other on going and new initiatives (e.g. EASYPOL, modules on investment appraisal and management, communicating food security information to policymakers, governance and political economy analysis) and will deliver these courses through blended learning programmes for food security professionals in FAO, key partners and member states. In addition, regional and national institutional capacities for providing training in food security related subjects will be developed by supporting national universities and relevant regional training centres in designing and delivering food security curricula. The proposed action will also support open dialogue on food security issues by contributing expert time to existing communities of practice such as the Forum on Food Security and Nutrition and e-Agriculture.

3.3. Risks and assumptions

The Action is designed on the following risks and assumptions:

- The Action assumes that food security continues to be a priority at global, regional and national levels. FAO with the support of the proposed Action will intensify its advocacy for the potential of investment in agriculture and food security for sustainable growth strategies in developing countries;

- Continued willingness to collaborate and participate in multi-stakeholder dialogue and decision making across different players in food security at global, regional and national levels is assumed. FAO will ensure a continuous dialogue and free flow of information between stakeholders and in particular, between the three Rome based agencies;

- Commitment to use information and knowledge for improved decision making among different actors at global, regional and national levels is also assumed. FAO will
document and demonstrate the impact of better information on the success of development interventions.

3.4. Crosscutting Issues

Capacity development and gender are cross-cutting issues that will be addressed across all four results. The CFS will strive to ensure equal representation of men and women in food security governance mechanisms and the HLPE will provide gender-sensitive policy advice. Gender analysis will be mainstreamed throughout the methodologies and guidance material to be developed so as to ensure an adequate understanding among all stakeholders of how gender issues may impact on the success of development interventions and related policies. Similarly, Result 4 will pay due attention to developing gender-sensitive training material and in developing capacities for gender sensitive analysis and policy responses.

3.5. Stakeholders

The ultimate beneficiaries of the proposed action are the vulnerable populations in regions and countries suffering from acute and chronic food insecurity and malnutrition. The stakeholders will be international, regional and national organizations and governments that will use the outputs/outcomes produced by the proposed Action, while contributing to their development. The three RBAs are the key partners at the global level. Continental and Regional Organizations such as the African Union/NPCA, SADC, CILSS and countries involved in implementing relevant projects/programmes will ensure that tools and policy instruments developed are suited to regional and national contexts and translated into appropriate actions (such as supporting CAADP implementation). The role of different partners in the implementation of the Action, especially at the country level will be further defined during the Inception Phase of the Action.

4. Implementation

4.1. Method of implementation

The Action will be implemented in joint management with the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO), covered by the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) signed with the European Commission.

FAO has been chosen for its recognized comparative advantages in providing global public goods in the area of food security information and for its recognized capacities in fostering governance initiatives in the areas of food security (e.g. CFS and Food Security Cluster) as well as inter-agency joint initiatives (e.g. the IPC).

A Standard Contribution Agreement will be concluded by the Commission and the FAO, and will be compliant with the provisions of Article 43 of the Implementing Rules of the Financial Regulation.
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FAO will conclude Letters of Agreement (LoA) and/or Inter-agency agreements (IAA) with partners, starting with IFAD, IFPRI and WFP for the implementation of the joint activities that will be identified in consultation with the Commission and the other RBAs. By working in partnership with the other Rome Based Agencies and other parties, opportunities for effective action and synergies will be realized.

4.1.1 Implementation set-up

The proposed Action will be implemented by FAO in close collaboration with IFAD and WFP and other relevant partners. Some ten technical divisions of FAO and the Technical Cooperation Department and the Decentralized Offices will be fully involved in the implementation of the Action and responsible for delivery of its results in the context of their respective programmes of work and budget. The existing management and coordination mechanisms in FAO will be applied to the proposed Action, which will be an integral part of the Organization’s Programme of Work and Budget.

Against the background of the renewal of FAO including managing for results and the new partnership strategy and considering the importance of the proposed Action in ensuring that technical outputs are mainstreamed into policy and programmatic actions at global, regional and country levels, the Deputy Directors-General for Knowledge and Operations will assume joint responsibility for coordinating effective management of the Action and realization of its intended outcomes.

A Steering Committee composed by FAO, European Commission, IFAD, WFP and eventually representatives of regional offices will be put in place. The Steering Committee will meet twice per year (once in Brussels and once in Rome) to review and discuss progress made and constraints encountered with ongoing work and to provide strategic guidance on planned actions. The European Commission will chair the Steering Committee and FAO will provide secretarial support.

4.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

All contracts implementing activities under the Action will be awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents provided by FAO.

4.3. Budget and calendar

The indicative budget breakdown is as follows:

Please use EN decimalisation in an EN text (the reverse of FR).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Budget in €</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Supported HLPE and civil society participation mechanism functioning in accordance with their mandates</td>
<td>€3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Food security decision making processes at global, regional and country levels use better information to prevent and/or mitigate the effects of food crises to more effectively address chronic hunger and malnutrition. Relevant actions in selected countries to be identified through calls for</td>
<td>€10,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The activities to be supported by the proposed Action and to be identified in the coming months in a demand-driven manner will be consistent with FAO’s Strategic Framework 2010-19 and Medium-Term Plan 2010-13 and related Strategic Objectives and Organizational Results. They will be complemented by identifiable and measurable results to be produced with funding from FAO’s assessed contributions for a total amount of at least €10m that will be duly described in the reports on the action. These reports will be shared with the Organization’s Governing Bodies through the existing reporting arrangements mechanisms, whereby the Commission’s contribution through the proposed Action will be duly acknowledged.

The Action has an implementation period of **4 years**.

### 4.4. Performance monitoring

Action design, planning and implementation will focus on results rather than activities. The proposed action will be closely monitored and reported to the European Commission but also in the context of the broader, integrated Programme of Work and Budget of FAO, which this action will be part of, and on the basis of key indicators listed in the log frame matrix.

A performance assessment matrix that takes into consideration all the above and that identifies yearly benchmarks towards the achievement of the stated results will be prepared during the Inception Phase and included in the Inception Report. The matrix will allow the Steering Committee to critically assess implementation performance and suggest possible re-orientation of activities. It will be updated every six months and attached to the six monthly progress reports.

### 4.5. Evaluation and verification

The Action will undergo a mid-term review as well as a final evaluation, carried out by independent experts. The proposed action will be subject to verification in accordance with the relevant provisions of the FAFA.
4.6. Communication and visibility

In accordance with the relevant provisions of the FAFA, visibility actions for this programme will be developed following the Joint Visibility Guidelines for European Commission-UN Actions in the Field http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/visibility/index_en.htm. Communication activities will focus on the outputs and impacts of the programme, targeting general and specific audiences in the countries concerned, as well as in the European Union. A detailed communication and visibility plan will be prepared during the inception phase of the programme, in consultation with relevant EU officials at EU headquarters and in the field, identifying key messages, target audiences and a costed work plan of action with clear indicators of achievement. This plan will be aligned with FAO’s corporate communication strategy and it will benefit from existing expertise and facilities in FAO’s Office for Communications and External Relations. The mention of the European Commission and its logo, as appropriate, will be specifically made in every report, paper, publication or press release related to this Action.
ACTION FICHE FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
PRIORITY AREA 2: STRENGTHENED GOVERNANCE APPROACHES FOR FOOD SECURITY "PARTICIPATION FOR GOVERNANCE"

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>Participation for Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>EU contribution: €20 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method/</td>
<td>Call for proposals: centralised management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management mode</td>
<td>Cris n° 2011/023-074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC-code,</td>
<td>52010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applicable</td>
<td>Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. RATIONALE

2.1 Sector Context

Ensuring that all relevant voices are heard in the policy debate on food security and agriculture is now a priority of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS), the United Nations’ forum for reviewing and following up on policies concerning world food security. In the 35th Session in 2009, the members of CFS have agreed on a wide-ranging reform that aims to make CFS the foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform dealing with food security and nutrition. The CFS now has a structure that allows input from all stakeholders, including civil society and in particular organisations representing smallholder farmers, fisherfolks, pastoralists and other vulnerable groups, at global, regional and national levels.

The European Union shares the CFS vision of highly participatory processes towards policies aiming at reducing hunger. The recent Commission Communication "An EU policy framework to assist developing countries in addressing food security challenges" advocates greater support for the participation of civil society and farmer organisations in policy making and research programmes and increased involvement in implementation and evaluation of government programmes. Building on lessons learnt from the first phase of the Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP) and the food security policy framework, the second strategic priority of the revised FSTP strategy for the period 2011-2013 focuses on the importance of strengthening food security governance at various levels. This strategic priority has 4 components:

- Strengthening governance at global level;
- Governance at regional and continental level;

1 See http://www.fao.org/cfs/cfs-home/en/
• Information for governance; and
• Participation for governance.

This action fiche will target the fourth component: participation for governance.

One of the main expected results from increased participation for governance, as defined by the multi-annual indicative programme of the FSTP, is that producers' organisations and their regional/continental platforms and civil society are participating more effectively in decision-making processes related to food security.\(^3\)

Food security governance is the process of decision-making as well as the process by which decisions are implemented with the objective to improve food security in its various dimensions. It is also the process by which competing priorities and interests of different groups can be reconciled. To achieve good governance for food security, practices should\(^4\):

• be participatory;
• build consensus among multiple stakeholders;
• respect the rule of law;
• be efficient and effective;
• contain ways to hold governance actors accountable;
• be transparent;
• be responsive to the needs of various stakeholder groups;
• provide equitable outcomes and be inclusive.

In accordance to the overall FSTP strategy of "improving food security in favour of the poorest and most vulnerable", and the EU objective of advancing the Right to Food\(^5\), this action will foster stronger participation in food security governance of key food security stakeholders belonging to some of the most vulnerable groups, thus calling for a bottom-up approach which will contribute to reducing the risk of these groups being marginalised socially, politically, and economically. A call for proposals is therefore the most adequate modality for this action in order to remain demand-driven and allow a flexible response to the different capacity levels of the potential applicants to the call.

Strengthening local ownership of strategies, programmes and projects, through active participation of key food security stakeholders must be encouraged and supported. In this respect, building their capacity to better analyse and define their own priorities, enhancing their advocacy capacity to defend their interests, and strengthening the creation of networks and alliances contributes to their greater involvement to food security governance.

An increased recognition of the legitimacy of these stakeholders' role in food security governance is of primary importance to better reflect "on the ground" experiences, lessons and needs in national, regional and international policies. Furthermore, the significance of these stakeholders needs to be enhanced in their role as programme

---

\(^3\) [http://ec.europa.eu/development/icecenter/repository/FSTP%202011-2013_Commission%20adoption.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/development/icecenter/repository/FSTP%202011-2013_Commission%20adoption.pdf)

\(^4\) UN ESCAP 2009 [http://www.unescap.org/pdd/prs/ProjectActivities/Ongoing/ee/governance.asp](http://www.unescap.org/pdd/prs/ProjectActivities/Ongoing/ee/governance.asp)

\(^5\) See for example the "Voluntary Guidelines to support the progressive realisation of adequate food in the context of national food security" published by the FAO [http://www.fao.org/righttofood/publi_01_en.htm](http://www.fao.org/righttofood/publi_01_en.htm)
partners and strategic allies to advocate for the promotion of the food security agenda in the international policy dialogue.

2.2. Lessons learnt

Farmers' Organisations

Strengthening Farmers' Organisations, including various types of producers, and their participation in food security governance plays a crucial role because they represent family farming which constitutes, by and large, the most important contribution to food supply in most developing countries and the first source of employment. To meet increasing food supply requirements in developing countries means an enormous challenge for family farming and also opportunities to step out of poverty: in that context, economies of scale, better access to technical knowledge, land, capital and market are clearly advocating smallholders to join and organise themselves.

The increased interest for Farmers' Organisations in the development community, numerous impressive success stories and the process of regional, continental and even global alliances among them are definitely promising but it must not conceal the fact that 1) Farmers' Organisations often have reduced capacities, especially when confronted to issues of regional dimension; 2) there are strong disparities from one country/region/continent to another; 3) some of the Farmers' Organisations are confronted with hostility or ignored by governmental authorities.

Supporting Farmers' Organisations is becoming more of a priority (growing food needs and price volatility are giving clear signals). However, it is essential to avoid certain risks, such as overestimating management capacities and indirectly diverting Farmers' Organisations from their own planning or current activities.

An interesting approach is ongoing with the “Support to Farmers' Organisations in Africa Programme” (SFOAP) for the African continent: the focus on regional platforms and the type of flexible management by International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) is allowing farmers' representatives to use the resources according to their planning and capabilities.

The monitoring report of the SFOAP, the evaluation reports of other actions benefiting directly Farmers' Organisations as PACNOP (Programme d'appui aux coordinations nationales des organisations paysannes) and numerous observations recall the same findings:

- The support to the structuring process among Farmers' Organisations, from local to national, regional, continental, global is highly relevant; it addresses the challenges ahead, particularly in what concerns food security governance. This observation calls for two subsidiary recommendations: 1) where and when it is possible, it is to the Farmers' Organisations.
Organisations structures themselves to "drive" their own support; and 2) the support has to be complementary to the effort undertaken so far and preserve the unity and cohesion among Farmers' Organisations (at national and regional level).

- Farmers' Organisations need **long-term support**, they usually will be working on different processes engaged on different fronts (geared towards their members, their own structure, governmental authorities, regional, international institutions, the donor community, public opinion, etc.). Understandably, they are not usually envisaging their actions as "projects". In this sense, a flexible approach in the logic of intervention is advisable when supporting FO's. Also it must be recognised that the question of financial sustainability remains generally unanswered: if the auto financing efforts can be bearable and sufficient at an early stage of FO's at local or even national level, it is not the case when they are engaged in capacity building at larger scale.

- Farmers' Organisations address numerous and various important domains such as land tenure, relations between different land users such as farmers and livestock holders, national customs systems, value chains, and rural planning, among others. Very often, the support to Farmers' Organisations take place in a project approach where the donor considers that the added value of this partnership can be instrumental in obtaining an objective. In order to avoid the already mentioned risk of diverting Farmers' Organisations from their own courses, the strengthening of Farmers' Organisations capacities can be usefully put at the centre of the support and, consequently, it must take into consideration their different points of interests, the multiple ongoing activities (at local, national and regional levels), the relative lack of information and training as well as of analysis capacity, the need to undertake, systematise and capitalize experiences made at ground level. In short, the support must adapt to the context, the weaknesses and strengths of the Farmers' Organisations.

**Pastoralists**

Pastoralists represent an important population group in many regions of the world, who make specific use of arid and semi-arid ecosystems, characterised by a limited, variable and unpredictable agro-ecological resource endowment. In order to make use of these territories, pastoralists critically rely on mobile livestock rearing – this livelihood strategy distinguishes them from other rural communities. For pastoral communities, livestock represents a primary asset and mobility a critical strategy; pastoral resource management must account for large territorial extension, harsh geographical setting, remoteness, low population density, and cross-border / regional networks and patterns of mobility. For these reasons, pastoralists' organisational structures and community-based institutions differ from those of other land users and have been rarely formalised.

Pastoralists traditionally play an important role in sustaining food security and nutrition levels in many poor countries, through their contribution to the rural as well as the urban populations in terms of animal proteins, micronutrients and vitamins. The capacity of pastoral resource management to produce important food products while
protecting fragile ecosystems, such as drylands, hold important implications for food security in the longer term.

Despite the important contribution of pastoralism to the national and regional economies\(^8\), pastoralists have been traditionally marginalised by mainstream policies, which have often challenged their resource access and mobility patterns. Pastoralists' involvement in representation and decision-making at different policy levels has equally been insufficiently addressed. As a result of years of neglect and poor investments, food and social insecurities together with provision of basic services and facilities are at lowest in pastoral regions.

Climate change represents an important challenge to herding communities; while coping with and adapting to variable and erratic climatic patterns represent traditional components of pastoralists livelihood strategies, food security in pastoral regions will ultimately depend on the capacity of herding communities to adequately access resources and opportunities through enhanced participation in the policy and economic domains.

Experience attest to the fact that building the capacities of community-based herders' organizations, and enhancing their capacity to represents herders' interest in the diverse policy and economic domains represent critical factors to lower the risk of conflict, to enhance access to and overall utilisation of resources and to positively benefit from exchanges with other groups and from market integration dynamics - with important overall implications for sustainable food security patterns. Experience also attests to the consistency of adopting a regional perspective to match the cross-border nature of pastoralist livelihoods and to overcome the neglect these groups often suffer from in the national policy dimensions. Lessons learnt in this regard are being compiled and systematized as part of a reflection within the European Commission.

**Fishers**

Around the world 200 million people rely on the fishery sector for their livelihood, most of them in developing countries. The sector was predominantly governed by a free-access principle. However, the constant decline in fish stocks has forced countries to develop policies and regulations to reduce as far as possible pressure on fish resources. The establishment of fisherfolk organisations is relatively recent and limited. These organisations are mostly involved at local level where they are used to managing common facilities such as landing sites, ice generation and trade. Their representation in policy dialogue both at design and implementation levels is very limited. Involving these organisations in the policy process will ensure their expectations are being taken into account and will facilitate and improve the implementation of regulations.

### 2.3. **Complementary actions**

From the beginning of its cooperation with third countries, the European Union has supported farmers in developing countries through various instruments: rural development projects, several instruments of stability for agricultural export (STABEX,

---

\(^8\) Refer to the IIED report 'Pastoralism: drylands invisible asset ?' - [http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/12534IIEED.pdf](http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/12534IIEED.pdf)
FLEX), research programmes, specific food security programmes (Food Security Thematic Programme, Food Facility), among others.

An ever increasing emphasis on participatory and quality cooperation projects have led to a more systematic involvement of Farmers' Organisations at all stages of operations. As an example, Farmers' Organisations increasing participation is crucial in the EU-funded "All African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Agricultural Commodities Programme" (AAACP). This programme of € 45 million specifically seeks to strengthen the capacity of ACP stakeholders to develop and implement effective commodity strategies in different parts of value chains. ROPPA (Réseau des Organisations Paysannes et des Producteurs Agricoles de l'Afrique de l'Ouest) has become the focal point for West Africa.

The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) emphasises the importance of regional Farmers' Organisations and asks regional economic organisations and national governments to invite Farmers' Organisations to actively participate to the dialogue on sector policies. The EU supports the institutional strengthening of CAADP with an allocation of € 5 million to a multi-donor trust fund established for this purpose.

However, cooperation activities directly targeting Farmers' Organisations are not plentiful. To be mentioned are the PACNOP (Programme d'appui aux coordinations nationales des organisations paysannes) supporting the CNOP-G (Confédération Nationale des Organisations paysannes de Guinée), and the programme SFOAP (Support to Farmers' Organisations in Africa Programme). The latest represents a new step forward in the support of Farmers' Organisations since it aims at increasing the capacities of African regional platforms with the objective of enhancing their support to national Farmers' Organisations and of better structuring farmers' representation at the continental level. The Pan-African Farmers Forum Organisation (PAFFO) was created within this framework in 2010.

As mentioned in the FSTP multi-indicative programme: The strengthening of platforms of Farmers' Organisations, such as those launched in 2007-2010 for African regional platforms, should be continued and broadened to cover other continents too.9

The actions targeting pastoralist, which will be selected through this Call, will insert themselves in broader actions to increase the visibility and participation of pastoralists in regional policy and economic dimensions impacting on their food security. A global knowledge and capacity building network advocating for pastoralism, the World Initiative for Sustainable Pastoralism (WISP)10, was established five years ago, through the collaboration between the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and other UN agencies. Within this framework, minimum standards for sustainable pastoralist development have been developed in order to raise the quality of pastoralist development programming and investment. These standards are currently mainstreamed in actions undertaken by a number of international organisations.

9 FSTP MIP 2011 -2013 (page 23)
10 www.iucn.org/wisp
In 2009, the FSTP supported the International Land Coalition (ILC) through the action "Putting a Pro-poor Land Agenda into Practice: Ensuring Access to and Control over Natural Resources Helps Achieve Food Security", and contributed to the defence of pastoralists' rights, as well as other resource users, and to the increased sharing of knowledge and building of networks with the objective to enhance the participation of stakeholders to decision-making processes within ILC and beyond.

Also, a number of development agencies have started rising the pastoralists' profile in different policy dimensions, for example the EU-funded Regional Pastoral Livelihoods Advocacy Project (REGLAP)\textsuperscript{11}, led by Oxfam. Moreover, the Commission has been active in funding activities that mostly relate to the management of drought events, also with a preventive approach. Experience has shown that closer strategic links are needed between the immediate urgent needs and longer term drought management capacities. Consensus is steadily emerging between a number of highly complementary development discourses, including disaster risk reduction, adaptation and resilience.

In such a framework, the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS)\textsuperscript{12} have been recently developed with the aim to support the design, implementation and assessment of livestock-related interventions - which has specific relevance for assisting pastoral communities. Furthermore, a number of agencies, from USAID and IFAD to CGIAR centres, have recently been involved in defining operational guidelines for Participatory Rangelands Management, an important approach to enhance pastoralists' participation in decision-making on resources which are critical to their food security.

The potential contribution of the fishery sector to food security is recognised more and more both by governments and donors. A major initiative consists of the 2005 Abuja declaration "Fish for All" which proposes a set of measures to develop the sector.

In 2004, the World Bank released announced its re-engagement in fisheries with the publication of a new sector strategy entitled Saving Fish and Fishers where emphasis was given to the shared management of the sector by the government and fishers. In this context the WB launched the new global partnership PROFISH aimed at providing a platform for dialogue among the different stakeholders on controversial issues, such as reducing subsidies in the sector, making foreign access agreements more transparent and equitable, and controlling illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing.

The EU has always supported the fisheries sector, mainly in ACP countries. Whereas this support used to traditionally target small-scale fishermen through projects under EDF, STABEX or the Thematic Budget Lines since mid-2000 the EC has now shifted to a more holistic approach by supporting the development of policies/strategies both at national and regional levels. In 2009 the Commission launched an all-ACP programme of €30 million (ACP FISH II) to improve the sustainable management of fisheries in ACP countries. Since 2005, the EU, through the Fishery Partnership Agreements, also supports this sector development of some fifteen developing countries. Some activities target specifically small-scale fisheries.

\textsuperscript{11} [http://www.elnt-relpa.org/ae sito/hoap n?id cms doc=63]
\textsuperscript{12} [www.livestock-emergency.net/]
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3. Description of the call for proposal(s)

3.1. Basic act and Financing source


The budget line is 21 02 01 for Food Security.

3.2. Objectives of the programme, fields of intervention and expected results

Objectives:

The overall objective of the programme is to increase the participation of key stakeholders in developing countries to decision-making processes related to food security and nutrition.

This action will strengthen the capacities of specific groups (farmers', pastoralists', fishers' organisations) in order for them to reinforce their participation in policy-making, having an impact on food security and nutrition. Better strategic coordination, information sharing, and advocacy capacity of all stakeholders are essential to enhance food security governance. The action will also aim at enhancing the recognition by decision-makers of the legitimacy and importance of empowered stakeholders who can actively participate in policy-making.

To reach these objectives, these stakeholders require increased capacity to ensure their particular needs and priorities are translated into food security policies. Food security policies, strategies and interventions in the field will gain greater coherence and effectiveness.

Fields of intervention:

Several key groups will specifically be targeted through this call for proposals because of the importance of their contribution to enhance food security governance and to lead to improved and better-informed food security decision-making at all levels. Although Farmers' Organisations often also include pastoralists and fishers, this call for proposals will support actions targeting the three groups both separately and together in order to provide ample space for the specific needs of each group: farmers', pastoralists' and fishers’ organisations.

Both existing networks and new networks will be supported at (sub)regional, continental and global level. If necessary, a percentage, to be defined, of the allocation will allow the financing of concrete support activities, provided these play a critical role in enhancing producers organization, networking and advocacy capacities.

The three target groups are the following:

1) Farmers' Organisations

   Strengthening Farmers' Organisations and their participation in food security governance plays a crucial role in enhancing the visibility of smallholder farmers' priorities in order to increase their income, and improve their
resilience and livelihoods. Stronger Farmers' Organisations can increase smallholder farmers' advocacy and mobilisation capacities, as well as enhance their information sharing, coordination, analysis and strategic capacities.

Whenever possible, the preference will be given to existing regional platforms of Farmers' Organisations. According to lessons learned mentioned above, the support will avoid a too strict (narrow minded) interpretation of "governance". Farmers' Organisations are engaged in processes where it could be counterproductive to separate advocacy/policy dialogue from other activities related, for instance, to the support to value chain development among their members. It is very important the presence of Farmer's Organisation in policy dialogue, for their capacities of analysis.

2) **Pastoralists' Organisations**

Several issues are of utmost important for pastoralist communities to establish their own advocacy strategy in order for their needs and interests to be better understood and taken into higher consideration at policy-making level.

As access to the natural resource base (including pasture, water and other resources) is a critical aspect of pastoral livelihood strategies, problems harmonising such access hold the potential to cause conflict and insecurity in these regions. In this regard, a number of diverse dynamics, including climate change, conflict, cereal price soaring and land acquisition schemes, are importantly reshaping access to resources with important implications for patterns of food security governance in pastoral regions. Some pastoral groups have faced specific difficulties in meeting their food security needs in recent years - including Karamoja, Bedouins, Peulhs, Somali and Kuchi.

Opportunities to fairly access markets, add value to their products, expand income generation opportunities and provide options for alternative livelihoods are equally important strategies to enhance food security in pastoral areas. Support to pastoral women groups in these domains has proved as effective and successful in many cases. Modern ways to access animal health, water and feeding also appear increasingly relevant to support food security amongst pastoralists. Appropriate use of recent, innovative technologies (i.e. information communication technologies, renewable energy schemes, etc...) could be of use in supporting pastoralists' capacity to exchange and manage information as well as to access basic services in remote areas and through cross-border networks. These options hold important potentials for overcoming traditional constraints to pastoralists' participation to policy dialogue and economic opportunities.

Enhancing cross-country and regional exchanges provide important opportunities to strengthen the effective capacity of pastoralist communities to engage in the societal dialogue regarding matters relevant to their food security\(^\text{13}\). Given the limited understanding of pastoral systems in most cases, especially on the socio-economic dynamics, it could be advisable to incorporate a focused action-research component whenever feasible.

3) **Fishers’ Organisations**

\(^{13}\) Examples might include ECOWAS and IGAD deliberations in support of cross-border pastoralist mobility.
The major issue for fishers is to make their interests and expectations reflected into the national policies. To this end, fishers' - in particular the poor and vulnerable, and women - participation in organisations should be enhanced, and organisations should be entitled to express their views during the policy process and to do so receive appropriate training related to policy development and management.

If they can be involved during policy design, fishers can also be called during the implementation process. Indeed, their accrued knowledge of and day-to-day contact with the natural resources could be used to feed the policies or the decision-making process. For instance, they could be given a role in monitoring the resources (variation in stock availability).

Fishers evolve in a complex chain of distribution. It is therefore important that they are aware of the different market opportunities and be properly trained (or duly represented) to negotiate with traders. Moreover, loss due to poor processing is an important factor of decreased revenues and food: appropriate techniques and material should be provided to fishers. Fishers' organisations should encompass the whole value-chain of fisheries.

It will be important, whenever possible, to involve local authorities in the implementation of projects. Local authorities need to encourage and support participation in food security governance of the three groups of stakeholders described above. Their capacity to empower these different groups to participate in decision-making by expressing their own needs and priorities is crucial in order to enhance good governance. Local authorities can Farmers' Organisationster social mobilisation and accountability at local level, give access to information, integrate the food security needs of different vulnerable groups into their strategic plans and conciliate various interests.

The following list of \textbf{general expected results is indicative only}:

- Beneficiary organisations, and their networks, are better structured and more active in developing and driving locally owned advocacy strategies;

  \textit{Indicative activity:} Improve the exchange of information, experience and knowledge within beneficiary groups and encourage the building of networks to provide an enhanced framework for best practices and lessons learnt.

- The capacity of beneficiary organisations, and their networks, to improve dialogue with governments and donors concerning food security in national policies is stronger;

  \textit{Indicative activity:} Inform and train beneficiaries with increased capacity in national debates and negotiations concerning food security as well as poverty reduction strategies, including the Right to Food.

- The capacity for reflection and analysis of beneficiaries concerning strategies of food security and the fight against poverty, including the Right to Food, is improved;
**Indicative activity**: Build capacity for accessing and using reliable and timely food security information.

- The needs of food security right-holders, in particular vulnerable people, are better known and the legitimacy of their access to critical resources recognised;

**Indicative activity**: Involve beneficiary organisations to carry out strategic thinking on subjects of interest with regard to food security and encourage the social mobilisation as well as the elaboration of their own advocacy strategies.

- The participation of smallholder farmers, pastoralists, fisherfolk and other targeted beneficiaries in food security policy dialogue is enhanced and more active at national, regional and international levels;

**Indicative activity**: Promote links, alliance building, and cross-country exchanges in order to increase the organisational capacities of beneficiaries;

- National and regional policies are designed in a more inclusive manner, with greater involvement from the targeted beneficiaries.

**Indicative activity**: Reinforce beneficiaries' capacity to better coordinate their actions in order to improve dialogue with governments, parliaments and donors concerning food security in national policies as well as regional/sub-regional policies and relevant institutions.

### 3.3. Eligibility conditions

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

Actions must take place at the regional, continental, or global level across several (at least 3) developing countries eligible under this programme. If duly justified, certain project activities, notably in view of transnational exchanges and for networking/coordination purposes, may take place in other countries.

### 3.4. Essential selection and award criteria

The essential selection and award criteria for the award of grants are laid down in the Practical Guide to contract procedures for EU external actions.

The maximum possible rate of co-financing for grants is 80%. Full financing may only be applied in the cases provided for in Article 253 of the Implementing Rules of the Financial Regulations where financing in full is essential to carry out the action in question.

### 3.5. Schedule of calls for proposals

Indicatively, the call for proposals will be launched during the summer 2011.
3.6. Indicative amount of call for proposals

The indicative amount for the present call for proposal is € 20,000,000 over an implementing period of 5 years. The source of funding is the food security budget line 21 02 01.

4. Support measures

Annual audits and visibility activities will be covered by the budget under the grant contracts to be awarded under the calls for tender.
ACTION FICHE FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
STRATEGIC PRIORITY 3: “ADDRESSING FOOD SECURITY FOR THE POOR AND VULNERABLE IN FRAGILE SITUATIONS”

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Addressing food security for the poor and vulnerable in fragile situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>EU contribution: EUR 99 805 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cris No: 2011/23072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method/Management mode</td>
<td>Calls for proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC code, if applicable</td>
<td>S2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. RATIONALE

2.1 Sector context

This strategic priority addresses food insecurity in exceptional situations at regional, national and sub-national levels, where Commission geographical instruments do not intervene or cannot operate sufficiently in the field of food security. In countries where the Commission is intervening (with the EU-funded humanitarian assistance), the FSTP will contribute to improved coherence and linkage between humanitarian and development interventions. It will also facilitate the Commission’s phasing out strategy regarding EU-funded humanitarian assistance. It will contribute to geographical instruments taking better account of food security and nutrition.

The objective of this component is to achieve a timely and sustainable reduction in the food insecurity of vulnerable groups in exceptional situations of transition and fragility, caused by internal or external factors, thus enabling them to recover from a crisis situation and to take advantage of development opportunities. This will include, among others, support to non-state actors (communities) and local authorities in establishing and operating targeted and flexible social transfer mechanisms, supporting interventions aimed at improving nutrition, managing the agriculture and food security risks faced by the poor and improving their resilience for instance through insurance and access to micro-credit, and programmes addressing integration of smallholders in value chains. Where possible, these interventions will aim to better incorporate food security concerns into the National Development Agenda of the country and, hence, will pave the way for integrating food security as an important priority within the EU/country development cooperation.

This component of the FSTP is particularly geared to the most marginalised and discriminated groups, which are very often the ultra-poor and, hence, food insecure. This strategic priority will operate in a restricted number of countries, characterised by food insecurity and situations of fragility and vulnerability.

By linking relief to rehabilitation and development (LRRD), the aim is to support rural economies and increase the food and nutrition security and resilience of poor rural households through income-generating activities.

In each selected country, the issue of coherence, coordination and complementarity between humanitarian operations and development operations will be tackled through the elaboration of a Joint Humanitarian-Development Framework (involving DG ECHO offices as well
as EU Delegations), in partnership with affected communities and local authorities and, if possible, with other public institutions. Joint Frameworks will aim at providing a shared vision of the crisis (including causes and impacts), a mapping of ongoing initiatives and a coordinated definition of future interventions in transition contexts for enhanced coherence and effectiveness of aid.

2.2 Intervention background and donor coordination related to food security

Donor coordination is at country level, involving consultation with stakeholders at all levels.

African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Countries

The Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) is a country with great agricultural potential. However, the recent armed conflicts, weak administration and few available resources delay the recovery of the sector. The population is poor with an average of less than one USD per day per person (168th and penultimate place ahead of Zimbabwe - Human Development Report UNDP 2010). Production does not cover requirement, imports are significant and involve a high cost of basic foodstuffs in urban centers. The incidence of malnutrition is very high, especially in rural areas, and several territories show severe acute malnutrition rates (> 15% - IFPRI/GHI 2010). 70% of the Congolese population is involved in agricultural sector activities that often do not exceed self-sufficiency levels.

In addition to the EU there are few other donors - Belgian Cooperation (note that Belgium has selected rural development as one of three concentration sectors in its PIC 2010 / 2013 and also provides the co secretariat of the Rural development Thematic coordination group that is chaired by the agriculture Ministry) - World Bank (WB), African Development Bank (ADB), Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) and United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

USAID - involved in agriculture and the amount of external support available covers only a very small portion of needs. The national budget provides less than 1% for agriculture. Support to agriculture is not included in the 10th EDF and only the FSTP allows the EU to take responsibility for actions to revive agriculture and food security.

The current main obstacles to agricultural development in the DRC are numerous and significant, and some go beyond purely agricultural questions to include issues such as land ownership and taxation - both official and unofficial (i.e. corruption). The "World Bank Doing Business Report 2010" places the DRC in 175th place out of 183 countries. The situation is compounded by weaknesses of administration, lack of security, lack of access to micro-credit, impassable roads making for difficult / impossible access to markets, uncontrolled imports and poorly targeted food aid.

The main focus and thrust of EU efforts are shared by those of other donors active in the sector. The country is vast and the incidence of overlapping is low and hardly to be feared.

By focusing on the supply basins of Kinshasa (Bandundu, Bas Congo, South Equateur and Kinshasa provinces), complementarity with the 9th and 10th EDF "infrastructure" programmes (rehabilitation of roads) and the 10th EDF "waterways" programme (riverine access to the capital) is ensured. Ensuring a smooth passage from field to market of agricultural products is an issue of primary importance. Concentration on a limited number of provinces avoids a dilution of funds.

The Commission has also signalled its intention to get involved in a humanitarian aid programme designed to strengthen nutritional rehabilitation in those territories showing acute malnutrition rates above 15% and for a period of two years (2011-2012). The FSTP/RDC programme includes support in two territories (Lodja-Lomela) of the Kasaï Oriental province.
Straightforward FSTP agricultural recovery actions can play an important role in the prevention of malnutrition while ensuring adequate complementarity with EU-funded humanitarian initiatives. An improvement in the basic standards of living is an achievable goal.

In addition, the EU has funded a programme of agro-forestry at Mampu, on the Bateke plateaux, 150 kilometers from the capital. Eight thousands hectares of acacia trees are harvested for charcoal and food production. A recent evaluation of this programme has shown its effectiveness, efficiency and durability, even after cessation of external aid. This model can be reproduced elsewhere. Complementarity between food security and environmental protection is particularly achievable because the experience is still recent and available.

In Haiti, despite the pledges made and the assessment of the government that agriculture is a key sector, it has generally received only moderate attention by donors. One exception is the nascent so-called North Pole programme which aims to develop the region with ambitious plans for infrastructure, the private sector and agriculture. This programme will bring together three major donors, the European Union, the United States and the Inter-American Development bank each financing infrastructure, the private sector and agriculture, respectively.

Chronic food insecurity continues to be an issue throughout the country, and is often linked to structural problems, lack of economic opportunities, and general poverty. Food insecurity continues to be at higher levels than before the earthquake in the directly affected areas, and only slightly decreased since February. Moreover a substantial proportion of the households continue to rely on unsustainable coping strategies, although the prevalence and frequency has dropped since February.

A follow-up Emergency Food Security Assessment (EFSA II) was conducted in June 2010. It found that the prevalence of food insecurity in the areas directly affected by the earthquake had dropped from 52% in February to 39% in June. Access to livelihood activities as well as stabilization of food prices and availability in markets has contributed to this improvement. However, the prevalence of food insecurity remains well above pre-earthquake levels primarily because economic activities have still not reached levels in place before January 2010. There are estimated to be between 2.5 million and 3 million food insecure people nationally in Haiti. Although the prevalence of food insecurity is higher in the directly affected areas than the non-directly affected areas, there are more food insecure people living outside the directly affected areas of the country.

The levels of food insecurity in the camps are similar to those of vulnerable people outside of the camps. In the urban camps, 39% of inhabitants are food insecure. In rural areas, 49% face food insecurity. However camp inhabitants are at risk to future shocks as a result of their lack of household assets.

In parallel, a FAO/ WFP Crop and Food Security Assessment mission was conducted in June/July 2010. The mission found that food production in Haiti is slowly recovering but remains significantly below the levels that existed prior to the January 2010 earthquake. Haiti’s spring harvest, compared to 2009, saw bean production drop by 17% and declines in maize, sorghum and plantain of eight, four and five percent respectively. The total import requirement in the 2010/2011 marketing year is put at 711,000 tonnes (cereal equivalent) of which 525,000 tonnes are expected to be imported commercially. This leaves an uncovered deficit of some 186,000 tonnes.

A joint Ministry of Health/ UNICEF nutrition survey was undertaken between April and June 2010 found that the nutritional situation of infants had not deteriorated thanks to humanitarian
interventions including a blanket supplementary feeding programme for pregnant and lactating mothers and children under five. Nevertheless, 6% of children are acutely malnourished and as many as 31.7% are chronically malnourished. Pregnant and lactating women and children under five continue to remain vulnerable and in need of ongoing assistance programmes.

Although Haiti has suffered many disasters in recent years, 2010 made it the most catastrophic country in the world. The earthquake that struck Haiti on January 12 killing around 225,000 people made it one of the most deadly natural disasters in history. This has been followed by an ongoing cholera epidemic which is now almost nationwide and probably still has to reach its peak. Finally, during this epidemic, the country has been hit in November by hurricane Tomas. Even before 2010, Haiti was classified as the poorest country in the western hemisphere and, even taking into account the massive donations promised at the New York pledging conference on 31 March 2010, it will continue to have this label attached.

Reconstruction of Haiti will take many years. However, the first bricks of reconstruction are being laid and during 2011, the country should move from the stage of total humanitarian relief toward rehabilitation and development. Since the establishment of an ECHO office in Haiti in 2009, relations between the EU Delegation and ECHO have been very positive and many discussions have taken place with a view to identifying means and ways of better coordinating their activities. The Food security Thematic Programme is an excellent instrument for putting these theoretical discussions into practice.

Rural development is a key sector in the view of the Government of Haiti to promote the reconstruction and development of Haiti. In May 2010, the Ministry of Agriculture published its "Plan National d'Investissement Agricole" and with this document donor coordination has a good basis for discussion and taking decisions.

As mentioned in the introduction, the Delegation coordinates effectively with the ECHO office and given that Haiti will benefit in 2011 from the FSTP budget; we expect to link on to certain ongoing ECHO projects.

Three Member States have embassies in Haiti – France, Spain and Germany. To coordinate and plan activities, there are monthly meetings specifically to discuss development cooperation in which the Delegation takes a lead role. The Rural Development and Food Security Section also actively participate in the monthly meeting of the Agriculture Sector Table and other occasional thematic operational seminars and meetings. At a higher level, the Delegation, with other major donors and government, sit at the table of the regular board meetings of the Interim Committee for the Reconstruction of Haiti which must approve all new proposed projects and programmes.

In 2010, following a call for proposal within the framework of the FSTP 2009, the Delegation, with a view to achieving complementarities with other EU-funded activities, specifically indicated that projects geographically located on the North-South axis would be favourably viewed. Such an approach links well with the Commission's largest financial investment project in Haiti - the road from Port-au-Prince to the second city of Cap Haitian.

The logic of the intervention is based on certain clear needs. The need to respond to the devastation of the 2010 earthquake with a primary objective of replacing humanitarian aid with activities linked to sustainable development. The need to be ready to respond with appropriate support should the needs assessment following the November 2010 hurricane (Tomas) deem it necessary. The need to provide enabling support to local populations to benefit from the opening up of new and profitable economic opportunities further sections of the main route linking the two largest cities in Haiti are completed.
Liberia’s economy, institutional, and human capacity were virtually destroyed by the conflict that pervaded the country between 1989 and 2003. More than 270,000 people died, 800,000 people were displaced, and the economy was ruined. The protracted war devastated the country’s basic infrastructure and rendered access to most productive inputs, services, and markets impossible. Public and private institutional capacities, at both the national and local levels, were severely disrupted or destroyed. The political situation has experienced marked improvement since the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement in August 2003. A democratically elected government was formed in 2006, the re-establishment of state authority and rule of law is progressing, and institutions and systems relevant to peace consolidation and national security are being strengthened.

Liberian agriculture comprises food and tree crops, fisheries, and livestock. The sector accounted for 42.2% of real gross domestic product (GDP) in 2008. Approximately 70% of the country’s population depends on agriculture for its livelihood. The sector is a significant contributor to the economy in terms of employment and foreign exchange earnings, and a primary determinant of nutrition, education, poverty reduction, and rural transformation. Approximately half of the population is either food insecure or highly vulnerable to food shortages due in part to low agricultural productivity that in turn is caused by structural impediments, inadequate policies, and prolonged conflicts that displaced farming communities, degraded transport and processing infrastructures, and diminished productive capacities such as assets and skilled personnel. Specific constraints include weak land management and water control systems, limited production intensification and crop diversification, restricted market access due to poor food value chains (i.e., storage, processing, marketing channels, and credit), and low institutional capacity.

The Government’s Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) was finalised in April 2008. The overall goal is for shared, rapid, inclusive, and sustainable economic growth. The PRS is based on four pillars:

I. Consolidating Peace and Security;
II. Revitalizing the Economy;
III. Strengthening Governance and the Rule of Law;
IV. Rehabilitating Infrastructure and Delivering Basic Services.

Agriculture’s contribution to economic recovery is fully recognised. Indeed, the first goal of Pillar II – Revitalizing the Economy – is to revitalize the food and agriculture sector to contribute to shared, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and development, to provide food security and nutrition, increase employment and income, and to measurably reduce poverty.

During 2010, Liberia has prepared a Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) post-Compact investment plan, and subsequently obtained a CAADP technical review report. The Liberia Agriculture Sector Investment Program (LASIP) presents the strategic choices that Liberia has made for agricultural growth and development over the next five years in an environmentally friendly and sustainable manner. It is within this pro-poor, conflict-sensitive context that the LASIP is concentrating its actions and efforts on smallholders with a focus on food crops (rice, cassava, and vegetables) productivity enhancement, value chains development (including market access), and capacity strengthening.

Agriculture Sector Working Group was created in 2010 which includes the donor representatives as USAID, EU, Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), JICA, IFAD and World Bank. This is in line with the Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) which is a strategic framework developed by
African leaders to restore agriculture growth and enhance food security and nutrition and the Liberia Agriculture Sector Investment Programme (LASIP) developed in line with the National Food Security and Nutrition Strategy. The creation of the Agriculture Sector Working Group enhance donor coordination and decrease duplication of activities in the agriculture sector which includes a food security and nutrition security component.

Medium term funding instruments such as the Food Facility and the FSTP are already addressing food security needs in the country, taking over from ECHO who has already closed its food security interventions.

Under the FSTP, various NGOs (Mercy Corps, Concern, Danish Refugee Council (DRC), Association for Fish Farming Development in Africa (APDRA) are implementing projects to improve availability and access to food in the traditional bread basket counties of Liberia (Lofa, Bong and Nimba) and the chronically food insecure areas (South East and Gbarpolu). Additionally, an urban agriculture project is implemented jointly by CARE and WHH in Greater Monrovia, Bomi and Bong addressing food insecurity in urban areas.

The Food Facility is funding the UN and Government of Liberia Joint Programme on Food Security and Nutrition launched in June 2008 and set to run from 2008-2011. Four UN agencies are funded by the Food Facility under the UN and Government of Liberia Joint Programme on Food Security and Nutrition: FAO, WFP, UNDP and UNICEF with a budget of EUR 10.9 million. Through a value chain approach, the UN agencies and the Government of Liberia are increasing the production, productivity, processing capacity and access to market of basic food products such as rice and vegetables mainly in Lofa, Bong and Nimba. In addition to this, the UNICEF project has successfully reduced the acute malnutrition rate in Liberia.

Besides the support to UN agencies, GIZ and Oxfam are improving availability and access to food in Lofa and South east Liberia through Food Facility funding. All these grants and contribution agreements contribute to the improvement of food security and of the nutrition situation in Liberia through support to poor and smallholders producers and farmer based organizations.

**Madagascar** is a rural country where agriculture employs about 80% of Malagasy population and accounts for approximately 47% of GDP of primary sector. Despite the undeniable potential, poor agricultural performance, mostly due to structural weaknesses, is a major cause of rural poverty. Chronic food insecurity in several parts of the country is the most extreme form of multidimensional aspects of poverty that affects Madagascar. Food shortages are both qualitative and quantitative. Indeed, the chronic malnutrition affects 50% of children under 5 years¹ and areas affected by food insecurity are mainly located in South and South East parts of the country.

Furthermore, Madagascar is regularly hit by natural disasters such as recurrent drought cycles in the south, cyclones and floods in south / east. Despite EU sustained efforts over time to strengthen the resilience of the ultra -poor groups (ECHO/DIPECHO programmes, Food Facility, thematic programmes etc.), the level of vulnerability of the poorest continues to deteriorate.

Indeed, the ongoing political crisis affecting the country since early 2009 exacerbated this precarious situation of rural households and increased the number of vulnerable people unable to invest in their farms. Agricultural production which is already heavily dependent on

---

¹ Enquête Démographique et de Santé (EDSMD IV) octobre 2009
climatic hazards has been affected by socio-economic effects of the political crisis due to a dysfunctional public support services to producers. Due to the application article 96 of the Cotonou Agreement 10th EDF funds have been frozen. This programme aims at supporting vulnerable people to improve their food and nutrition situation in the most fragile areas of the country.

In December 2010, a Commission services humanitarian mission visited the south of Madagascar to verify the humanitarian situation in the South following alarming information from the Early Warning System (SAP)\textsuperscript{2}, and the local and international press. Although there were no signs of a humanitarian crisis needing EU intervention, the mission noted that the chronic vulnerability associated with the effects of droughts in 2008 and 2009 is increasing the vulnerability of the population of this extremely poor region, where 66%\textsuperscript{3} of households have a low food consumption score.

The mission recommended the implementation of LRRD actions addressing the structural constraints and supporting food production to prevent future food crises.

To ensure a better and effective monitoring of the situation regarding food security, the mission also recommended strengthening the SAP and to update its methodology.

A "Rural Development and Food Security Donors' group" is active since 2003 and meets monthly to coordinate activities, enhance internal coherence and discuss relevant strategic issues of the sector. The Delegation which chaired the group for 4 years (till the end of 2010) actively participates in these discussions and has played a proactive role in promoting donors' coordination and harmonisation. Furthermore, at the level of UN agencies there is a "cluster on Food Security and Nutrition" in which various stakeholders (NGO, UN agencies, and civil society) meet regularly at both regional and national levels to share information on food and nutrition situation.

An external evaluation of the EU funded programmes supporting Food Security (PASA 2003 – PASA 2004) and Nutrition (PRONUMAD) was recently carried out (December 2010). Its aim was to analyze the performance of 25 NGOs projects and draw lessons from the field. Moreover, several internal/external monitoring and evaluation reports have contributed to identify a number of lessons which will feed future interventions and may be summarized as follows:

- **Enhancing local experiences and adapting to specific conditions (no blue print approach) to ensure sustainability and long term impact;**

- **Flexible and participatory approach is needed in the formulation of food security programmes. All stakeholders, and above all the final beneficiaries, should be involved in the early "needs assessment" to identify the most appropriate strategies and responses to cope with it;**

- **Continuity of assistance to existing and well structured Farmers Organizations at grassroots level allows for quick projects' start-up and facilitates the enhancement of people's resilience to shocks and provides appropriate responses to food insecurity and malnutrition;**

- **Promoting a variety of diversified crops in sufficient quantity (pulses, groundnut and vegetables, cassavas etc.) helps to ensure stable food production and food security and to enhance the incomes of smallholder farmers;**

\textsuperscript{2} SAP: système d'Alerte Précoce

\textsuperscript{3} FAO/PAM évaluation de la sécurité alimentaire à Madagascar nov. 2010
• Small-scale irrigation systems show an interesting cost/benefit ratio to increase production/food availability, contributing to reduce chronic malnutrition;

• Appropriate and functioning social and technical public services at decentralized level for promoting household food security are important to ensure better efficiency and long term sustainability;

• A systematic link between emergency, rehabilitation and development is essential for successful interventions in the field of Food Security;

• Synergies between donors and actors involved in food security and nutrition in Madagascar need be better exploited both at local / regional and national level to capitalize various experiences and allowing for economies of scale;

• Efficient and realistic Monitoring / Evaluation systems have to be established at an early stage of project implementation.

The interventions supported by the FSTP will concentrate in the South where the most fragile population is present. This will be done in coordination with ECHO intervention within a Joint Development Humanitarian Framework.

The institutional situation of Sudan is very peculiar because of the status of Southern Sudan, which will become an independent country by July 2011. Moreover, the EU resumed cooperation with Sudan after the signature of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement in 2005. However, in June 2009, the Government of Sudan decided not to ratify the revised Cotonou Agreement thereby losing access to the 10th EDF. In spite of this, in July 2010 the European Council approved the allocation of EUR 150 million for Sudan (Special Fund for Sudan or “SFS”) in order to support war-affected and vulnerable populations. However, these funds cannot be channelled through the central government institutions.

Sudan has suffered from protracted conflict over the last decades, including ongoing fighting in Darfur, a long civil war between the North and the South ending in 2005 and a conflict in the Eastern region finished in 2006. Overall, the livelihoods of millions of people were affected and continue to be severely disrupted in spite of the peace agreements because both of the fragility of State institutions and the lack of proper infrastructure in most of the post-conflict areas. According to the recent Sudan’s 2010 MDGs Progress Report the proportion of the population below the National poverty line is 45.5% in Northern Sudan and 50.6% in Southern Sudan. Poverty rates vary significantly between states – from three in four people in Northern Bahr el Ghazal state (75.6%) to only one in four people in Upper Nile state (25.7%). Moreover, a recent national baseline household survey categorized food deprivation in Southern Sudan as of very high severity. The same survey showed that food deprivation is also of very high severity in Darfur and the Eastern region and of high severity in the transitional areas (South Kordofan and Blue Nile). War, insecurity and massive displacement in Darfur; and instability linked to the uncertainty of the post-referendum period in the Transitional areas and in Southern Sudan are likely to result in further deterioration of the food security situation. In the East prospects for a sustained peace are better, but the region is increasingly being affected by droughts, which are putting further stress over the food security situation of smallholders and the landless rural population.

Agricultural development with a particular focus on food security has been the main focal sector of the EU’s aid to Sudan since 2005 and will continue to be so within the SFS, as 49% of the funds have been allocated to the sector (EUR 73.5 million). The SFS food security objective is double: (i) to enhance capacity of the decentralized level of the public administration (States) for food security policy formulation, planning and budgeting and (ii) to improve livelihoods of rural smallholders. Actions funded under the FSTP AAP 2011 will
link with the SFS second component, as they will be aimed at increasing rural smallholder production and access to food in counties and localities within the States targeted by the SFS, but not covered by the latter. The FSTP AAP 2011 will also be complementary to the first component of the SFS, as the guidelines for the calls of proposals will require that actions funded are consistent with the states sector plans for the agricultural sector and validated by the relevant states’ line Ministries. These interventions will be programmed, launched and implemented taking into account the new situation created by the split of Sudan into two independent States.

Further to the EU, donor allocations for the rural development sector in the North are low and in most cases limited to a single state. The main donors are Netherlands, Canada, Japan and Italy, with most of the support targeting smallholders’ agricultural production in traditional rain fed areas. Actions funded by FSTP 2011 will include localities in which there are no ongoing programmes funded by other donors and where there are synergies with other ongoing EU funding interventions. These interventions will target the most vulnerable populations in coordination with EU humanitarian interventions.

In Southern Sudan, there is a greater donor involvement particularly from USAID and DFID (starting in 2011). Other donors are the WB-managed Multi Donor Trust Fund (MDTF-S), the Netherlands and Canada. USAID is focused on supporting the transition towards a commercial agriculture in the "green belt" (Western and Central Equatoria), while DFID foresees to fund WFP’s interventions from food aid towards safety nets in areas where stability allows scaling down food aid. Possible actions funded by the AAP 2011 will target smallholders unable to transition towards fully market oriented agriculture but able to increase production and sell a surplus and will therefore be complementary both to USAID and DFID strategies. The EUD Juba office currently chairs a natural resources and rural development donor group that will ensure complementarities among donors’ actions and alignment with Government priorities.

In the South, the Government also lacks capacities for policy formulation and planning, but it has been more forthcoming in the dialogue with donors and highlighted food security as a priority concern within their four component food security strategy including an increased budget allocation to the agricultural sector.

Concerning coordination with EU humanitarian aid, humanitarian projects ready to graduate towards rehabilitation and development actions will be given priority and humanitarian and development intervention will be linked within a Joint Framework. To this effect, the ECHO offices in Khartoum and Juba will be requested to nominate external evaluators for the calls of proposals organized by the Delegation.

**ASIA**

In Afghanistan, a landlocked and mountainous geographical country with nearly three decades of continuous insecurity, the majority of the population is highly vulnerable to shocks. As a consequence, livelihoods are poor and scarce, and a large part of the population lives in food insecurity.

Three quarters of the population live in rural areas, and the economy is largely dependant on the agricultural sector. Nearly 59% of the employed population is engaged in work in agriculture or livestock. With nearly 85% of the population entirely dependent on their livelihoods on agriculture and allied activities like animal husbandry, any impact on agricultural yields is felt across the country. Agricultural production fluctuates significantly from one season to another (with nearly 100% difference between 2008 and 2009 cereal production rates). Although the 2010 harvests were quite satisfactory due to favourable
weather conditions, the technological shortcomings of agriculture in Afghanistan and its vulnerability to external factors contributes to the outbreak of recurrent humanitarian crises which hamper attempts to address root causes. The lack of rains and snow during the current winter (2011) is mobilizing the Government, which is currently establishing contingency plans and schemes with the WFP and other UN agencies.

In a total population of some 26 million, hunger and malnutrition affect 7.3 million people countrywide (28%), with another 5.4 million at risk of falling into food insecurity. In total 48% of the population is either currently experiencing food insecurity or is at risk of facing asset depletion and the weakening of their livelihoods. Market dynamics since autumn 2010 concerning the prices of oil and staple food contribute to a worsening of the food security situation.

With respectively EUR 40 million and EUR 75 million provisioned for the period 2011-2013, Agriculture (irrigation, seeds, livestock, horticulture, change management) and Rural Development are two of the main focal areas of the EU cooperation programme in Afghanistan. The EU has been the main donor contributing to the national production of improved seeds since 2002 (EUR 30 million disbursed to date). The Food Security action in Afghanistan is a complementary mechanism that is integrated into this global strategy and acts as an immediate and multiplier effect in this field.

Coordination efforts in the food security sector are done through the Food Security and Agriculture Cluster (FSAC) which gathers UN agencies (FAO, WFP), most NGOs implementing food security projects (from emergency responses to mid/long-term interventions), and representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock. Apart from the EU, the participation of donors in this cluster is rather limited.

Donor-focused coordination is generally carried out through consultative groups and the Agriculture Task Force chaired by the Minister of Agriculture. Consequently, the links between food security and agriculture are not sufficiently institutionalized and the EU has opportunities to strengthen what should be a more natural collaboration.

While in Afghanistan few agencies remain active in the field of Food Security, the EU will continue to focus its attention on chronic needs and will keep strengthening its approach while ensuring a proper link between FSTP and ECHO actions, targeting specifically acute food security needs. There is close and constant coordination between the Delegation and the ECHO Afghanistan office on food security to ensure that both strategies are coherent and complementary. In fact, all LRRD activities are discussed and selected jointly with ECHO Afghanistan to ensure the transition from relief to development.

In North Korea (DPRK), the humanitarian crisis ended in 2004. Food insecurity is now primarily due to long-term and structural problems. Over the last few years, the nature of the food security issue has also seemed to be shifting from a problem of food availability to one of food accessibility. While the political context of the DPRK gives little room for supporting reform of the sectors involved in food security (and keeping in mind the current EU policy towards the DPRK: no policy reform dialogue, for instance), donors can work at gradually introducing new technical practices. In line with this, implementing LRRD actions as we have over the last few years remains an appropriate approach. Since the 2002 and subsequent Council conclusions and regulations, EU actions are limited to humanitarian aid to which food security is equated. There is no development cooperation with North Korea.

In order to build upon long-standing EU humanitarian support in the DPRK, whenever possible and appropriate, health and water and sanitation are integrated into EU actions funded under the FSTP.
Annual programmes and their scope are discussed with the North Korean authorities (i.e. as many stakeholders and beneficiaries as possible, at various levels), EU Member States (especially those present in the DPRK), other donors and international agencies, as well as with the resident European NGOs. These discussions feed into the actions envisaged under the Annual Work Plans.

In Pakistan, devastating floods in August and September 2010 (up to December in certain areas of Sindh province) were the worst disaster faced by the country in recent history. Relief operations started swiftly funded inter alia by the EU. Up to one fifth of the country’s land area (mostly arable land) was flooded and seed stocks, livestock, agricultural assets were washed away; while 20 million people were affected; 1.8 million houses, tens of thousands of schools and health posts, bridges, roads and irrigation systems were destroyed or damaged beyond repair. The floods badly damaged the rural and agricultural infrastructure and the Kharif (summer) crops. In various areas, land was not accessible or workable for Rabi (winter) planting season. In a positive consequence, much of the agricultural land received rich sediment that will boost the yields in the mid-term if the land can be correctly reclaimed. However, some areas are covered in sands brought by the floods, in particular close to where the rivers broke the protection bunds. Apart from initial food price inflation, prices have now stabilised but remain high and under the threat of the soaring global commodity markets.

The EU has provided EUR 150 million in immediate humanitarian relief implemented through different actors including the UN agencies, Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement and international NGOs. Within this global humanitarian funding, at least 25% have been allocated to food assistance, notably through an alliance of 6 international NGOs gathered in the Pakistan Emergency Food Security Alliance (PEFSA). The PEFSA focused its intervention on targeting the most vulnerable areas to ensure that families could meet basic levels of food consumption, thereby minimizing the risk of asset depletion as a negative coping mechanism. Various needs assessment missions took place: WFP’s Flood Relief Assessment (FRA), UNICEF’s Flood Affected Nutrition Survey (FANS), UNHCR’s Rapid Protection Assessment (RPA), UNOCHA’s Multi-Cluster Rapid Humanitarian Needs Assessment (MCRAM).

On January 7 the Government of Pakistan National Disaster Management Authority announced that by the close of January 2011, the relief phase of the national flood response would officially end (with the exception of 5 districts). However, an estimated 6.2 million people, partly homeless, remain dependent on daily relief assistance. The majority was facing chronic extreme poverty prior to the floods. Sindh and South Punjab in particular are the worst affected areas.

To respond to the early recovery needs and in keeping with the EU strategy of Linking Rehabilitation, Relief and Development (LRRD) it is proposed to follow-up on the EU humanitarian funded relief operations, taking into account the significance of a market analysis - cash transfer approach, targeting Sindh and South Punjab. These two areas are the most affected in terms of both damage to infrastructure and to the pre-existing dwellers' socio-economic status (rural poverty being highest among the majority of landless), as confirmed by shocking rates of malnutrition relative to other parts of the country, with global rates of acute malnutrition existing above the emergency threshold even prior to the floods. Needs assessments continue to highlight income/food and shelter as the two priority issues for the majority of the beneficiaries.

As shelter is not included in the objectives of the FSTP, it will not be addressed in this action.

Other major donors such as DfID or OFDA have been consulted in order to avoid duplication and to guarantee linkage of activities in the target areas. DfID focuses on livelihoods and
mainstreaming of Disaster Risk Reduction in Sindh and Punjab till August 2011. OFDA is active in the WASH, shelter and protection sectors. Both agencies' interventions are time bound and so far do not go beyond the early recovery phase. Both also are only a partial response to the needs.

Taking stock of the lessons learned in the ongoing Food Facility projects activities and the implementation of the first relief emergency phase, recognising the coherence between LRRD and the humanitarian program, considering the objectives and priorities of the FSTP, this program will focus on the food security in transition to development, i.e. with a time horizon of 2 – 4 years, starting in 2011, in Sindh and the south of Punjab provinces.

**ENPI**

The latest surveys indicate that circa 25% of the Occupied Palestinian Territory (OPT) population is food insecure, showing that households are cutting their food and non-food expenditure and that poor families are spending $\frac{2}{3}$ of their income on food items.

Food insecurity, in the OPT, is mainly the result of a lack of adequate income (relatively high rate of unemployment and underemployment) and erosion of livelihoods as a consequence of the current political situation.

Moreover, the current global soaring of food prices and the inflation this might trigger increases the food insecurity. The OPT is a net importer of staple food – nearly 70% of the total staple food is imported and - due to a lack of control on border trade, strategic stock management, agricultural subsidises – the Palestinian Authority has limited capacity to react to soaring food prices.

The agriculture sector keeps playing an important role in the economic and social life of the Palestinian population. It accounts for circa 8% of GDP and 20% of total exports. It provides employment and income -mainly as a second source of income- for circa 140,000 families – or approximately 20% of the population- and remains the main absorber of economic shocks for the most vulnerable.

Palestinians, have a long history of olive and olive-oil production, and nowadays the sector still has both a strategic importance in the economy of the OPT, and a sound export potential. Olive production is widespread -covering circa 50% of the total cultivated area-, practiced mainly by small farmers, and a labour-intensive activity which makes its development crucial for poverty alleviation, food security and to strength farmers' livelihoods. However, the low income generated by the agro-production is also extremely vulnerable to any "shock" such as droughts, death/sickness of a family member, or events related to Israel's occupation practices.

In the OPT, women play a significant role in agriculture and in the backyard food production by providing income and food for their households. Women empowering initiatives are important to support food security and development.

The small and medium farmers targeted by this proposal are extremely vulnerable due to important productivity constraints such as: limited availability of water resources, use of agro-marginal land, lack of credit and appropriate extension services, and the effects of Israel's occupation practices.

The proposed actions under the FSTP are in line with the recently officially launched 'Agriculture Sector Strategy: A Shared Vision' and with the Palestinian National Authority Government Programme where the olive sector and the availability and the sustainable management of the agricultural water are key issues. It also adheres to the recommendations of recent surveys where agriculture related initiatives are considered to be an entry point to
support food security. Finally, a specific strategy for the olive and olive-oil sector is expected to be ready in April 2011 which will provide further guidelines for the programme.

The ongoing coordination amongst the Palestinian National Authority (PNA), donors and NGOs that is taking place in the Thematic Working Group for the Olive Sector, will be enhanced in order to ensure optimal use of the resources allocated to the sector. In addition to this, the EU Representative Office in Jerusalem is bringing together local and international NGOs that are engaged in the sector to exchange information and views about the sector performance. Regular meetings are held with European Commission services in order to look for ways to support and put into practice LRRD in the food security operations.

Finally, the proposed actions under the FSTP 2011 are built upon the successful components of the previous programmes, and by promoting an integrated approach of water management and the treatment of the olive mill waste-water; it will complement other EU activities in this area.

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 of this component is to achieve a timely and sustainable reduction in the food insecurity of vulnerable groups in exceptional situations of transition and fragility, caused by internal or external factors, thus enabling them to recover from a crisis situation and to take advantage of development opportunities.

Interventions will be supported in order to ensure that food security is addressed in an LRRD context. Coordination and harmonisation with humanitarian and geographical instruments (DCI, ENPI, EDF), together with other donor assistance, will have to be ensured with a strategic, joint LRRD framework identifying short and medium term interventions addressing the food insecurity of the poorest and most vulnerable. Such strategies, designed in consultation with local stakeholders and local authorities, where possible, will include the phasing-in/phasing-out of assistance based on reliable information and sound analysis. In this respect, both humanitarian and development actors will have to work closely, adhering to the principles of LRRD.

Under this priority, all four pillars of food security will be addressed, including interventions to protect, maintain, and recover productive assets vital for food security, reduce malnutrition and address vulnerability to shocks and strengthen resilience. It includes, among others, community-based interventions for reducing and/or mitigating risks, support to social transfer mechanisms including safety nets (which will need to be effective, affordable and flexible, allowing for quick expansion in times of crisis), interventions for strengthening the development capacities of communities, and basic socio-economic infrastructures at community level. Increased attention will be paid to nutrition, particularly assisting those for whom appropriate nutrition will have a positive effect on the achievements of MDG 1c

(prevalence of underweight children under five years of age), and MDGs 4 (reducing child mortality) and 5 (improving maternal health).

Where possible, these interventions will aim to better incorporate food security concerns into the National Development Agenda of the country and, hence, will pave the way for integrating food security as an important priority within the EU/country development cooperation.

In terms of approach, priority will be given to projects following on from or complementing current EU-funded sources (Humanitarian, European Development Fund (EDF), Development Co-operation Instrument (DCI), 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 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:

ACP Countries

In the Democratic Republic of Congo, the FSTP strategy for LRRD countries has been addressing for some years certain issues such as poor farmer organization, poor access to quality input, lack of research, nonexistent training and coaching techniques, and insufficient market access networks.

The revival of both production (mainly through distribution of improved seeds and training) and marketing channel organization formed the basic objectives of the last two FSTP DRC calls for proposals. Farmers organizations play a central role in implementation and reinforcement of these was also a major focus.

The involvement of administrative services is examined on a case-by-case basis, depending on the effectiveness of these collaborations. The weakness of the administration makes it difficult for large-scale programmes and projects of medium-scale, implemented by NGOs or IOs, are preferred so as to ensure an impact on target populations.

The FSTP allocation 2011 will allow the following actions:

- **Lot 1**: Continuation of actions launched in the previous AP FSTP (EUR 10 to 15 million): Enhancement of Farmers Organizations, production support and development of distribution networks in the basins supplying Kinshasa.

  Expected results are: Strong, federated and financially autonomous Farmers Organizations, marketing chains managed by the Farmers Organizations federations themselves and for the profit of grassroots membership; Increased production; Increased quantities sold in Kinshasa and more stable prices in urban markets; An increase in producers’ household revenues.

- **Lot 2**: The recovery of agriculture in the territories showing high rates of acute malnutrition as a complement to EU-humanitarian projects (EUR 5 million): Distribution of the basic supplies required for agriculture; Support for producers; Institutional support; Promotion of a balanced diet.

  Expected results are reduced rates of malnutrition; Improved living conditions; enhanced supervision and training of producers.

- **Lot 3**: Agroforestry (EUR 10 million up to EUR 20 million): Planting of acacia in areas of savannah of poor fertility; short-term subsistence farming with production of charcoal in the medium term; positive CO2 effects.
Expected results are: 10,000 hectares laid out and planted with acacia in areas of savannah of poor fertility near big cities; 700 individual self-sufficient farms; 15,000 tons of food crops produced each year during the project; 20,000 tons of charcoal produced each year from year 7.

In Haiti, within the framework of the FSTP 2011, the launching of an LRRD intervention will consider the following but not exclusive approaches. Firstly, it will target the causes of malnutrition and food insecurity. While humanitarian tools can alleviate the symptoms of malnutrition they do not eradicate the causes. Possible FSTP actions will look at increasing food production in terms of quality and diversity and facilitating access to markets for such production. This will lead to higher disposable income from the improved food production stimulating local economies. Secondly, following the earthquake, the EU, other donors and NGOs with funds provided directly to them following the earthquake have invested very large sums providing humanitarian support through wide-scale cash and food for work programmes in the affected zones. These programmes, which by their nature can only be short-term, have certainly improved food security but they cannot be sustainable. (Food aid programmes to populations living in the tent cities have ceased to operate for quite a long period. In addition, EU-funded humanitarian programmes will gradually come to an end during 2011.

The call for proposals within the framework of the FSTP will seek to find innovative solutions to this central issue, primarily in rural areas but also taking into consideration urban areas so as not to exclude urban small-scale agriculture that, given the right approach, could bring very positive results. The geographical regions for intervention need to consider the area affected by the earthquake as well as those rural areas where substantial populations fled in the aftermath of the quake. Hurricane Tomas, with its violent winds and heavy rain devastated certain areas, in particular some commercial crops (bananas), vegetable gardens and certain fishing activities. The assessment of the damage is still ongoing but it could be necessary to consider certain rehabilitation support in affected zones.

Geographic areas for possible interventions at this stage need to be wide, given the ongoing assessment of needs following Tomas. Obvious areas to be considered are greater Port-au Prince, the north-south axe, Artibonite, but at this stage other areas cannot be excluded.

In Liberia, the specific objective of the future call for proposals is to achieve timely and sustainable reduction in the food insecurity of vulnerable groups in the most affected counties of the country, thus enabling them to recover from a crisis situation and take full advantage of development opportunities.

A main focus will be put on supporting the post-conflict recovery phase in areas of high rates of food insecurity, including restoration of and support to livelihood systems, in complement and coordination with the Food Facility interventions.

The main sectors of intervention under this program are those that aim at:

(i) create, maintain and recover productive and social assets vital for food security, to allow economic reintegration and longer-term rehabilitation;

(ii) address vulnerability to shocks and strengthen people’s resilience through support for crisis prevention and management;

(iii) improve food security and nutrition of particularly disadvantaged and marginalised groups; and

(iv) strengthen/consolidate local institutions and emerging central ones.
Improving access to food through broad-based participation in income-generating activities in key agricultural supply chains, together with the development of safety nets that protect the welfare of Liberia’s diverse types of vulnerable individuals and households represent two major food security challenges that will need particular attention.

The FSTP allocation 2011 will allow the following actions as an indicative and non-exhaustive list:

- Actions aimed at improving food production, availability of food products and diversification at local and county level. The applicants are requested to have a critical analysis of the relevance of tools traditionally used in support to agriculture development (farmer field schools, seed multiplication and conservation, food stores etc) before deciding to include them in their proposal. Eventual investments aimed at creating and/or rehabilitating the production, processing and marketing assets of the beneficiaries will fall under this domain of intervention;

- Actions in support to access to markets, including primary transformation of agricultural products, establishing linkages between farmer organizations and private sector or potential clients and farm-to-market roads;

- Actions in support to cash crop production when these are being judged as one of the best avenue for boosting economic/purchasing power of target beneficiaries (economic access to food concept). A commodity-chain approach is highly recommended for the cash crop productions;

- Actions in support to improved nutrition, including, when and where relevant, support to vegetable production or back-yard gardening and back-yard animal production either at households' or schools' level;

- Actions aimed at strengthening the role and capacities of the local institutions directly concerned by the problematic of food security, agricultural development and economic development. This can include for example selected Ministry of Agriculture at central and county level. These actions can include investments (equipment and supplies), staff costs, running costs and capacity-building activities. They have however to directly contribute to the Project’s implementation and objectives;

- Actions supporting the community-based organizations involved directly or indirectly in the food security chain (farmers’ associations, village development committees, cooperatives, processors, marketing structures ...). Here again both investments, staff costs, running costs and/or capacity building activities can be foreseen;

- Actions implementing social transfers in order to develop safety nets that protect the welfare of Liberia’s diverse types of vulnerable individuals and households;

- Actions supporting better environmental awareness and conservation both at the level of actions implemented under the Project and at a larger community/local/county level, including promotion/use of renewable energy. In particular, in areas bordering protected areas, forest reserves or fragile eco-systems, the applicants’ proposal should include in their proposal specific interventions that will relieve pressure on these ecosystems and/or promote their protection, such as the promotion of sustainable harvesting of Non-Timber Forest Products (NFTP).

In Madagascar, the overall objective of the call of proposals will be to contribute to poverty reduction by improving sustainable food security, nutrition, social and economic development among highly vulnerable rural households. It will contribute to further improve
coherence and linkages between humanitarian and development interventions with a specific focus on LRRD.

The first specific objective is to increase agricultural production/availability by promoting adequate and diversified food crops and improving access to food markets, in particular for vulnerable and poor groups. The following list of activities is indicative and not exhaustive:

- Support increase and diversification of food agricultural production /productivity, through appropriate and performing agricultural techniques (biodiversity conservation and soil protection practices etc...). Diversification of food crops with high nutritional value in areas of chronic food insecurity, promoting drought-resistant seeds, as a necessary response to climatic conditions in the South;

- Support strengthening farmers' organizations and producers at local level through training and better access to agricultural inputs and to technical services to improve their food production;

- Implementation of small-scale irrigation with a strong emphasis on appropriate techniques at households' level;

- Improve access to water for agricultural production, by developing sustainable ground-and surface-water resources management systems, including rainwater harvesting;

- Strengthen the capacities of households/farmers organisations/communities and water users, to ensure the sustainability of investments provided.

- Support income generating activities related to agricultural production.

The second specific objective will result in the nutritional status of the most affected and vulnerable social groups being improved at community level by preventive actions and by means of better food quality and use in areas with high malnutrition rate. The following list of activities is indicative and not exhaustive:

- Provide training and knowledge sharing on preventive actions focused on improving the nutrition status of children under five, mothers and school children in areas of chronic food insecurity;

- Support awareness and prevention campaign to improve hygiene and nutrition behavior;

- Support the improvement of the quality and use of appropriate food for the poorest.

The beneficiaries will be fully involved in all phases of the programme cycle through a participatory approach, to ensure their full ownership and the long term sustainability of the programme. A system for monitoring and evaluation will be defined for each project to measure impact of actions

Sudan is included in the category of countries in particularly fragile situations within Group 1 of the new 2011-2013 MIP, alongside other countries with no EU cooperation in place. In line with the MIP 2011-2013, the objective of the FSTP in Sudan will be to help achieve the first MDG by improving food security for the poorest and most vulnerable in conflict affected areas of Southern Sudan, the Transitional Areas, Darfur and the Eastern region. Bearing in mind the independence of the South on the 9th of July, the total allocation for Sudan will be divided in two lots, each of them being allocated 50% of the overall budget.

The AAP 2011 will target areas affected by conflict were prevalence of food deprivation is of high severity and above (>20%) and where complementarities with ongoing and planned EU interventions are possible. Particular attention will be given at complementarities with the agricultural development component of the Special Fund for Sudan. In the North, Darfur and
the Eastern region as well as the States of Blue Nile and South Kordofan will be eligible. Localities in which there are synergies with other EU-funded actions will be given priority. In the South, all States will be eligible. The FSTP 2011 allocation to Sudan will contribute to improve food security in these areas by funding actions aimed at:

- Increasing rural smallholders' production (crop production, livestock, and fisheries) as well as their access to markets. Actions including a component strengthening local government authorities' capacity to deliver rural services to smallholders will be given priority. The same will apply for actions which include a nutritional dimension, particularly diversifying smallholder agricultural production in order to improve the quality of the nutritional intake;

- Increasing access to food of landless rural population by identifying income generating opportunities.

Actions mainstreaming the strengthening of smallholders' resilience against shocks and those supporting local NGO capacity to become active stakeholders in food security advocacy, planning, coordination and policy elaboration could also be funded.

**ASIA**

In **Afghanistan**, the European Union, through an additional contribution of EUR 6 million, will continue to support community-level livelihood recovery programmes in specific areas. The EU will seek to support further interventions aiming for long-term impact through the recovery and stabilisation of livelihood systems in Afghanistan. The objective of this programme is to increase the food security of vulnerable households by implementing actions to sustainably increase food production, consolidate livelihood strategies and outcomes, and enhance the resilience of targeted communities to alleviate their vulnerability to shocks.

A strong focus for the action will be communities living in rural areas. Another goal pursued with this additional contribution is to support the efforts of our NGO partners at field level for strengthening both food availability and access in a middle term period as well as stabilizing the food security indicators in the areas of work. As such and when relevant, the EU will capitalize on already acquired lessons learnt on former or ending EU funded programmes, with an aim of strengthening the results already achieved.

As regards, coordination with humanitarian assistance, there is room for strengthening a specific technical dialogue especially on social protection issues, with the final objective of bringing better solutions for stabilizing food consumption and preserving the assets of the most vulnerable people among the chronically food insecure.

On the results already achieved at field level, projects currently developed under the Food Facility and others resulting from the call launched under the FSTP 2008 should be continued through the LRRD 2011. These projects, aimed at targeting chronically food insecure populations, insist on aspects such as the increasing of the local agricultural production, the enhancement and preservation of households' productive assets, as well as the strengthening of local management structures for water systems, grain/ seeds banks, income generation activities based on market approaches.

Already engaged within the LRRD 2010, the LRRD 2011 will continue to work with field partners on better measuring and evaluating the achievements and the sustainability of the programmes proposed. Efforts will be made on pursuing a better quantification of the results achieved at field level as for example concerning local agricultural production, the enhancement of livelihood alternatives and enhanced management of local structures.
In North Korea (DPRK), the fields and type of actions envisaged under this Action Plan were discussed with, and endorsed by, DPRK authorities under the AAP 2010. Considering the current food security situation and country context, further support to these fields of intervention is fully justified. Furthermore, they are not in contradiction with the DPRK policy guidelines published in this year's Joint Editorial.

Moreover, the list of areas of actions given below is indicative, and the Annual Action Plan will be discussed with the DPRK authorities during forthcoming missions by Commission services.

Since it is acknowledged that the food situation is more fragile in urban than in rural areas, and since access to food seems to become more of an issue in the DPRK, the programme will continue to cover both rural and urban areas. To address the social pockets of vulnerability, and considering that foreigners have restricted access to households, we will also continue working with social and health institutions.

As mentioned above, the needs and actions envisaged here will be further discussed with all stakeholders, and with donors and organisations active in the country while preparing the call for proposals.

The objectives for 2011 are:

- Contributing to stabilising food production and availability by further building and strengthening the resilience of cooperative farms, and communities, and to improving their access to food; and

- Strengthening the capacity of North Korean institutions involved in food security to tackle the current issues and initiate the required changes. This second component focuses on exposing North Koreans to international partners and practices; an approach which is supported by most EU Member States and other donors.

- As mentioned above, we will try to further the discussion on access to food. It must be noted however that this is an extremely sensitive subject in the DPRK; and it will therefore likely have to be approached indirectly -as we do when addressing nutrition via food processing, which, contrary to nutrition, is a national priority.

The 2011 Annual Action Plan will cover projects, which, in line with the above-mentioned objectives, will be of two types:

1) Community-based projects: will target cooperative farms and communities, health and social institutions, small factories, city or county-level communities and facilities, etc. Given the importance of the agricultural production that is grown on slopes, the subsequent erosion and risk of recurrent flooding, disaster prevention/reduction and environmental protection will, as much as possible and whenever suitable, be integrated into project design. As much as possible, issues such as income generation, the rights of people with disabilities and gender equality will also be covered.

2) Partnership projects: will aim to build and/or strengthen the technical and institutional capacity of Korean scientific and technical institutes, academies, universities, ministry departments, federations, etc. dealing with food security by initiating or pursuing contacts with foreign counterparts.

In line with the above, indicative areas of action will focus on community-based and small partnership projects aiming at improving the nutritional status of the most vulnerable groups, the resilience of communities/cooperative farms, at rehabilitating or strengthening the country's production capacity, and, as much as possible, to look into improving access to
food. This list will be further adapted to reflect the ongoing discussions held with the Korean authorities and consultations with other donors and actors present in the country: soil fertility / crop production / plant nutrition; horticulture; livestock development; fish farming; pest management / organic pesticides / IPM; organic agriculture; post-harvest treatment, farm management, food processing (cooperative/county or dong level); natural resources protection / management; urban agriculture; sustainable renewable energies; nutrition; water and sanitation.

In Pakistan, restoration of livelihoods on- and off-farm) and/or restoration of food security are major concerns of flood affected populations. Therefore, the objective of the FSTP-funded action is to decrease food insecurity and malnutrition of the flood affected populations (in particular female-headed households, small and landless farmers).

Expected results include restoration of livelihoods to pre-flood levels, incorporating elements of disaster risk reduction, and a significant reduction of malnutrition especially in under 5 years old population.

Fields of intervention may include but are not limited to the following social and economic measures with a dual focus on targeting of the most vulnerable in flood affected areas, while ensuring community based planning as the core intervention logic:

- Regular social transfers as a tool to reduce inequalities and to increase access to food thereby protecting productive assets and freeing up resources for small scale investments;
- On-farm and off-farm income generation;
- Improving resilience of the most vulnerable to future monsoon floods;
- Rehabilitation of community physical infrastructure (schools, health units, etc);
- Empowerment of women as key agents to improve household food security, health and nutrition status through targeted and appropriate capacity building on agricultural, and nutritional practices;
- Agricultural production;
- Awareness raising on nutritional issues, including assessment of evolution of nutritional value of food over the project period;
- Capacity-building of local implementing partners and authorities on the management of food assistance programmes, including social protection).

Potential partners include the 9 members of the Pakistan Rural Support Programme Network and international NGOS and their partners.

**European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI)**

The general objective of the programme in the Occupied Palestinian Territory will be to reduce food insecurity and protect the livelihoods of subsistence and small-scale olive-farmers in the occupied Palestinian territory.

The programme's specific objective will be to support the value chain of the olive and olive-oil sector, in particular by:

- Providing capacity building to the institutional sector framework to enhance its ability to develop policies and regulations and ensure their enforcement in view of creating a favourable business and investment environment;
- Introducing good agricultural pre- and post- harvest practices to improve the productivity and the quality of the olive-oil, and techniques to reduce the environmental impact of the olive-mill wastewater;
• Promoting the adoption of an integrated approach to water management in order to increase water availability and improve demand-management of water in agriculture; and
• Promoting and developing the export of olive-oil.

Main fields of intervention are:
• Agricultural and water management technical assistance (including: effective water harvesting, conservation and transportation; water utilisation efficiency – soil moisture monitoring, irrigation scheduling; water productivity – integrated cropping; etc.);
• Construction or improvement of rain-water harvesting and storage facilities and canals;
• Management and technical training (including: development of market skills and technical knowledge specifically for women);
• Institutional capacity-building activities; and
• Market promotion and development activities.

The programme will pay attention to targeting the small-scale and subsistence farmers and covering those geographic areas where food insecurity levels are worst. Moreover, the programme will especially target women, by empowering their role in the agriculture sector.

3.3 Risks and assumptions

Risks and assumptions vary depending on specific local conditions.

ACP Countries

In the Democratic Republic of Congo, the best results will be achieved under conditions of improved security and better governance. The presidential and general elections should take place in 2011 or 2012 and the security situation may suffer as a result. The undertaking of projects in those provinces currently stable reduces the risk. The progressive involvement of local government – on a case-by-case basis - also reduces the risk of these funds not reaching their ultimate beneficiaries, namely, the rural people.

Haiti has been a fragile country for many years and this fragility has increased substantially during 2010 due to several events - the destructive earthquake in January, an ongoing nationwide severe and deadly cholera epidemic and, at the present time, a breakdown in the present Presidential election process. Each of these events continues to be a risk and together will probably have negative effects on the population for many months to come.

Political stability and national security has been basically assured by MINUSTAH (Mission Nations Unies pour la Stabilité d'Haiti) since 2004. It is assumed that this will continue to be the case and the present mission is guaranteed to remain in place until at least October 2011. In addition, following the devastating earthquake of January 2010, the international community has committed itself with very large financial pledges to reconstruct the country and to ensure that Haiti no longer remains the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere by a large margin. This involvement of the international community can be assumed as an important and positive factor. Finally, despite the problems that afflict Haiti on a regular basis, implementation of development activities has always continued and it is assumed that this situation will persist.

In Liberia, the main risks relate to the political and security situation of the country that could be compounded by the general elections in 2011. However, the political and security situation has improved since the inauguration of the new Government and progressively consolidated with the support of the international community. Political stability should further induce the social and economic stability required for the implementation of this Programme.
The main assumptions are:

- There is consistency with the other initiatives on agricultural development and food security funded by other donors such as African development bank, World Bank, IFAD, USAid and Sida.
- The Government of Liberia develop appropriate policies at the macro-economic level, on trade issues and on agricultural development.
- The Government of Liberia is open to continue a frank dialogue and negotiations with the European Commission and other development partners.
- The environmental risks linked to agricultural development will need to be addressed.
- The same applies to potential health risks.
- Finally the proposals will need to take into consideration the cultural and/religious preferences of the populations as these could lead to program rejection and even potential conflicts.

In Madagascar, political and social unrests may affect the implementation of the programme. This risk should be mitigated by the actions of the programme contributing to social cohesion and food security stability. It is assumed that farmer organizations and decentralized stakeholders will be able to mobilise community participation and promote active involvement of beneficiaries during planning and implementation of activities and security and access conditions are improved in the country and allow full access for effective implementation and monitoring. Overall, natural disasters (hurricanes, drought) may affect the impact of the program, but the degree of this risk is not foreseeable.

In Sudan, the main risks are the following:

- Insecurity increasing throughout the Southern states and the transitional areas as a consequence of the referendum and resulting on displacement of population and/or reduced access to targeted geographical areas;
- Failure of the Government strategy for Darfur, resulting in increased criminality and/or conflict that restrict international presence in the region;
- Government directly or indirectly restricting access to NGOs and International Organizations in targeted geographical areas;
- Partners experiencing difficulties in recruiting and retaining qualified technical personnel, in particular in South Sudan.

It is assumed that both North and South Governments remain committed to the peace process and that political stability and security prevails both in North (Darfur, East, Transitional areas) and Southern Sudan during the post-referendum period.

Asia

In terms of risk in Afghanistan, insecurity and an increased violence in certain rural areas that were previously calm are factors to be considered. Opium smuggling and potential natural disasters represent as well threats to development efforts. Other risks derive from the social status of women and child labour.

In North Korea, the interventions will be launched with the main assumptions that the DPRK authorities:

- Cooperate with, and second suitable technical local staff to, the EUPS and visiting project partners during the whole project cycle;
- Allow for 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, as per the terms of the Financing Agreements;

- Remains constructive and open-minded in exploring new geographic and technical areas of interventions 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 concerns the deterioration of the political situation and worsening of operational/implementation context/conditions for the EU, EUPS and other implementing organisations in the DPRK.

In Pakistan, the main risks and the corresponding measure to mitigate or accept the risks are the following:

- Political instability and security situation. Counter-measures envisaged: Contingency plans, reduction of mobility;
- Provincial and communities' interest and priorities in participating in the action. This risk is considered to be low. Counter-measures envisaged: Capacity-building activities at the grassroots level; strong and broad partnership with local government and grassroots organisations
- Discrimination of vulnerable groups in beneficiaries targeting and selection is considered high in the light of the 2010 relief operations. Counter-measures envisaged: Strong emphasis on capacity building of community leaders and local authorities will be essential.

ENPI

In the Occupied Palestinian Territory, the main risks for the implementation of the projects that will stem from the call for proposals (CfPs) are the deterioration of the political relations with Israel and of the political situation within the OPT. However, the possibility of occurrence is considered low. In order to minimize this risk, the CfPs' guidelines will request that the project design permits flexibility during the implementation and includes appropriate monitoring and reporting mechanisms.

### 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 Regulation 2342/2002 as last amended by Commission Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 478/2007).

### 3.5 Essential selection and award criteria

The actions will be selected on the basis of a call for proposals launched by the relevant European Union Delegations in the different countries and by Commission headquarters in the case of North Korea.

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 EU external actions⁵.

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 2011. Delegations are responsible for the preparation and launching of their respective call. Delegations can choose to include the allocation FSTP 2012, if available, to the total amount of the call and thus launch a single call for two budgetary years.

3.7 Indicative amounts

The total indicative amount for the calls for proposals to be launched by the EU Delegations is €99,805,700 from 2011 appropriations. The indicative amounts per country are listed below. The source of funding is the food security budget line 21 02 01.

Subject to the adoption of the 2012 General Budget of the European Union by the budgetary authority, an additional amount from budget item 21 02 01 of the 2012 budget will be added to finance selected projects under these calls for proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Amount in €</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>22 805 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>6 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>4 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>8 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>11 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>6 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>7 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>30 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENPI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Palestinian Territories</td>
<td>5 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>99 805 700</strong></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.
ACTION FICHE FOR OCCUPIED PALESTINIAN TERRITORY (2011)

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Support to the UNRWA Social Safety Net Programme (SSNP) in the West Bank, Gaza Strip, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>€ 5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method / Management mode</td>
<td>Project approach – joint management with an international organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC-code</td>
<td>52010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Food Security Assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

The EU has been an important donor to the UN Relief and Works Agency for xxx (UNRWA), the average annual contribution per year exceeds €100 million (last 11 years average). In 2010, the EU’s contribution, including bilateral contributions by its Member States, represented almost 60% of all donor support to UNRWA’s regular (core) budget and almost 50% of all contributions to the Agency’s overall operations including emergency appeals and specific projects and programmes. As such, the EU is the largest provider of international assistance to Palestine refugees.

As of the end of 2009, about 4.76 million refugees were registered with UNRWA across five fields of its operations. In 2010, the Agency’s Social Safety Net programme (SSNP), which consists mainly in providing registered Social Hardship Case (SHCs) beneficiaries with a yearly allocation composed of food in-kind and cash subsidy, provided in-kind food assistance to 272,358 registered Palestine refugee SHC beneficiaries across the five fields. According to latest estimates, the annual cost of the food basket distributed amounted to $70 before the global increase in food prices. Today the cost of the same food basket has increased to $101; while the annual cash subsidy remained at $40. Accordingly, the total assistance provided per beneficiary per annum has increased from $110 to $141 (equivalent to €108²). In addition, the total annual extreme poverty gap in 2010 for the five fields is approximately €13 million with an annual per capita average of €102. UNRWA estimates that the cost of its SSNP for 2011 will amount to €42 million: €15.7 million food-in-kind, €9.4 in cash allowances, and €13.4 million additional cash subsidies to bridge the extreme poverty³ gap)

---

¹ Most of UNRWA’s regular budget is used to pay salaries of its 30,000 staff (teachers, doctors, nurses and social workers) most of whom are Palestine refugees themselves.

² Based on an exchange rate of USD 1= EUR 0.764 (UN exchange rate of November 2010).

³ Extreme poor are those who cannot meet their minimal nutrition requirements.
Over the past two years the price of basic food commodities provided by the Agency has doubled, particularly in oPt (the occupied Palestinian territory). The prevailing political and socio-economic conditions and the Israeli government’s strict restrictions on movement and access of people and goods has driven Palestinian refugees, living in the oPt, deeper into poverty. The latest available information on poverty levels indicate that household poverty rates soared to 51.8 in Gaza and 19.1% in the West Bank in 2007 (World Bank, February 2010, page 18)\(^4\), while unemployment rates rose to 40.6% in Gaza and 19% in the West Bank in 2008, (Ibid.). In Lebanon, 66% of the refugee population are poor and 6.6% are extremely poor according to the latest UNRWA-AUB (American University of Beirut) socio-economic survey conducted among the refugee population during the summer of 2010. In Jordan, according to the 2009 new poverty study by the Department of Statistics in Jordan, 13% of the population live below the absolute poverty line of USD 960 per capita per year. In Syria, the refugee community benefits from a relatively open policy permitting full access to governmental services and to the labour market. However, refugee families have little chance to have access to financial resources and do not benefit from any social safety net apart from the assistance provided by UNRWA. As the situation has remained relatively unchanged, it is likely that current coping mechanisms may soon be depleted. In that context, the blunt increase of food products on the international market had a high impact on the poorest households who are highly dependant on food aid delivered by international organisations and UNRWA in particular as far as oPt is concerned.

One third of West Bank households and 71% of households in the Gaza Strip received food assistance in the second half of 2008. Food accounts for approximately one half of total household expenditures, making families highly susceptible to variations in food prices and income levels. According to the results of a joint UN rapid food security survey published in May 2008, 38% of the Palestinian population is food insecure (compared to 34% in 2006). Food insecurity in the Gaza Strip is more widespread, reaching 56%, and in the West Bank it is 25%. Food insecurity is higher among refugees (44%) compared to non refugees (33%) however, both population groups faced a similar increase (10%) in their food insecurity in the past two years. Food insecurity reaches 50% in camps.\(^5\)

Since the end of 2009, UNRWA’s SSNP in the West Bank caters to the needs of 35,473 SHCs (30 percent of whom live in extreme poverty) while in the Gaza Strip the number of SHCs benefiting from the programme is 93,666 SHCs (65.9 percent of whom live below the extreme poverty line). Jordan, Syria and Lebanon to a lesser extent, provide more stable environments, yet, here as in the West Bank and Gaza fields, the number of vulnerable SHCs is of concern. In Lebanon, 50,951 registered SHCs (out of which an alarming 25,747 live below the extreme poverty line) are dependent on the Agency for daily subsistence. In Jordan 51,277 (of which 10,990 live below the extreme poverty line) and Syria 34,080 registered SHCs (of which 10,762 live below the extreme poverty line) are reliant on the Agency’s SSNP.

\(^4\) World Bank (February, 2010) “Checkpoints and Barriers: Searching for Livelihood in the West Bank and Gaza, Gender Dimensions of Economic Collapse”. The World Bank, Sustainable Development Department, Middle East Region and North Africa, Washington, D.C.

Within this context, the Agency started to reform its SHC programme. This was to increase its effectiveness, outreach and equity for the most vulnerable Palestine refugees across five fields. The existing context (increasing poverty due to the political situation and soaring food prices) fully justifies implementing the reform. The reform intends to create a social safety net (SSN) that aims to alleviate poverty among the refugees with particular emphasis on the extreme poor (poorest of the poor). Those identified as such will receive additional cash subsidies (Family Income Supplement - FIS) to cover their extreme poverty gap (food poverty gap). However, the implementation of the FIS placed additional financial burden on the Agency, which requires increased and sustained financial donor support.

Prior to the decision to use the Food Security thematic programme in support of the UNRWA Social Safety Net Programme as proposed within this fiche, alternative options were taken into serious consideration particularly within the EU's annual support to the Agency's regular budget. However, with a critical operational deficit of USD 60 million within UNRWA's 2011 regular budget largely needed to pay salaries and provide core services, the Agency's budgetary shortfall is seriously limiting the Agency's capacity to address the bare minimum of refugee needs particularly for those who need these services the most. UNRWA's regular budget is virtually completely dependant on voluntary contributions from donors while its costs are highly fixed (85% of expenditure is allocated to its labour force of approx. 30,000 staff). Moreover, the Agency has a very limited margin for manoeuvre when it comes to making decisions over where further cost reductions can be made. Ultimately the decisions on what to cut, freeze or reduce are limited to those budget lines with no staff component (i.e. services). From a political view point, any reductions in staff would be extremely detrimental and would give rise to serious unrest in refugee communities and lead to potential staff strikes. Moreover from a cash flow point of view, any staff reductions would involve greater cash outflows as the Agency would be compelled to pay service benefits, a luxury it cannot afford.

The proposed intervention is a support of an ongoing programme; a programme that has existed since the Agency was established in 1950. The proposed action falls under the scope and objectives of the Food Security Multiannual Indicative Programme (FSMIP):

>To improve food security in favour of the poorest and most vulnerable and contribute to achieving MDG 1, through a set of actions which ensure overall coherence, complementarity and continuity of EU interventions, including in the area of transition from relief to development as well as in particularly fragile situations.

The aim of this intervention is to address food insecurity among the Palestine refugee population and is an exceptional situation, where the Commission geographical instruments, predominately the EU's support to UNRWA's regular budget, cannot operate sufficiently or conclusively in the field of food security as previously mentioned.

As the context affecting Palestine refugees is a protracted and political crisis and continues to be characterised by food insecurity and situations of fragility and vulnerability, therefore support of UNRWA's Social Safety Net Programme using the
Food security instrument is clearly in line with this component of the food security thematic programme and is particularly geared to the most marginalised and discriminated groups, which are very often the ultra-poor and, hence, food insecure.

The proposed action targets the social safety net implemented by UNRWA. Cash and/or food transfers will reach the poorest refugee families in Gaza, West Bank, Lebanon, Syria and Jordan (which account for approximately 6% of the entire refugee population).

The proposed intervention intends to complement the already available resources allocated to provide assistance to refugees through the SSN programme including the most recent €21.6 million allocation to the cPt made available through the Food Facility Instrument. In concrete terms, the €5 million will be utilized to comprehensively address the basic food security needs, in terms of food in-kind and additional cash assistance, for the most vulnerable Palestine refugees in Gaza, the West Bank, Jordan, Syria and Lebanon and will be earmarked within UNRWA’s Social Safety Net Programme for this purpose.

2.2. Lessons learnt

Since its establishment in 1950, UNRWA has become identified as the “quasi government” structure for Palestinians living in refuge in UNRWA’s fields of operation. Its mandate is to provide services to refugees which would otherwise be provided by a government body. Originally these services encompassed Relief provision and Public Works, but in order to support refugees effectively in the context of long-term political uncertainty, it has become increasingly necessary to adopt a ‘long term development’ as opposed to a ‘relief’ approach which has now committed to within the Agency’s Medium Term Strategy (2010-2015). However, the importance of UNRWA’s continued assistance to refugees is about more than just its services, but marks the lack of an acceptable solution to the plight of the Palestine refugees. For this reason, attempts to change UNRWA’s role are often strongly resisted.

The present project will build on the results achieved so far by the SSN programme. The EU has been substantively supporting the SSN programme, previously referred to as the SHC programme, for several years and its reform since the end of 2005. Therefore, the SSN programme is the product of a reform process and has actually not yet reached its full implementation stage.

This reform mainly consists of modifying the targeting system of the Agency’s Social Safety Net, shifting from a status-based approach to a poverty-based approach. Accordingly a poverty screening survey was conducted in the five fields during 2008 & 2009 for all SHC families to identify the extreme poor among the SHC population. As a result, a total of 31,084 extreme SSN families in the five fields received a Family Income Supplement (FIS) to bridge their poverty gap in 2009. Following the successful piloting of the SSN database module in Jordan during the fourth quarter of 2010 and based on the lessons learned from this pilot, the full implementation of the poverty-based approach will start during the first quarter of 2011 in the five fields.
As part of the Agency's comprehensive programmatic reforms, the SSN programme was evaluated as part of the overall programme review of Relief and Social Services (RSS) Department with concrete recommendations provided. Many of these recommendations have already been taken on board - some points are already being addressed while others will be addressed in the near future.

In addition, the latest European Commission External Review of UNRWA's programmes, which was conducted late in 2010, has also taken a close look at the SSNP and provided recommendations particularly in relation to the programme's performance.

Finally, the SSNP has been subject to an external evaluation by the EC in 2009. Many of the report's recommendations are being taken into consideration in the Agency's next phase of reforms referred to as UNRWA's Sustaining Change Plan.

2.3. Complementary actions

Since 1971, the EU has contributed annually to UNRWA's Regular Budget. In 2010, the EU contributed € 86 million in support of the Agency's basic health, education, relief and social services programmes. This funding is used primarily to cover the Agency's crucial core programme services in the areas of Health, Education, Relief and Social Services and is essentially used to pay salaries for teachers, doctors and social workers active in the refugee camps. Moreover, UNRWA has committed itself to the concept of prioritization, therefore it is expected that the Agency take additional steps to further prioritise services with a clear focus on the most vulnerable Palestine refugees as stipulated in UNRWA's 2010-2015 Medium Term Strategy. However, successive funding shortages and subsequent austerity measures and cost reductions have prevented programmes from expanding in tandem with the growth in the refugee population. This has led to the reduction of ongoing programme activities and precluded certain activities which normally would be part of UNRWA's regular programme of work.

Parallel to essential financial contributions to the Agency, the EU actively supports the ongoing UNRWA's reforms.

The EU has also been the largest donor of food and cash assistance to UNRWA's SSN Programme the most recent of which has been the EU's 2009 contribution of €39.7 million\(^6\) to fund the majority of the programme's financial needs for 2009 and 2010 for the whole of the occupied Palestinian territory.

Besides supporting UNRWA's general fund, the EU continues to provide support, including EU humanitarian funding, to a number of extra-budgetary special emergency appeals and projects. In 2010, a total of €14.7 million was earmarked to UNRWA in support of UNRWA's humanitarian services provided to Palestine refugees.

---

\(^6\) The funds come from a special €1 billion Food Facility which was created in 2008 by the EU to help developing countries to deal with crises in the face of rising worldwide food prices.
The European Commission's mandate of providing humanitarian support in a protracted crisis situation as is the case among the refugee population is becoming increasingly difficult. This EU support, through food aid allocations under UNRWA's Emergency Appeals, targets a different category of beneficiaries – ones that fall into poverty at a specific point in time as a result of access problems, violence, occupation, blockade etc. These are families that have the ability to graduate out of poverty if provided with the immediate humanitarian assistance. Moreover, EU humanitarian support does not fund long term actions or UNRWA's regular core programmes such as the targeted Social Safety Net Programme.

In addition to the EU, other traditional donors gave support to UNRWA's Social Safety Net programme in 2010, notably Belgium, France and Japan (alphabetical order, EU Member States first).

An added element of consideration is the increased burden on the Agency imposed by the ongoing crisis in the oPt, the demographic growth rate of the refugee population, and cost increases due to the higher operational charges related to the movement and access restrictions imposed by Israeli authorities as well as the depletion of all reserves7. Major efforts from the donor community will be necessary in order to maintain basic services delivery at an acceptable level for the 4.7 million refugees.

2.4. Donor coordination

Since 2006, the EU (don't you mean the European Commission) has been an observer of the UNRWA Advisory Commission (AdCom), the main body where donors and host countries coordination takes place. This structure was expanded and reinvigorated and plays a vital role in enhancing the dialogue between the various stakeholders, providing advice and assistance to the Agency, for the final benefit of the refugees. For the past three years, the European Commission has chaired the subcommittee of the Advisory Commission which prepares the operational work of the semi-annual meetings of the AdCom. This mechanism of follow up is working well. The synergies amongst donors and common understanding between them and the Host Countries on UNRWA tasks, missions, challenges and achievements have been improved during the last years.

The Delegation, as stipulated in the Food Security Multiannual Indicative Programme (FSMIP), will in due course start the preparation of a joint framework on development and humanitarian activities. It should be noted that currently there is no Joint framework in place between the EU Representative Office and the ECHO office in Jerusalem, due to the quite clear division of tasks among both as far as UNRWA funding is concerned (ECHO deals with emergency assistance while the Representative Office is focused on development). Moreover, the Delegation is in regular contact with Commission colleagues as regards to UNRWA interventions and programming.

---
7 The Agency has traditionally used its diminishing reserves towards bridging its chronic funding gaps.
3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectives

The overall objective to which the project will contribute is to improve stable political and social living conditions for the Palestine Refugees in West Bank, Gaza Strip, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon.

The specific objective of this intervention is to contribute to the alleviation of poverty among the refugee population, with a specific emphasis on the extreme poor through the provision of in-kind food assistance to approximately 281,888 SSN beneficiaries in the five fields and additional cash assistance family income supplement (FIS) to approximately 82,632 extreme poor SSN beneficiaries in the oPt to bridge their poverty gap.

Details of the beneficiaries receiving food security assistance under this intervention are summarised in the log frame attached.

3.2. Expected results and main activities

The expected result is to provide the basic package of food in kind and additional cash assistance to approximately 281,888 (in 2011) vulnerable refugees across its five fields of operations. The total number of 281,888 vulnerable refugees targeted within this operation accounts for almost 6% of the total refugee population estimated at 4.7 million across the region. The main activity of the proposed action will consist of food aid distribution and cash transfers (referred to as family income supplement) to SSNP families. The UNRWA will continue on its already initiated activity of better targeting the poorest refugees in order to increase effectiveness and equity.

As far as an exist strategy is concerned, UNRWA has been informed that it cannot expect to tap into the food security budget line for earmarked funding in support of its Social Safety Net programme beyond the 2013 budget. The exist strategy will come through the Commission's support of the Agency's regular budget in 2013 and will take the form of "budget support" from which UNRWA may chose to subsidise this core programme. At this point in time it is difficult for the Agency to make any drastic funding changes as support to this "donor driven" project approach. As the programme addresses key issues of poverty and hunger and contributes to the achievements of the MDGs, it will be given priority, as far as possible, by the Agency.

3.3. Stakeholders

The direct beneficiaries of this programme are the Palestine refugees registered in the SSN programme and living under the poverty lines derived for the Gaza Strip, Jordan, Lebanon, and West Bank.
With the Social Safety Net Programme, food and cash assistance goes to the poorest segments in society, with often old/very old people, the sick and disabled or families without a member able to earn an income. Escaping from the safety net situation is for these people very difficult if not impossible. There may be an exception in regard to disabled people. Especially the younger disabled are eager to get a training and/or education to earn their own income.

Several key stakeholders were involved in the design process including donors and host governments. As for the refugees and staff, several raising awareness campaigns were conducted in all fields to highlight the benefits of the new poverty-based approach.

The RSSP (Relief and Social Services Programme) reforms including the SSNP have been consulted with partners and other stakeholders. These reforms are being funded by a number of donors, mainly the EU.

The RSSP has been providing relief assistance to Palestine refugees ever since it was established and continues to do so long as its mandate is extended by the international community. Eligibility criteria, instructions and guidelines are in place to govern the implementation of the SSNP. It is worth noting that a total of 350 social workers, supervisors and support staff are dedicated for the implementation of this programme.

### 3.4. Risks and assumptions

The following risk was taken into consideration during the design of the project: the political environment does not deteriorate to an extent that will significantly affect UNRWA’s operations. The Gaza Strip is subject to blockade by Israel and areas of the West Bank can be subject to closure without warning, UNRWA is effectively the only organisation which can ensure effective delivery in these conditions.

Any military operations in the region could have unpredictable consequences and might threaten the operation.

### 3.5. Crosscutting Issues

Good governance is integrated through the ongoing reform of UNRWA administration and management. Since the Geneva Conference in 2004, UNRWA has engaged in a process of internal reform. The Organisational and Development Process has concentrated on reforming UNRWA’s organization design, management capacity and approach for achieving improved service delivery. In addition, UNRWA has developed its Medium Term Strategy (2010-2015). The SSN programme, through the adoption of the poverty-based approach eliminates the current discrimination against the working poor as well as any age or gender biases.
4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Implementation method

The programme will be implemented by joint management through the signature of a contribution agreement with UNRWA, within the framework of the European Commission's Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement with UN Organisations (FAFA).

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 UNRWA.

4.3. Budget and calendar

The total EU financial contribution to the operation amounts to €5 million.

**Budget for 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Euro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of Food in kind and/or additional cash assistance to the beneficiaries on a quarterly basis in West Bank, Gaza Strip, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon</td>
<td>An average of 281,888 SSN beneficiaries will receive food security assistance in West Bank, Gaza Strip, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon</td>
<td>€4,832,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs for the Senior Poverty Advisor, Research Associate and Poverty Analyst/Statistician for 6 months in 2011 for the SNN Programme. Staff costs for two Procurement and Logistics officers</td>
<td></td>
<td>€150,000 €18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>€5,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The implementation of the programme will last for 12 months.

4.4. Performance monitoring

The performance of the project will be closely monitored by UNRWA. The EU Representative office in Jerusalem will also ensure adequate monitoring on the basis of key indicators established in the Logical Framework, progress reports and participation to relevant meetings/committees.
External Results Oriented Monitoring missions may be carried out by the European Commission.

4.5. Evaluation and audit

Audits will be carried out by UNRWA according to its/their Financial Regulations, Rules and directives. In addition, expenditure verifications may be carried out by the EU.

4.6. Communication and visibility

In accordance with the visibility provisions under the European Commission-UN Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) and with the European Commission-UN Joint Action Plan on Visibility signed in September 2006, the EU and the implementing organisations will work together to ensure appropriate visibility actions for the programme as a whole, as well as for specific interventions and activities under the programme.

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

Fiche d'Action Pour Le Programme Thématique De Sécurité Alimentaire
Priorité Stratégique 3: “Traiter L’insécurité Alimentaire Au Sein Des
Populations Pauvres Et Vulnérables Dans Les Pays En Situation Fragiles”.

1. IDENTIFICATION

| Intitulé/Numéro | Programme d’Appui Sectoriel à la Politique de
Souveraineté et Sécurité Alimentaire de la Bolivie
(avenant à la Convention de Financement no. DCI-FOOD/2009/22002) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coût total</td>
<td>UE: 4 Mio EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Méthode d'assistance / Mode de gestion</td>
<td>Appui Budgétaire Sectoriel (ABS - gestion centralisée directe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code CAD</td>
<td>43040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. MOTIF ET CONTEXTE NATIONAL

2.1. Contexte national et motifs du PAPS

2.1.1. Situation économique et sociale et analyse de la pauvreté

La Bolivie a enregistré une variation positive de son PIB de 3,4% durant la période 1996-2005 à 5,2% pour la période 2006-2008, marqué par un accroissement de 6,15% en 2008, le meilleur taux enregistré depuis des décennies.

La Bolivie, dû à sa faible intégration dans les marchés internationaux de capitaux, a été relativement épargnée par la crise financière actuelle. Pour 2009, et malgré le contexte international de crise, l’accroissement enregistré est de 3,4%, le plus élevé en Amérique latine et soutenu par la demande domestique interne. Un accroissement de 4% est attendu pour l’année 2010 ce qui reflète une récupération des exportations et de l’investissement public.

L’inflation, historiquement faible, a subit une augmentation à partir du dernier semestre 2010. L’inflation enregistrée est de 7,18% au 31 décembre 2010 (fortement plus élevée que le 0.26% enregistré fin 2009). Cet accroissement s’explique par: les conditions climatiques adverses et la hausse des prix internationaux des denrées alimentaires. Toutefois, l’inflation cumulée en 2010 aurait pu être beaucoup plus élevée, si le gouvernement n’avait pas mis en place des mesures de contention de ces prix; l’élimination des taxes à l’importation, les restrictions des exportations, les subventions et le contrôle de prix de certains produits, tel que le sucre. La conjoncture actuelle de rareté et de hausse des prix des denrées alimentaires demande aux gouvernements et plus particulièrement au Gouvernement de la Bolivie des réponses en termes de politiques de sécurité alimentaire.

La dette interne de la Bolivie s’est accrue de 43% en 2008 par rapport à l’année 2007, en raison des mesures prises par la Banque Centrale de Bolivie sur les Opérations de Marché Ouvert, dans le but de contrôler l’inflation. Pour 2009, les chiffres préliminaires montrent une
réduction de 9% par rapport à l’année 2008. La dette extérieure est passée de 2,2 Mrd USD à la fin de l’année 2008 à 2,8 Mrd USD, à la fin du mois d’octobre 2010, ce qui ne constitue pas un risque à court ou moyen terme, compte-tenu des liquidités importantes dont le pays dispose, de l’ordre de 9,2 Mrd USD.

La Bolivie est l’un des pays les plus pauvres d’Amérique Latine: 60% de sa population totale (9,52 millions) vit au-dessous de la ligne de pauvreté, atteignant 80% dans le milieu rural. De plus, c’est l’un des pays où les inégalités sont les plus fortes du continent avec un coefficient de Gini de répartition des revenus de 0.6. Le dernier indice de Gini, de 2006, est relativement mauvais, mais ne reflète pas encore les effets de la politique du gouvernement d’Evo Morales. Le FMI suppose que les effets des politiques de "cash transfer" conditionné, vers les populations vulnérables (mères allaitantes, enfant scolarisés en primaire et personnes âgées) auront des effets positifs à partir de 2009, l’analyse de ces effets étant en cours.

Cependant, avec un index de développement humain de 0,69, la Bolivie souffre d’indicateurs préoccupants de vulnérabilité, dus au faible développement économique, à la grande dépendance du commerce international des produits manufacturés et dérivés du pétrole, et à une faible résistance aux chocs climatiques.

Du point de vue de la sécurité alimentaire, si l’on considère l’incidence de la pauvreté extrême, sa réduction a été significative pendant les dernières années, passant de 41,2% en 1996 à 32,7% en 2008, soit 3,2 Mio de personnes selon les dernières données disponibles. Ce pourcentage est toutefois très élevé par rapport à la moyenne de la région, qui est de l’ordre de 12,6%, selon les données du PNUD pour l’année 2007.

Il convient de préciser que ces données présentent de fortes variations selon les milieux urbains ou ruraux, les départements du pays (qui reflètent en partie les conditions agro-écologiques) ou les conditions ethno-linguistiques. Par exemple:

- La proportion des personnes qui vivent en condition de pauvreté extrême en zones rurales est environ 2,5 fois supérieure à celle des zones urbaines (respectivement 53,3% et 22% selon les données estimées de 2008);
- Les départements de Potosí et de Chuquisaca présentent plus de 60% de la population en situation d’extrême pauvreté, contre 25,1% dans le département de Santa Cruz;
- Des fortes différences existent également entre population indigène et non indigène (respectivement 48,8% et 21,3% selon l’enquête des foyers 2006).

2.1.2.  Politique Nationale de Développement


- "Bolivie Digne" pour les thèmes sociaux ;
- "Bolivie Démocratique" pour la consolidation des organisations indigènes traditionnelles ;

1 Pourcentage de la population n’atteignant pas les revenus suffisants pour satisfaire ses besoins alimentaires de base.
• «Bolivie Productive» qui propose un nouveau modèle de production basé sur l'intervention de l'État et l'expansion du marché domestique;
• «Bolivie Souveraine» qui précise la vision du gouvernement pour les relations internationales.

Approuvé le 12 septembre 2007 par Décret Suprême\(^2\), le PND prévoit ainsi 100 politiques hiérarchisées et organisées en 28 secteurs de développement. La mise en application de ces politiques est prévue selon 166 « stratégies » à développer grâce à la mise en marché de 321 programmes, qui s’exécutent sur le terrain à travers de projets et d’autres types d’interventions.

Bien que relativement détaillée et structurée, cette première version du PND ne décrit pas d’objectifs précis, qui puissent être mesurés avec des indicateurs adéquats sur le plan qualitatif ou quantitatif, et éventuellement réajustés. Il existe toutefois un processus d’amélioration des mécanismes de planification, suivi et monitoring du PND à différents niveaux.

Durant la première période de cinq ans de l’exécutif, cette tâche a été déléguée aux différentes entités de l’organe exécutif\(^3\). Via l’élaboration de plans quinquennaux « sectoriels », ces entités avaient pour tâches d’approfondir la mise en place des différentes politiques du ou des secteurs desquels ils étaient responsables.

C’est ainsi que le plan sectoriel de développement: "Révolution Rurale, Agraire et Forestière"\(^4\), formulée en 2007 par le Ministère du Développement Rural, Agriculture et Environnement (MDRAyMA) devenu en 2009 le Ministère du Développement Rural et des Terres (MDRyT), traduit les changements stratégiques contenus dans le PND.

Le Plan Sectoriel « Révolution Rurale, Agraire et Forestière » formulé en 2007 par ce Ministère s’inscrit dans la mise en place complémentaire de trois politiques définies dans le Plan National de Développement: la transformation de la structure foncière et de l’accès aux terres et aux forêts, la transformation des modèles productifs et alimentaires et l’appui à la production et transformation des ressources naturelles renouvelables (notamment l’eau pour la production agricole), et met en avant trois objectifs stratégiques : 1) Avancer vers la sécurité et souveraineté alimentaire ; 2) Augmenter la contribution de l’agriculture et de la forêt au développement économique du pays ; 3) Promouvoir la gestion durables des ressources naturelles.

D’autre part, en vue d’établir les bases de la décentralisation en Bolivie, tel que le prévoit la nouvelle Constitution Politique de l’État en vigueur depuis le mois de février 2009, l’Assemblée Législative Plurinationale a élaboré une « Loi-cadre d’Autonomies et de Décentralisation ».

Cette loi, promulguée par le président Evo Morales le 19 juillet 2010, régule le nouveau rôle du gouvernement central et définit le régime des compétences des gouvernorats régionaux, départementaux, indigènes et des municipalités. De même, elle décrit les mécanismes de planification, de programmation budgétaire et d’exécution, de coordination entre les différents niveaux de gouvernement et la création de nouvelles instances dont le mandat est d’accompagner ce processus. Selon les prévisions du gouvernement central, l’élaboration du

\(^3\) Organisation de l’Organe Exécutif (DS 29894 du 25/01/2009, articles 14 et 15et DS 0429).
\(^4\) Plan Sectoriel "Révolution Rurale, Agraire et Forestière" (Résolution Ministérielle n°360 du 31/12/2007).
système économique et financier associé devrait se préciser sur la base des résultats du recensement prévus en 2011.


2.2. Contexte sectoriel : politiques et défis

Contexte sectoriel de la Sécurité Alimentaire en Bolivie.

La Bolivie reste l’un pays les plus vulnérables de l’Amérique Latine à l’insécurité alimentaire:

En Bolivie la proportion de personnes sous-alimentées est de 23%\(^5\), la plus élevée au niveau régionale après Haïti et largement supérieure à celle des pays environnants. Au niveau mondial la Bolivie est placée par rapport à la catégorie de prévalence de personnes sous-alimentées (20-34%) dans une situation comparable à celle des pays de l’Asie du Sud ou de la moyenne pour l’Afrique subsaharienne. De plus la disponibilité énergétique alimentaire disponible pour la consommation humaine, DEA, par habitant, est de 2160 kcal/jour, considérée comme basse, à nouveau la plus basse de l’Amérique Latine après Haïti. Par ailleurs, la productivité agricole bolivienne représente moins de la moitié de la moyenne régionale, la plus basse de la région avec celle de Haïti et du Honduras\(^6\).

Concernant l’état nutritionnel, la Bolivie est le pays de l’Amérique Latine avec l’incidence la plus élevée en matière de pauvreté infantile extrême (48% des enfants entre 0 et 17 ans), expliquée en grande mesure par l’état nutritionnel très préoccupant des enfants: la malnutrition chronique frappe 26,5% des enfants, plaçant la Bolivie en quatrième place au niveau régional\(^7\).

Si la vulnérabilité à l’insécurité alimentaire diffère de manière importante à l’intérieur du pays 44% des municipalités boliviennes démontrent un taux élevé ou très élevé de vulnérabilité à l’insécurité alimentaire\(^8\), environ 40% des foyers peuvent être considérés en "situation d’insécurité alimentaire grave", puisqu’ils consomment moins de 70% des besoins minimaux en calories.

La stratégie nationale de développement productif considère le thème de la Sécurité Alimentaire « avec » souveraineté, c’est-à-dire basée sur le droit du pays de définir ses propres politiques et stratégies de production, de consommation et d’importation d’aliments de base en conservant et valorisant sa diversité productive et culturelle, comme étant la base fondamentale de la souveraineté nationale au sens large.

Bien que le secteur de la Sécurité Alimentaire soit principalement géré par le MDRyT, à travers l’élaboration et la mise en place du Plan Sectoriel « Révolution Rurale, Agraire et Forestière », le PND décrit également la sécurité alimentaire comme un thème transversal, et donc « multisectoriel » (au sens de la définition des 28 secteurs qui y sont décrits), étroitement

\(^5\) "L’état de l’insécurité alimentaire dans le monde" FAO 2009.
\(^6\) CEPAL 2005.
\(^7\) Bulletins "Desafíos" CEPAL 2010.
\(^8\) Enquête Nationale 2006 de vulnérabilité à l’insécurité alimentaire.

En Bolivie, deux institutions publiques principales sont donc responsables de la mise en œuvre de politiques et actions liées à la sécurité et souveraineté alimentaire (sous ses trois aspects principaux, c’est-à-dire la disponibilité, l’accès et l’utilisation des aliments de base) : le MDRyT et le CONAN.

a) MDRyT
Le MDRyT, a mis en place des politiques visant à augmenter la production et la productivité agricole ainsi que le renforcement du marché interne. Il est donc actuellement le principal responsable de la disponibilité et l’accès aux denrées alimentaires. De même, le Ministère de l’Eau et de l’Environnement est associé à la logique de souveraineté et sécurité alimentaire, notamment par le biais du Vice Ministère des Ressources Hydriques et Irrigation.

La valeur ajoutée agricole contribue de 15% au PIB, mais le secteur emploie 80% de la population rurale et 35% de la population active du pays. La majorité des producteurs ruraux vit dans des conditions de pauvreté (modérée ou extrême) et dépend de la production à petite échelle pour assurer sa subsistance. C’est parmi cette population que l’on retrouve la majorité de la population migrante temporaire. La Bolivie a cependant des poches de productivité relativement élevées dans les régions de production de soja, de cacao et de quinoa. La majorité du secteur de la production agricole est donc orientée vers l’agriculture de subsistance et d’approvisionnement du marché local, avec d’importants déficits d’infrastructures (routières, marchés etc.) et d’organisation du marché interne, notamment en ce qui concerne l’approvisionnement des consommateurs urbains.

La productivité agricole des petits et moyens producteurs est peu compétitive en relation avec les pays voisins en raison d’une utilisation limitée des intrants, tels qu’engrais, semences améliorées, des niveaux de formation insuffisants et la non disponibilité de moyens technologiques adaptés à la petite production agricole. C’est la volonté du gouvernement actuel pour résoudre ces problèmes qui l’a motivé à mettre en œuvre des politiques de soutien à ce groupe majoritaire de producteurs agricoles, en augmentant la contribution de l’Etat aux investissements publiques destinés à l’amélioration des conditions de production chez les producteurs les plus vulnérables (ceux de l’altiplano en particulier, mais aussi les paysans des régions de Santa Cruz, Pando et Beni). Ces investissements ont plus que doublé au cours des deux dernières années.

Afin de répondre aux priorités définies par le gouvernement en matière de changement structurel de la dynamique de la production rurale, tout en contribuant à la mise en place du premier objectif stratégique du Plan Sectoriel, le ministère a élaboré et approuvé en juin 2008 une Politique spécifique de Sécurité et Souveraineté Alimentaire9, définissant ainsi les principes, les stratégies, les lignes d’action, les acteurs, les modalités d’intervention et les instruments d’application de la dite politique.

Pour les volets disponibilité et accès, et afin de faciliter la mise en œuvre des politiques et d’éviter au maximum les lourdeurs administratives, la Bolivie s’est dotée d’instruments de gestion des investissements publics, particulièrement par la création de l’Entreprise d’Appui à

---

9 Résolution Ministérielle n°172 du 24 juin 2008
la Production Agricole, chargée de la mise en œuvre du programme SEMBRAR\textsuperscript{10}, de l’Unité Déconcentrée du PASA (UD PASA) chargée de la mise en œuvre du programme CRIAR\textsuperscript{11}, et du Programme d’Appui Rural (PAR), chargé de la mise en œuvre du programme EMPODERAR\textsuperscript{12}. Par ailleurs, le Ministère de l’Eau a créé EMAGUA (Entreprise de l’Eau) en Juillet 2009, chargé des investissements en matière d’irrigation et de gestion des bassins versants.


b) CONAN (Conseil National de l’Alimentation et de la Nutrition)

Le CONAN a été créé par le gouvernement actuel en avril 2006\textsuperscript{13} comme instance de coordination interinstitutionnelle pour promouvoir et assurer le Droit Humain à l’Alimentation Adéquate au bénéfice de l’ensemble de la population bolivienne.

En outre, constitué de neuf ministères, et présidé par le Président de l’état plurinational de Bolivie, le CONAN est donc considéré comme l’instrument multisectoriel pour l’élaboration et la mise en application de politiques publiques d’alimentation et de nutrition.

Dans la pratique, ce conseil se constitue également en tant qu’instance de coordination, de divers programmes mis en œuvre par les différents ministères membres (Santé, Education, Planification,...), que ce soit par des opérations de "cash transfert" aux femmes allaitantes, aux enfants des écoles primaires et aux personnes âgées.

De plus, le CONAN intervient spécifiquement dans l’exécution coordonnée des programmes multisectoriels :

Le programme Malnutrition zéro a pour objectif d’éliminer la malnutrition chronique des enfants de moins de deux ans et de réduire de 78% à 40% l’anémie des enfants de 23 mois à 6 ans à l’horizon 2010. Il intervient dans 114 des 136 municipalités de Bolivie et se concentre sur l’encouragement à l’allaitement maternel, la distribution de complements alimentaires pour nourrissons et femmes allaitantes, le contrôle de la qualité des aliments, l’information et l’éducation.


L’ensemble de ces programmes, constitue le troisième concept de la sécurité alimentaire, à savoir l’usage des denrées.

- Considérations sur les capacités institutionnelles et le budget sectoriel.

\textsuperscript{10} Programme qui promeut le droit à l’alimentation au moyen de projets.
\textsuperscript{11} Programme qui encourage les processus d’augmentation de la production et de la disponibilité alimentaire au niveau des petits producteurs.
\textsuperscript{12} Promotion de l’entreprenariat en milieu rural.
\textsuperscript{13} Décret Suprême N°28667 d’Avril 2006.
Le pays a une définition explicite de la politique sectorielle de souveraineté et sécurité alimentaire qui rompt, dans une certaine mesure, avec les orientations classiques, dans le sens où elle privilégie la production et la consommation interne, où elle donne à l'État un rôle actif et où elle est particulièrement orientée vers la diminution directe de la pauvreté avec des mesures volontaristes et directes. Cette politique ne remet pas en cause les initiatives privées mais vise à une plus grande équité dans la distribution des compétences et des ressources. Cela se traduit par une augmentation substantielle des dépenses publiques, le cash transfert et les investissements, directement liées à la sécurité alimentaire.

Au sein de chaque entité publique, les normes boliviennes du Système de Programmation des Opérations 14, prévoient l'élaboration de plans stratégiques institutionnels sur la base du Plan National et des Plans Départementaux et Municipaux de Développement (PND, PDD et PMD). Dans une perspective à moyen et long terme, ces plans stratégiques détaillent l'évolution des différentes activités prévues, et anticipent les budgets pluriannuels indicatifs correspondants.


Quant aux budgets, ils sont mobilisés et exécutés par chaque institution dans les limites du cadre légal actuellement en vigueur, c'est-à-dire via l'élaboration et l'approbation des Plans Opérationnels Annuels (POA), qui résultent d'un réajustement progressif des prévisions prêtablement définies dans les PEI.

A cet égard, il est important de souligner les avancées très importantes du Gouvernement de la Bolivie dans la gestion des budgets publics: le Vice-Ministère du Budget du Ministère de l'Economie et des Finances Publiques est en train de conclure l'élaboration du cadre normatif (nouvelle Loi de Budget Public), laquelle prévoit l'inclusion de la budgétisation pluriannuelle, celle-ci étant prévue à caractère indicatif.

C'est ainsi que la mise en œuvre (au sens large) de la politique sectorielle par le MDRyT est estimée à environ 120 Mio USD (actuellement 88 Mio EUR) par an, correspondant au budget destiné à la mise en œuvre des nombreux programmes et projets sous la responsabilité du Vice-Ministère du Développement Rural et Agricole (VDRA) (objectif stratégique no2 du PEI) et aux différentes initiatives complémentaires de renforcement institutionnel et opérationnel, qu'elles soient de dimension politique (comme l'élaboration de différentes lois, dont la Loi de Souveraineté Alimentaire prévue pour 2011), financière (comme la stratégie des alliances stratégiques et l'implémentation de mécanismes d'alignement des différentes sources de financement) ou organisationnelle. De ce budget total, les ressources sollicitées par l'UD PASA (POA 2011) sont de l’ordre de 15 Mio USD (actuellement 11 millions d’Euros). Il convient de noter qu'à l'heure actuelle, les POA de la gestion 2011 n'ont pas encore été officiellement approuvés ni consolidés au niveau du MDRyT, l'aboutissement de ce processus étant prévu pour fin février 2011.

14SPO, article 14.
Par rapport à l’évolution de l’inscription budgétaire sectorielle, entre 2008 et 2010 le budget programmé est passé d’environ 210 Mio BOB à plus de 242 Mio BOB, avec une exécution de respectivement 107 Mio BOB et 143 Mio BOB, ce qui représente une hausse de 15% par rapport au montant programmé, et de 35% par rapport au montant effectivement exécuté. Une amélioration du processus de mobilisation des ressources publiques est également démontrée, avec un taux d’exécution qui s’est accru de 0,51% en 2008, de 0,53% en 2009 et de 0,59% en 2010.

Parallèlement, une diversification des sources de financement de l’UD PASA est observée à partir de 2010. La durabilité financière du secteur devra toutefois être au centre du dialogue politique UE – MDRyT.

Concernant l’UD PASA, il faudrait qu’elle prenne des dispositions pour éviter d’une part la rotation trop rapide de son personnel et d’autre part pour décentraliser au niveau départemental les opérations d’investissement et de suivi des actions.

Le MDRyT a pris des dispositions pour renforcer, au sein de l’UD PASA, le SISPRO, système de suivi et d’évaluation des programmes de sécurité alimentaire, en augmentant ses performances. En effet, en plus de faire le suivi financier et contractuel des actions, il intègre des indicateurs de performance et de résultats en matière de réduction de la vulnérabilité et d’insécurité alimentaire. De plus, le Ministère prévoit de consolider les systèmes de suivi statistiques de la production, des rendements, des prix et des conditions agro-climatiques afin d’améliorer sa capacité à accompagner les politiques des municipalités et des communautés agricoles et à les évaluer. Le SISPAM (Système d’Information des Prix Agricoles et des Marchés) sera consolidé en 2009 et 2010 en coordination avec l’Institut National des Statistiques.

- Cadre de suivi de la mise en œuvre de la politique sectorielle.

Le développement d’un cadre général pour le suivi (Performance Assessment Framework - PAF) de la mise en œuvre de la politique national de sécurité et souveraineté alimentaire est en cours avec l’appui de l’ABS "Food Facility" (la finalisation du PAF est prévue pour la mi-mars 2011).

De fait, le MDRyT dispose déjà d’un ensemble d’indicateurs pour mesurer les effets et l’impact au niveau projet de l’amélioration de la sécurité alimentaire. Les 19 indicateurs, qui correspondent aux catégories de disponibilité, accès et utilisation des produits alimentaires de base, ont été approuvés officiellement par le MDRyT et ainsi intégrés à la politique sectorielle.

Aussi bien les indicateurs ci-dessus mentionnés que ceux contenus dans les DTA du programme "Food Facility" en cours seront affinés dans le cadre du PAF.

- Situation macroéconomique.
Malgré l'impact négatif de la crise globale sur l'économie, la croissance réelle a atteint 3,4 % en 2009, la plus importante dans la région, et pour 2010 on attend un taux d'environ 4%. Les prix de l'alimentation en baisse et un ralentissement de la demande intérieure ont contribué à une forte baisse du taux d'inflation sur 12 mois, qui à la fin 2009 atteignit 0,26 %. Ces niveaux d'inflation n'ont pas pu être maintenus en 2010. A cause de l'inflation importée et des effets du changement climatique sur la disponibilité de denrées alimentaires au niveau international et local, l'inflation est montée à 7,18%. Des mesures anticycliques modérées ont supporté la demande intérieure. Le surplus fiscal de 2009 s'est en principe répété en 2010, le chiffre préliminaire étant de 2%. En ce qui concerne la politique des taux de change, depuis octobre 2008 la banque centrale a efficacement maintenu l'indexation du Boliviano (BOB) au Dollar Américain (USD). Le système financier a été peu affecté par la crise globale du fait de sa faible intégration au marché international des capitaux. La perspective macroéconomique pour 2011 est favorable mais avec une forte pression sur les prix. La croissance réelle du PIB devrait atteindre 4% en 2011 traduisant la reprise des exportations d'hydrocarbures et de l'investissement public, des termes de l'échange favorables, avec une inflation prévue de 6%.

-Gestion des Finances publiques.

La gestion des finances publiques en Bolivie a connu de grandes avancées depuis 2007, quand le gouvernement a décidé de mener plusieurs auto-évaluations du type PEFA (appelée "Evaluación de las Finanzas Públicas-EFIP"), utilisant la même méthodologie mais en ayant recours à du personnel local. Une version finale du rapport de l'exercice incluant un plan d'action sommaire fut présentée à la fin 2008. Bien que l'exercice fut considéré un peu faible au niveau méthodologique, il n'en demeure pas moins un pas important dans la bonne direction.

Pendant le premier trimestre 2009, le Gouvernement a compris l'importance de ce type d'exercice pour l'amélioration de la gestion des finances publiques et la promotion de l'utilisation de l'appui budgétaire comme outil financier plus eficient. Un vrai PEFA devenait alors indispensable. En ce sens, il a été demandé à la Banque Mondiale de réaliser une évaluation PEFA. L'exercice conclu a été présenté au cours de la deuxième semaine d’octobre 2009. D’autre part, le Ministère de l’Economie et des Finances Publiques a sollicité une assistance technique pour élaborer et mettre en œuvre une réforme en profondeur de la gestion des finances publiques. Fin 2009, la Délégation de l’Union Européenne en Bolivie a offert une assistance technique de court et moyen termes pour appuyer l’élaboration d’un plan d’action visant l’amélioration de la gestion des finances publiques "Plan de Acción para la Mejora de la Gestión de las Finanzas Públicas" (PAMGFP). Le 19 juillet 2010, le Ministre de l’Economie et des Finances a officialisé la version préliminaire du PAMGFP. En décembre 2010 le Ministère de Finances bolivien a présenté la version finale du Plan à la communauté internationale qui l'a approuvée.

En conséquence, on peut affirmer que le Gouvernement a entrepris les actions nécessaires pour améliorer la gestion de ses finances publiques, et de ce fait la Bolivie peut être considérée comme éligible à un appui budgétaire sectoriel.

2.3.  
Eligibilité à l'appui budgétaire

Etant donné la vulnérabilité très importante et chronique de la Bolivie à l’insécurité alimentaire et les effets du changement climatique sur la disponibilité de denrées alimentaires, la priorité que le gouvernement en place accorde à cette problématique, le fait que la sécurité alimentaire soit considérée par la délégation comme un secteur prioritaire à soutenir dans le
cadre de la prochaine stratégie-pays, et l’utilisation du mécanisme "appui budgétaire sectoriel" rend ce programme éligible au financement de la FSTP 2011-2013 dans le cadre de sa priorité 3.

D’un autre côté, les trois critères d’éligibilité applicables à l’appui budgétaire sectoriel sont remplis:

- Existence d’une politique sectorielle définie et prioritaire pour le Gouvernement de la Bolivie.
- Situation macroéconomique stable.
- Mise en place par le Gouvernement des actions nécessaires pour améliorer la gestion de ses finances publiques.

L’analyse détaillée de ces critères est développé dans le point 2.2.

2.4. **Enseignements tirés**

La longue expérience d’appui de l’UE au MDRyT en matière de sécurité alimentaire, ainsi que le cadre de dialogue gouvernement-bailleurs existant, a permis aux différents acteurs impliqués dans la mise en œuvre des différents programmes de partager certaines appréciations:

- L’instrument "appui budgétaire sectoriel", véritablement appliqué pour le secteur depuis moins d’un an, est efficace pour mettre en œuvre une politique de sécurité et souveraineté alimentaire plus pertinente.

Par rapport à la mise en œuvre de l'instrument appui budgétaire en Bolivie, on peut souligner comme avancées l’élaboration du plan d’action pour l’amélioration des finances publiques, et plus concrètement, la reformulation de la réglementation du financement externe, le projet d’un Cadre Fiscal à Moyen Termes, des actions pour améliorer la prévisibilité des fonds du TGN, l’élaboration de l’avant-projet de loi de Réforme fiscale et Tariﬁère, et une version préliminaire de la nouvelle Loi d’Acquisitions, entre autres.

Concernant les politiques sectorielles, l’instrument d’appui budgétaire a permis d’améliorer les instruments de planiﬁcation et le suivi des dites politiques18, ainsi que la capacité de gestion des institutions concernées ayant induit une augmentation des ressources publiques qui leur sont allouées.

- La politique de souveraineté et sécurité alimentaire est dirigée vers les couches les plus vulnérables de la population. Cette orientation requiert un ciblage pertinent des bénéﬁciaires, ce qui demande une amélioration des outils de prise de décision.

- Bien qu’un processus de déconcentration ait été initié au sein du MDRyT, et qu’en 2007 l’Unité Déconcentrée du Programme d’Appui à la Sécurité Alimentaire (UD PASA) ait été créée, et qu’elle s’appuie au niveau départemental sur les Unités de Développement Intégré (UDI) pour l’exécution des projets, les activités de planification et programmation budgétaire ont continué à être gérées exclusivement au niveau central, sans aucune délégation de ces tâches ni octroi des moyens minimum

---

18 Notons par exemple que le PNDIC: Plan Nacional de Desarrollo Integral con Coca a été élaboré dans le cadre de l’ABS "coca".
nécessaires pour le faire au niveau départemental. Grâce à la promulgation récente de la Loi-cadre d’Autonomies y de Décentralisation et sa mise en application imminente, c’est tout le cycle des activités d’investissement public qui sera en principe délégué aux régions, départements, et municipalités, depuis l’identification concertée des projets et ouvrages nécessaires avec les populations locales, jusqu’à leur planification, programmation budgétaire, exécution et gestion. Il est donc très important d’impliquer ces différentes institutions dans la planification des politiques.

- Le système actuel, appelé SISPAM, offre le service d’information des prix de gros des principaux produits alimentaires dans les neuf capitales départementales. Ce service est en train de se consolider grâce au programme d’appui budgétaire sectoriel en cours. Une tranche variable supplémentaire pourrait générer de meilleures capacités au sein du SISPAM pour qu’il puisse étendre sa couverture de suivi aux villes de second ordre à l’échelle nationale. Cet accroissement de couverture requiert des ressources et des capacités nécessaires à la restructuration, modernisation et renforcement du système, mais également des ressources supplémentaires nécessaires aux opérations de mesures et centralisation des données, traitement et analyse de celles-ci, ainsi que pour la communication et la diffusion des résultats et les mesures d’encouragement ou de contrôle définies par les autorités politiques responsables. Le système ainsi créé ne pourra rester fonctionnel que si le gouvernement en assume les coûts (personnel et opérations), autant sur le terrain qu’au niveau institutionnel, ce qui peut être pris en charge par l’outil d’appui budgétaire sectoriel.

Grâce à un meilleur système d’information sur la production et les prix au niveau national, régional et local aussi bien le gouvernement que d’autres acteurs pertinents (gouvernorats, municipalités et bailleurs) peuvent améliorer la planification de leurs actions et les rendre plus efficaces.

2.5. Actions complémentaires

Ce programme s’inscrit dans le processus démarré avec l’ABS "Food Facility" dans le cadre de la Régulation EC 1337/2008 établissant une facilité pour une réponse rapide à la lutte contre l’augmentation des prix des aliments dans les pays en développement, qui a pour objectif de renforcer les capacités du gouvernement dans la mise en place de sa politique de sécurité et souveraineté alimentaires. La Convention de Financement "Food Facility" a été signée par les autorités nationales le 12/04/2010 et a une durée de 24 mois. Cette convention, d’un montant de 7.750.000 EUR comprend un appui budgétaire de 7 Mio EUR et une aide complémentaire de 750.000 EUR. L’appui budgétaire est décomposé en une tranche fixe de 4 Mio EUR (déboursé en juin 2010) et d’une tranche variable de 3 Mio EUR, dont le paiement est prévu pour le deuxième semestre 2011.

Il faut souligner que les actions financées dans le cadre de cet appui budgétaire visent les populations les plus vulnérables du pays (grades 4 et 5 de vulnérabilité à l’insécurité alimentaire19) et que par conséquent une complémentarité est recherchée avec les actions d’urgence soutenues par l’Office d’aide humanitaire de la Commission européenne (ECHO) qui visent les mêmes populations. A cet égard, une coopération étroite avec ECHO a été développé, avec un dialogue continu et des missions conjointes d’analyse des besoins MDRyT - Délégation de l’UE en Bolivie – ECHO.

---

19 Selon la carte de vulnérabilité à l’insécurité alimentaire en Bolivie (VAM), actualisée par le PMA en 2005.
Dans le cadre du dialogue entre la Délégation de l’UE en Bolivie et l’ECHO le besoin d’outils d’aide à la décision concernant la politique sectorielle de sécurité alimentaire a été ressenti, le financement de cet outil est prévu dans le cadre de l’aide complémentaire (mise à jour de la carte de vulnérabilité à l’insécurité alimentaire). Aussi, des indicateurs liés à la réduction de la vulnérabilité aux effets du changement climatique seront identifiés dans le cadre du PAF.

Il est important de souligner que ECHO intervient de manière limitée dans le temps dans différentes régions du pays\(^{20}\), en suivant la localisation géographique des urgences (essentiellement des sécheresses, inondations et gelées). Par conséquent, il n’est pas possible ni recommandable de focaliser cet appui budgétaire dans des régions spécifiques, le principal critère de choix des bénéficiaires dans le cadre de la politique sectorielle de sécurité alimentaire étant leur vulnérabilité à l’insécurité alimentaire.

D’autres actions financées par l’UE visent à développer des mécanismes régionaux de réponse à l’insécurité alimentaire:
- Projet de l’ONG VSF-CICDA d’appui aux systèmes de commercialisation des pays andins.
- Projet FIDA-CIP d’appui à la recherche-vulgarisation-action dans le domaine de la sécurité alimentaire au niveau régional.

En application de l’article 5.1.3 du FSTP un Cadre Commun Humanitaire Développement sera préparé.

D’autres nombreuses actions complémentaires sont soutenues par la UE, qui touchent directement ou indirectement le thème de la sécurité alimentaire.

- L’UE appuie les actions du PAM (Programme Alimentaire Mondial) au travers de deux accords de contribution pour le Programme d’Appui à l’Alimentation Scolaire :
  
  - 2.574.500 EUR pour une période de 3 ans, a partir de Avril 2007, dans le cadre d’une ligne de financement appelée "Quick Win".
  
  - 1.800.000 EUR pour une période de 24 mois dans le cadre de la Food Facility. L’objectif de ce projet est de renforcer la substitution de l’importation d’aliments donnés au PAM, par la mise en place de mini chaînes de production, transformation et commercialisation de produits locaux, qui associent les municipalités, les associations de producteurs et les associations de parents d’élèves pour l’organisation des petits déjeuners scolaires dans les écoles rurales des régions vulnérables à l’insécurité alimentaire.


D’autre part, d’autres bailleurs interviennent en complément des actions financées par l’UE:

- La Banque Mondiale finance pour un total de 60 Mio USD des projets dans le cadre du programme EMPODERAR et elle a octroyé 32 Mio USD pour un appui au système de recherche agricole.

\(^{20}\)Rapport annuel ECHO 2010.
• La Coopération Belge contribue à hauteur de 10 Mio EUR au programme multisectoriel de "Malnutrition Zéro". Le Japon y contribue aussi pour un montant de 5 Mio USD.
• La Belgique finance aussi un projet de développement durable de 5,4 Mio EUR dans la région de Potosí qui s'appuie sur le renforcement des filières productives fruitières. La Belgique s'est inscrite depuis deux ans dans une logique d'alignement, dans le cadre du MDRyT, en étroite coordination avec l'UD PASA.
• Le FIDA, Fond International pour le Développement Agricole, a mis en œuvre avec le MDRyT un projet de 12 Mio EUR d'appui à la filière des camélidés sud-américains, en relation avec le programme EMPODERAR.
• De nombreuses initiatives d'appui au secteur agricole et rural, qui contient des éléments visant l'amélioration locale de la sécurité alimentaire (disponibilité et accès) sont soutenues par des bailleurs de fonds tels que le Danemark et la Suisse (production de semences améliorées), la Hollande, l'Allemagne, et le Canada (petits systèmes d'irrigation et gestion intégrée de petits bassins versants).
• La BID a accordé un crédit de 20 Mio USD pour le renforcement des actions menées dans le cadre de l'UD PASA.

2.6. Coordination des bailleurs de fonds

La sécurité alimentaire est un secteur prioritaire pour les bailleurs en matière de coopération avec la Bolivie, aussi bien du point de vue stratégique pour réduire la pauvreté, que du point de vue des engagements financiers pris avec les autorités boliviennes. Depuis 1997, l'UE est un des partenaires stratégiques de la Bolivie en sécurité alimentaire, (i) d'abord dans le cadre de la mise en œuvre du Règlement de 1292/1996 portant sur l'aide alimentaire et les opérations d'appui à la sécurité alimentaire et (ii) ensuite dans le cadre de la Régulation EC 1337/2008 établissant une facilité pour une réponse rapide à la lutte contre l'augmentation des prix des aliments dans les pays en développement. Étant donné la probabilité qu'à moyen terme le financement de la sécurité alimentaire ne soit plus assuré dans le cadre d’un instrument thématique de la Commission européenne, la sécurité alimentaire et plus largement le développement rural qui est un des secteurs des plus pertinents en Bolivie, sera considéré comme un des secteurs focaux d’intervention dans le cadre de la nouvelle stratégie de coopération UE-Bolivie 2014-2020. Assurer une continuité dans les appuis de l’UE au secteur en attendant la nouvelle stratégie pays est donc essentiel.

Sur la base d'une évaluation positive des initiatives antérieures de coordination des bailleurs de fonds (PMAP: Appui Budgétaire Multi Donneurs – 2004 – 2006) et sur la base d'une approbation de la Déclaration de Paris sur l'harmonisation et l'alignement, le gouvernement actuel, coordonne le GRUS (Groupe des Partenaires pour le Développement de la Bolivie) qui réunit chaque mois les représentants du gouvernement (Ministère de la Planification au Développement) et de la coopération bi et multilatérale. Le GRUS est de plus divisé en Groupes Sectoriels et on recense actuellement les Groupes Environnement (Bassins Versants, Changement Climatique, Biodiversité), Éducation, Macro-économie, Développement Productif et Agricole, Santé.

Le MDRyT participe systématiquement aux réunions du groupe "Développement productif et Agricole", qui se réunit sur une base trimestrielle. Ce groupe constitue donc le principal cadre de dialogue sur la politique de sécurité et souveraineté alimentaires. Les bailleurs les plus actifs dans le domaine "sécurité alimentaire" (Belgique, GTZ, PAM, UE) sont actuellement en train de constituer un sous-groupe dans le cadre du groupe développement productif et agricole.
La coordination du gouvernement et des bailleurs a produit des résultats importants, notamment en ce qui concerne la concertation avec le gouvernement au sujet des évaluations de la macro-économie et de la gestion des finances publiques (PEFA 2009).

Enfin, il faut souligner que dans le cadre de l’ABS "Food Facility" de manière conjointe le MDRyT et les bailleurs vont élaborer un Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) qui permettra d’approfondir la coordination des bailleurs avec le gouvernement et d’affiner le suivi de la politique sectorielle.

3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectifs

L’objectif global du programme est de diminuer la vulnérabilité des populations à l’insécurité alimentaire en Bolivie.

L’objectif spécifique:


3.2. Résultats escomptés et principales activités

Les trois résultats attendus sont les suivants:

- **Résultat 1**: Le système d’information de la production interne, distribution, prix et consommation des produits alimentaires de base augmente sa couverture de suivi au niveau des producteurs et des marchés secondaires sur l’ensemble de l’État plurinational et contribue davantage à la planification des politiques.

- **Résultat 2**: Les capacités de planification, suivi et exécution de la politique de sécurité et souveraineté alimentaire sont renforcées pour l’ensemble des acteurs en appuyant les processus de déconcentration et décentralisation en cours. Des analyses permettant d’améliorer les stratégies d’intervention concernant la politique de sécurité et souveraineté alimentaire sont disponibles.

- **Résultat 3**: La vulnérabilité à l’insécurité alimentaire et aux effets du changement climatique des populations les plus vulnérables du pays est diminuée, en concertation avec les réponses d’urgence implémentées par d’autres institutions notamment ECHO.

3.3. Risques et hypothèses

Risques:
- Les capacités techniques et opérationnelles des entités gouvernementales souffrent d’une faiblesse structurelle qui se traduit par une perte de savoir-faire et par une rotation importante des professionnels à tous les niveaux. Le cycle de changement de personnel systématique après une démission de ministre ou vice ministre risque de se répéter.

Mesure d’atténuation: renforcement du dialogue politique avec le MDRyT sur la gestion du personnel.
- Des retards dans l’application effective de la Loi – Cadre de Décentralisation: le processus d’approbation des décrets permettant l’application de la Loi risque de se prolonger, en raison des multiples intérêts en jeu.

Mesure d’atténuation: promouvoir dans le cadre du dialogue politique avec le MDRyT l’implication des municipalités dans les actions de "souveraineté et sécurité alimentaire".

- La Bolivie est un pays très sensible aux conditions climatiques adverses (phénomènes du Niño et de la Niña, fortes gelées ou précipitations localisées, etc.) accentuées par les conséquences du changement climatique, ce qui peut avoir des impacts sur la production agricole et les prix au consommateur, et donc sur la sécurité alimentaire des populations.

Mesure d’atténuation: la dimension "réduction de la vulnérabilité aux effets du changement climatique" sera prise en considération lors de l’identification des indicateurs de déboursement de cet appui budgétaire.

Hypothèses:

- Le nouveau PND continue à reconnaître l’importance de la sécurité et souveraineté alimentaire pour le développement du pays.

- Volonté politique du MDRyT renouvelée pour l’amélioration des systèmes de suivi de la Politique de Souveraineté et Sécurité Alimentaire pour son caractère important dans la prise de décisions.

3.4. Parties prenantes

Le bénéficiaire direct du programme est, dans le cadre de cet appui budgétaire sectoriel, le MDRyT (aussi bien ses services centraux que ceux déconcentrés) en tant que responsable de la mise en œuvre de la politique de sécurité et souveraineté alimentaire.

D’autres acteurs (municipalités et gouvernorats) seront aussi bénéficiaires dans le contexte actuel de décentralisation.

Les populations directement bénéficiaires de ce programme sont les populations rurales les plus vulnérables à l’insécurité alimentaire (catégories 4 et 5 de vulnérabilité à l’insécurité alimentaire).

Les bénéficiaires indirects sont d’autres bailleurs actifs dans le domaine et la société civile, étant donné que l’amélioration des instruments de suivi et planification de la politique sectorielle leur permettra de mieux cibler leurs actions.

L’extension du degré de couverture du système de suivi des prix et produits agricoles bénéficie aussi bien aux producteurs qu’aux consommateurs, ruraux, périurbains et urbains.

3.5. Questions transversales

Etant donné l’incidence de l’instrument appui budgétaire sectoriel dans une gestion axée sur les résultats et la bonne gestion des finances publiques, la bonne gouvernance du secteur sera un des aspects transversaux des actions menées dans le cadre de ce programme.

La politique de sécurité et souveraineté alimentaire de la Bolivie contient le principe du respect de l’environnement et d’égalité de chances dans l’accès aux ressources par les populations les plus démunies.
Le respect de la diversité culturelle est aussi un principe de base des politiques en Bolivie.
4. QUESTIONS DE MISE EN ŒUVRE

4.1. Mode de gestion

Le programme sera mis en œuvre avec les procédures de gestion centralisée. La modalité de mise en œuvre de ce programme est l’appui budgétaire sectoriel, permettant de continuer l’appui budgétaire sectoriel "Food Facility" en cours d’exécution. Un avenant à la Convention de Financement N° DCI-FOOD/2009/22002 sera signé avec les autorités boliviennes ajoutant une tranche variable de 3,5 Mio EUR et une aide complémentaire de 0,5 Mio EUR.

Le déboursement de la tranche variable sera justifié par un système de suivi permanent des indicateurs contenus dans les DTA annexés à l’avenant à la Convention de Financement.

Comme indiqué sur le point 2.2, il existe déjà une batterie d’indicateurs validé par le MDRyT, très techniques et qui correspondent, au niveau projet, aux catégories de disponibilité, accès et utilisation des produits alimentaires de base. Nous disposons également d’indicateurs de déboursement actuellement utilisés dans le cadre de la Convention de Financement "Food Facility". Tant ces indicateurs que leur évaluation seront affinés dans le cadre du PAF en cours d’élaboration, afin d’améliorer leur pertinence pour le suivi de la politique sectorielle.

En ce sens, aux catégories "disponibilité", "accès" et "utilisation des produits alimentaires de base" auxquelles appartiennent les indicateurs actuels, une catégorie supplémentaire "fonctionnement d’une politique sectorielle de souveraineté et sécurité alimentaire" devra être définie dans le cadre de ce PAF. Cette nouvelle catégorie permettra d’identifier des indicateurs liés à la durabilité du secteur à travers l’assignation des ressources du Trésor, le financement public du secteur, le cadre stratégique de suivi de cette politique, ainsi que la coordination avec d’autres acteurs sectoriels (bailleurs et société civile). La dimension "réduction de la vulnérabilité aux effets du changement climatique" sera prise en considération lors de l’identification des indicateurs de déboursement.

Procédures de passation de marchés et d’octroi de subvention Ce n’est pas applicable à la composante d’appui budgétaire (3,5 Mio EUR). Les contrats établis dans le cadre de l’aide complémentaire devront être préparés et mis en œuvre en concordance avec les procédures et documents standards disponibles et publiés par la Commission Européenne pour la mise en œuvre des opérations externes.

4.2. Budget et calendrier

Le budget du programme aura une partie appui budgétaire et une aide complémentaire. L’appui budgétaire sera articulée autour d’une seule tranche variable, étant donné le montant alloué pour ce programme et que l’appui budgétaire sectoriel "Food Facility" a une tranche fixe et une seule tranche variable. L’aide complémentaire sera mobilisée pour l’assistance technique, une éventuelle évaluation finale21 et une étude sectorielle d’appui à la planification de la politique.

La durée prévue est de 18 mois: 12 mois de période d’exécution et 6 mois de période de clôture.

---

21 L’instrument "appui budgétaire" en principe ne prévoit pas d’évaluations. Son opportunité sera toutefois évaluée au cours de la mise en œuvre de l’appui.
La ventilation indicative du montant global du programme est comme suit:

| Montant (Mio EUR) | Total (Mio EUR) | %  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATI, étude sectorielle et éventuelle évaluation (aide complémentaire)</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tranche variable</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Aide complémentaire**

Une assistance technique sera mobilisée afin de mener une série d'études fondamentales (entre autres sur un système de suivi de la mise en œuvre de la politique sectorielle), de faciliter l'appropriation de l'instrument ABS par le MDRyT et de manière générale, de maximiser les effets de l'ABS.

L'actualisation des outils permettant la prise de décisions de stratégie sectorielle est ressentie comme nécessaire aussi bien par le gouvernement que par les bailleurs, y compris ECHO. À cet égard, cette aide complémentaire prévoit d'actualiser la carte VAM de vulnérabilité à l'insécurité alimentaire, laquelle date de 2005, et de l'adapter au nouveau contexte de décentralisation.

4.3. **Suivi de l'exécution et critères de décaissement**

Les indicateurs permettant d'évaluer le degré de déboursement de la tranche variable seront liés à l'avenue de la politique sectorielle (voir aussi point 4.1). Le choix des indicateurs sera cohérent avec le PAF en cours d'élaboration (sa finalisation est prévue pour la mi-mars 2011). La délégation UE en Bolivie suivra de manière rapprochée cet exercice, et elle en informera de manière régulière le Siège.

Les conditions de décaissements des tranches variables seront liées aux conditions générales d'indicateurs suivantes:

i. disponibilité et qualité des produits alimentaires de base pour les populations les plus vulnérables à l’insécurité alimentaire;

ii. accès et utilisation des produits alimentaires de base par les populations les plus vulnérables à l’insécurité alimentaire;

iii. renforcement institutionnel des capacités de planification et de suivi de la politique de sécurité et souveraineté alimentaire, ainsi que sa viabilité financière.

Il est important de souligner que, par rapport aux indicateurs présentement utilisés, la dimension "vulnérabilité aux effets du changement climatique" sera prise en considération dans le cadre du PAF et les indicateurs identifiés explicités au niveau des DTAs.
Le décaissement de la tranche fixe sera sujet aux résultats favorables de l’ensemble des indicateurs relatifs i) aux performances macroéconomiques du pays (sur la base du rapport annuel de l’article IV du FMI, des documents des Institutions de Bretton Woods, des rapports de la Banque Centrale, du rapport de l’Institut National des Statistiques et toutes autres sources d’informations acceptables pour la Commission); ii) aux progrès en matière de gestion des finances publiques et iii) à la mise en œuvre de la politique sectorielle (sur la base des rapports gouvernementaux, rapport d’exercice du MDRyT, des agences de coopération et autres sources d’informations acceptables pour la Commission).

La demande pour le paiement de la tranche variable sera accompagnée de toutes les informations et documents pertinents.

4.4. Évaluation et audit


4.5. Communication et visibilité

Des actions de visibilité cohérentes avec l’instrument "appui budgétaire sectoriel" seront développées dans le cadre du programme et compteront avec l’appui de l’assistance technique mobilisée.
ACTION FICHE FOR FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME

COMPONENT 3: ADDRESSING FOOD SECURITY FOR THE POOR AND VULNERABLE IN FRAGILE SITUATION

"IMPROVING THE LIVELIHOOD OF SMALL FARMERS IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF TOTONICAPÁN, EL QUICHÉ, ALTA AND BAJA VERAPAZ IN GUATEMALA"

ACTION FICHE FOR GUATEMALA

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>Improving the livelihood of small scale farmers in the departments of Totonicapán, El Quiché, Alta and Baja Verapaz in Guatemala. CRIS N° 2011/261-887</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>EU contribution: € 2 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Aid method / Method of implementation | Project approach  
Joint management with an international organisation (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) |
| DAC-code     | 52010 Sector Food Security                                                                                                     |

2. RATIONAL

2.1. Sector Context

2.1.1. Persistent chronic malnutrition in an increasingly vulnerable environment

Guatemala’s levels of food and nutritional insecurity are among the worst in the world. With 49.8% of children chronic malnutrition\(^1\) the country presents the highest rate of chronic child malnutrition in the region, levels that are higher than many African nations. In rural areas of the western highlands mostly populated by indigenous people, rates above 60% prevail and reach 90% in the most dramatic cases.

Nutrition and food insecurity in Guatemala is the result of a series of structural causes rooted in the colonial history of the country. Land ownership concentration is among the highest in Latin America, with 2% of farmers owning more than half of agricultural land, and 45.2% of the farmers possessing 3.2% of land. More than half of the population is poor and has limited access to food. The minimum salary covers less than 75% of the cost of the basic food basket and many agricultural workers do not even get the minimum wage.

Poor households depend on a poor diet, rely on an unstable income, and live without food reserves. To cope with the lack of food they tend to reduce the number of meals per day. Although Guatemala was the first country in Latin America to enforce nutritional fortification (iodised salt, sugar with Vitamin A, wheat flour with iron), deficiencies in vitamin A and iron have persisted in Guatemalan children. These deficiencies cause anaemia in pregnant women.

---

and lactating child, with deficiencies in the sight and immunological resistance, underweight and stunting of children. More than one third of children less than five die because of maternal and child malnutrition.

In addition, Guatemala has also become one of the countries most affected by climate change and natural disasters, with dramatic effects on rural livelihoods. The natural events that ravaged the country in 2010 (Pacaya volcano eruption, Tropical Storm Agatha, Tropical Depression 11-E), together with a series of droughts and tropical storms that occurred in previous years have exacerbated the social and food vulnerability, deteriorating the livelihoods and living conditions of poor households, raising the necessity of a disaster risk management approach and the structural improvement of food security and nutrition.

2.1.2 Key challenges in food security and nutrition

Subsistence agriculture is the predominant agricultural system in the country. Poor families in rural areas mainly cultivate maize and beans, which constitutes the basis of their diet. Due to unequal access to land, their plot is small often located on slopes and degraded soils. Productivity levels are low and production is poorly diversified due to dependence on irregular rainfalls and a limited access to quality seed and inputs. Soil degradation contributes to the downward trend of productivity levels.

The lack of agricultural extension services is another major flaw of the agricultural sector, hindering the access to good agricultural practices that are necessary to raise productivity, diversify production and reconstitute soil fertility. Where they exist, they are still incipient and in a limited area of the country. In 2009 the Government made an important effort to activate the National Agricultural Extension Services with the support of FAO through the EU Food Facility (EUFF) and the Special Programme on Food Security (SPFS).

An additional challenge is that Guatemala and the other Central American countries are facing an important shortage of quality-assured seeds, which constitute an important limitation to productivity and production. Only few producers can afford quality-assured seeds sold by private firms and in Guatemala there is a lack of information of appropriate seeds varieties for the different agro ecological areas.

Other aspects play a major role in perpetrating chronic malnutrition. Low education levels lead to poor domestic hygiene and unhealthy nutritional habits. The limited access to safe water frequently causes diarrhoeas in children and deteriorates their nutritional status. Less educated women are less able to address the malnutrition and related illnesses of their children. Supplementary nutrition combined to breast feeding needs to be expanded. Only 16% of children less than one have a sufficient energetic consumption, and only 35% have sufficient protein level.

Finally, State institutions have historically been weak with poor inter-institutional coordination and limited resources, resulting in the lack of basic social services in rural areas that are crucial to optimise food production and use (water, sanitation, heath, education). The adoption and implementation of structural reforms, such as the water law and the decentralisation process, have been either delayed or abandoned.
2.1.3 Food Security and Nutrition major policies and programmes

Government’s attention to food security and nutrition has led to the adoption of a National Law and Regulation on Food Security and Nutrition in 2005, and related national policy and strategic plans. A Food Security and Nutrition System (SINASAN) has been established, including the Presidential Secretary for Food Security and Nutrition (SESAN) whose role is to coordinate and promote the implementation of the Food Security and Nutrition Policy through a medium term strategic plans (PESAN). The Law also included a Food Security National Council (CONASAN), specific bodies facilitating consultation and participation (National Food Working Group and INCOPAS) and a working group with selected cooperation agencies (GIA). This can be considered as the most comprehensive institutional framework in Central America addressing food security and nutrition.

The current strategic plan (PESAN 2009-2012) seeks to (i) increase basic grains productions for increased country self-sufficiency; (ii) improve population access to the basic food basket; (iii) promote breast feeding and nutritional education; (iv) expand the coverage and improve the quality of health services and water and sanitation utilities; and (v) strengthen institutional capacity of the SINASAN. There is an emphasis on strengthening inter-institutional coordination and addressing food and nutrition security as well as chronic malnutrition in a more integrated and sustainable manner, taking account the most vulnerable populations in the prioritised municipalities.

One of the most relevant programmes of PESAN is the National Strategy for Reduction of Chronic Malnutrition (ENRDC), whose objective is 25% reduction by 2016 of the prevalent chronic malnutrition in children under 5. That would be achieved through a series of measures related to basic health services, food and nutrition education, breast feeding and complementary food, water and basic sanitation, family economy and community organization. The ENRDC is supported by six United Nations agencies through a 3 years joint programme (2008-2011), but its implementation suffered from lack of appropriate funding.

In 2010 the Government started a process for revising and updating the PESAN, including the development of a specific Plan for the 6 departments of the western highlands (PLANOCO).

2.2. Lessons learnt

The EUFF project has shown the critical role of delivering seeds and fertilizers together with technical assistance to boost agricultural productivity and promote diversification. The impressive demand of farmers to expand good agricultural practices related to conservation agriculture, combining profitable agricultural production with environmental concerns and sustainability, underlined the need for production technical assistance.

In addition, working closely with local institutions has allowed bringing the issue of food security and nutrition to the local level. By partnering with municipalities and the local offices of the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food (MAGA) and of the Secretary for Food Security and Nutrition (SESAN), the EUFF has been able to increase awareness and place food security issues higher in the local political agenda, helping mobilising funds to support activities in this sector and start creating effective local agricultural extension services. The EUFF has been effective engaging MAGA and SESAN on plans concerning the national agricultural extension system and providing a stimulus to agricultural productivity. That has created a momentum among local authorities, field technicians, good practices’ promoters and farmers. However, these achievements need further consolidation in order to fully deploy its development potential and deliver enduring/sustainable results.
Other previous EU projects funded from the food security thematic lines also underlined the need to focus on the more depressed rural areas and on the highly vulnerable population with limited development potential, taking into account the impact of natural disasters and environmental degradation. It has also emphasized the need to combine production approaches with social needs, including health, education and nutrition in order to contribute to raising the income of the most vulnerable population, facilitating their access to basic goods and services. EU humanitarian interventions have also shown the need to strengthen the Active Nutritional Vigilance System from the Minister of Health through better trained community sentinel sites.

Considering the causes of food insecurity and malnutrition in Guatemala, it is important to carry on long term interventions together with more short-term actions and emergency actions when needed. This explains why food security projects in Guatemala are elaborated with a LRRD approach. In this regards, the continuous exchange of information and the close coordination with EU humanitarian action can be raised. LRRD approach is even more important when tackling soil erosion which entails both a disaster prevention perspective (prevents landslides) and a development concern (improves soil productivity). This intervention will be an opportunity to design a "Joint Humanitarian Development Framework (see Article 5.1.3 of the FSTP.

2.3. Complementary actions

In spite of the dramatic situation with chronic malnutrition and food insecurity in Guatemala, EU support to food security and nutrition in recent years was limited to a few small projects financed under the thematic lines. However, the impacts of high food and oil prices in 2007 and 2008 and the food crisis in 2009 provoked by the dry corridor drought has raised awareness to this issue and the EU was able to provide a comprehensive response involving different instruments through long, medium and short interventions. That was also based on the fact that food security was addressed as priority activity in the Guatemala CSP 2007-2013 for rural and economic development.

Long term intervention concerned a sector budget support programme to support the Food Security and Nutrition Policy and Strategic Plan of Guatemala (PESAN 2009-2012), with an initial amount of €33.8 million, which has been increased in 2011 by more €6.5 million (as part of EU's contribution to the impact of the Agatha Tropical Storm in 2010). The fact that Guatemala has a comprehensive legal, policy and institutional framework in food security also justified that this sector was chosen for the first EU budget support intervention in the country.

The medium term action has been provided through the Food Facility (€16 million), including the joint projects with FAO and WFP (€11 million) and four projects with NGO (€5 million).

Short term projects addressed more urgent needs, through EU humanitarian interventions replying to the different droughts, tropical storms and volcano eruptions in 2009 and 2010 that has dramatically raised the levels of acute malnutrition resulting on death of children. That support amounted to €5.5 million targeting in particular the departments or specific communities presenting higher rates of acute malnutrition. Projects focused on food assistance, livelihoods recovery, national nutritional surveillance system and water and sanitation. An additional amount of €1 million was approved by ECHO end of 2010, after having assessed deterioration of the situation with acute malnutrition in the dry corridor and other affected regions.

Finally, the Rural and Local Development in Huehuetenango (€25 million budget, of which €20 million funded by the EU) includes a series of social infrastructure (water & sanitation and waste management) and productive infrastructure projects that have an important impact on the
food security situation in that department that presents some the highest levels of chronic malnutrition in Guatemala (average 67%, with some municipalities reaching 90%).

The EU has thus become the main donor in food security in Guatemala and is leading donor coordination contributing to further policy dialogue and inter-institutional coordination in this sector. Moreover, the interaction between long, medium and short term interventions has provided opportunity for increased synergies among projects and programmes and the exchange of information.

Other donors have contributed to food security or food security related programmes on health and education, especially Spain, Italy, Germany, Sweden, Japan and Canada. In addition, six UN agencies (FAO, WFP, UNICEF, WHO, the United Nation Population Fund (UNFPA) and the United Nations Volunteers (UNV) supported the joint programme on the National Strategy for Reduction of Chronic Malnutrition, although limited funds did not allow reaching the initial budget (USD 64 million). A second joint programme with a more modest amount (USD 3.68 million) has been developed with UNDP, FAO and UNICEF strengthening environment governance to address climate change in the dry corridor.

Appeals launched by the United Nations in 2009 and 2010 following the dry corridor and Agatha/Pacaya disasters have also failed to mobilize the targeted amounts. Following the drought of 2009, a First Flash Appeal of USD 34.2 million was launched in March-August 2010 and was financed up to 35%. A Second Flash Appeal related to the tropical storm Agatha, launched in June 2010 for an amount of USD 16 million was financed up to 32%.

2.4. Donor coordination

The Government created in 2008 an International Cooperation Council (Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Finance and the Planning Secretary) for the coordination of international cooperation. With the support of a main donors group (G13), the Government has launched an harmonisation and alignment programme, aiming to increase ownership of aid and align it with the Government priorities, introduce sector-based approaches, mid-term planning, result oriented management and Government-led working groups (Mesas) on selected sectors. That process addressed in a first step education, health, justice and security and was afterwards extended to food security, environment & water.

As far as food security is concerned, a Government-led Working Group was created end of 2009 (MESAN- Mesa de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional) and stated regular monthly meetings in 2010 with representatives from SESAN and the Ministries and other public entities involved in the implementation of the food security strategic programmes, as well as the main donors in the sector. In parallel, a G13 Donors Working Group on Food Security was created under the leadership and coordination of the EU and Canada and also holds monthly meetings, where were presented and discussed the Government plans on food security, the impacts of the 2009-2010 natural disasters on food security and the implementation of the EU budget support programme. This has greatly contributed to the improvement of donor coordination in this sector.

Moreover, in the context of the decision to further EU-US strategic cooperation in selected countries and sectors, Guatemala was chosen as pilot country for food security sector. Joint efforts are being carried helping the Government revising and updating the PESAN and developing the specific strategic Food Security Plan for the Western Highlands (PLANOCO), as well as ensuring better coordination between activities of NGOs financed by both the EU and USAID.
3. **Description**

3.1. **Objectives**

The project overall objective is to contribute to improve the food and nutritional security of small farmers' communities in Alta Verapaz, Baja Verapaz, El Quiché and Totonicapán selected rural areas of Guatemala (Annexes 1a-1b).

The specific objective of the project is to improve the resilience and the nutritional status of vulnerable smallholder farmers by increasing agricultural productivity and diversification, strengthening access to local markets and improving nutritional and hygiene habits.

3.2. **Expected results and main activities**

*Result 1. Strengthened agricultural production and disaster risk management to improve food security and preserve livelihood assets*

The basis for food security, sustainable agriculture and disaster risk management is the accessibility and the diversification of diet and production systems, which minimize exposure to climatic events and environmental deterioration. The project strategy is based on the promotion of “milpa” and “patio hogar” systems developed by FAO in Guatemala. The first provides the grains needed for a basic diet, while the second provides the vegetables and complementary small livestock for a balanced diet. The latter also incorporates a strong component of increased livelihood assets and disaster risk reduction.

*Outputs will consist of:* i) selected farmers will diversify their production systems through intercropping of stapled grains (maize and beans) and backyard production (vegetables and small livestock) which lead to improve the family diet and provide additional income; ii) improved technical knowledge and increased farm production; iii) selected farmers strengthen their capacity in conservation agriculture, agro forestry systems and disaster risk management; iv) target farmers are confident with the use of basic agricultural mechanization, water management and conservation agriculture; v) farmers are organized to conduct a local network of seed evaluation (maize and beans) and to maintain seed stocks to contribute to food security and Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR); vi) a contingency plan for Agriculture Disaster Risk Management is established at community level and linked with the national network; vii) farmers groups access to micro finance initiatives for agriculture and non agriculture related activities are enhanced.

*Result 2: Improved extension services provided by development partners (SNEA, municipalities and NGOs), for the transfer of appropriate technology aimed at strengthening smallholders' livelihood.*

The dissemination of appropriate technology and Good Agricultural Practices (GAPs) will be supported by a network of extension services provided by the National Agricultural Extension System (SNEA), municipalities and local NGOs, which include professionals and voluntary agents (promoters). The promoters are provided with dedicated training and, through an incentive programme, they replicate the knowledge gained on their own plots, promoting a farmer to farmer exchange.

The extension system, through the centres of teaching and learning (CEAS) set up under the EUFF and through farmers-to-farmers exchanges, will guarantee the dissemination of extension messages (technical innovations, better utilization of food, integration on local markets). Conservation agriculture, implementation and preservation of local banks of seeds, integrated
farm management, and the inclusion of GAPs will be stressed in order to improve sustainable production and the conservation of natural resources. The inputs distribution will be oriented, when necessary, to the restoration of vulnerable livelihoods.

*Outputs will consist of the following*: i) trained development partners effectively deliver specific and clear extension messages to improve sustainable productivity, promote farming systems diversification and conservation agriculture, disseminate GAPs, and develop disaster risk management strategies; ii) CEAS are developed and voluntary promoters and farmers at community level are trained and recognized; iii) selected farmers are trained in the use of basic mechanization to improve soil and water management in conservation agriculture; iv) selected farmers groups are trained and master basic skills to carry out local varieties trials and local seeds bank preservation.

**Result 3: Strengthened associations and farmers groups improve their access to market and are capable to identify market opportunities.**

The intervention will support and consolidate the successful past experiences of the EUFF which strengthened existing marketing channels and opened new ones, connecting suppliers, traders and processors. The promotion of appropriate technologies related to pre and post harvest practices to improve grain quality and avoid losses is also a central concern (losses at this stage are in the order of 20 to 30%). WFP will closely collaborate with FAO on marketing linkages and on food for work and food for cash schemes, building on the synergies and complementarities experienced during the EUFF.

*Outputs will consist of*: i) strengthened knowledge of organizations and their members in aspects of entrepreneurship, organization, administration and accounting practices, among others, aiming to the efficient functioning and sustainability of these institutions; ii) beneficiaries master appropriate technologies on pre and post harvest practices and on grain analysis based on the on-farm methods developed by the EUFF; iii) pre and post harvest losses are significantly reduced among the beneficiaries; iv) improved marketing of maize and beans according to international quality standards to meet demand from the industry, the army, the Government and WFP; v) better understanding among farmers of value chains and market opportunities.

**Result 4: Families’ nutritional and hygiene habits as well as their access to safer water improve.**

The diversification of farming systems is part of a strategy of improving nutrition of farmers’ families considering that access and availability of a variety of food will lead to improve family diet. Along with technical training on sustainable production of staple grains, vegetables and small livestock, the promotion of improved nutrition structured around local food production will be of major importance. In addition, actions to address sanitary constrains and quality food will be promoted.

*Outputs will consist of*: (i) training material to promote better nutrition based on local food production is produced and disseminated; ii) families understand the importance of a balanced diet and food hygiene practices and start adopting them; (iii) Effective liaison with specific actors ensures that pregnant and lactating women as well as infants receive supplementary food (iv) standard indicators to monitor malnutrition in infants less than five years old are implemented; v) a monitoring system of grains stocks at household and community level is established; vi) the importance of healthy home practices is understood by beneficiary families; vii) access to safe water improves and good practices of waste water management are developed.
3.3. Risks and assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of risks</th>
<th>Mitigation strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political instability and increased levels of violence and insecurity are potential risks for the implementation of the project.</td>
<td>Give strong participation to local steering committees and adhere strictly to the indications of the UN security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala remains vulnerable to natural disasters (earthquakes, Hurricanes)</td>
<td>Elaborate a strategy of DRM considering actions of preparedness, mitigation and integration on development processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A severe drought could potentially affect food security at the household level in 2011. This would have implications for the implementation of the project</td>
<td>1. Very tight monitoring and planning to avoid the loss of farm inputs. 2. Implementation of a monitoring system to record and evaluate grain stocks at farm and communal level. 3. Links with developments partners, WFP and government to facilitate assistance in case of food scarcity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A further increase in food prices, particularly in grains and fertilizers, would significantly erode the amount delivered to project beneficiaries. It will also affect the coping mechanisms of households as it will reduce off-farm opportunities of employment, thereby reducing an important part of revenues used to buy food.</td>
<td>Same as above i.e.: 1. Very tight monitoring and planning to avoid the loss of farm inputs. 2. Implementation of a monitoring system to record and evaluate grain stocks at farm and communal level. 3. Links with developments partners, WFP and government to facilitate assistance in case of food scarcity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural development, operational extension system and food security are major priorities of the current Government and the intervention builds on existing or already planned activities developed by the UN agencies under programmes agreed with the Government. It is assumed that this view of integration of food production and nutrition will be shared and supported for the duration of the project.</td>
<td>Support the extension systems at national, municipal level to have incidence in government strategy. Create strong partnerships and alliances with UN agencies and development partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misuse of inputs by targeted farmers</td>
<td>1. Direct involvement of Commune Councils, local leaders and promoters. 2. Decentralised project management through local steering committees. 3. Training and permanent advisory services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4. Crosscutting Issues

Gender, environment, indigenous people and human rights are the most relevant cross-cutting issues that will be taken into account as part of the project.

Detailed information on gender participation in the current EUFF project shows that 30% of women are engaged in farm production. Activities in the proposed project will seek to ensure a more balanced participation, not only on backyard activities, but on cash crop production which generates income to be administered by women. This will encourage a more clear orientation of home expenses on health and nutrition of children.

FAO has long recognized the crucial situation of inequity in the relations between men and women in terms of opportunities, access to resources and decision-making on household development. The perspective of gender is transversal and fundamental in the interventions and in the relation with families participating in the project. A new approach in extension structure and methodology will incorporate a family household approach, as a replacement to the single
promoter approach (a male approach of extension), the objective being that women, children and men contribute and benefit equally.

Environmental concerns are intrinsic to the different activities of this project, in particular the component of conservation agriculture, sustainable agricultural practices, and natural resources management. For instance a key concern in conservation agriculture is soil management by promoting anti-erosive techniques to limit the risk of landslides. Weed management and basic mechanization are aimed to 'zero tillage' and permanent soil cover (conservation agriculture principles), techniques through which the soil becomes thicker and improves its fertility. Another approach in line with conservation agriculture is the promotion of agro forestry systems which implies introducing trees in cultivated plots which will either provide fruit or bring nutrients to the soil and increase its fertility. These examples of good agricultural practices respond both to the concern of raising productivity, diversifying production, and promote a sounder environmental management, thereby reducing vulnerability to disasters and building resilience towards climate change. In this approach, the use of local varieties is promoted in order to preserve local agro biodiversity that are more resilient and more accessible to poor farmers.

Promoting and consolidating more resilient farming systems of small holders should be seen as one of the many necessary steps to make the human right to food a reality in Guatemala. Like poverty, chronic and acute malnutrition is mostly rural and indigenous. Contributing to eradicating this situation is one of the many ways to promote more equal opportunities to the society's bottom and excluded indigenous peoples.

3.5. Stakeholders

Direct beneficiaries

The project will benefit 12,000 families of the Departments of Alta Verapaz (2000), Baja Verapaz (3200), Quiché (4800), Totonicapán (2000) (Annex 2). Families will be selected among EUFF beneficiaries of the EUFF according SESAN vulnerability indicators and land.

In Alta Verapaz the municipality of Ixçán, selected in the EUFF for its potential for agricultural productivity, will be excluded from this project as families have more land and benefit from better agro ecological conditions. In Baja Verapaz, the municipality of Granados will be excluded as it is not in the list of the prioritized municipalities by the Government.

The project will start activities in two municipalities of Totonicapán where poverty, food insecurity and chronic malnutrition indicators are among the worst in Guatemala. The implementation in this department will allow developing synergies with FAO emergency and rural development projects, with WFP and with the USAID "Feed the Future" initiative.

Indirect beneficiaries

FAO will continue to build on strategic partnership established during the EUFF with the WFP, the Municipalities, the Consejos Municipales de Desarrollo (COMUDES) and the Consejos Comunitarios de Desarrollo (COCODES) in close coordination with the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food (MAGA), the Secretary for Food Security and Nutrition (SESN), as well as the farmers associations. Moreover, FAO will work closely with WFP on marketing aspects and on food-for-work and food-for-cash schemes, as described in Result 3.

4 Implementation issues
4.1. Method of implementation

Joint management through the signature of a Contribution Agreement under the Commission's Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) with UN/FAO. The choice for the Joint Management with FAO is based on the following considerations:

- FAO experience in Guatemala in promoting Good Agricultural Practices among subsistence farmers and small holders producers.
- A privileged relation with the MAGA and SESAN and an active dialogue in particular on the national extension system (MAGA defined the FAO/EUFF intervention as the backbone for the future extension system).
- The experience built by the EUFF teams in the three departments of intervention, and the working dynamics set up with local institutions (municipalities and local representations of MAGA and SESAN).

National and Local Steering Committees will be created to ensure coordination, follow-up implementation and evaluate progress made. The National Steering Committee will be constituted with representatives of MAGA, SESAN, FAO and the EU Delegation. Moreover, FAO will further increase its coordination role between implementing partners to better share information and experience and will consider direct agreements with experienced NGOs to ensure implementation and build capacity of local actors.

4.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

All contracts implementing the action are awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents laid down and published by FAO.

4.3. Budget and calendar

The total cost of the project is estimated at EUR 2000000 (Annex 3), of which the EU contribution is EUR 2000000. The duration of the project will be 30 months as from the signature of the Contribution Agreement with FAO. The source of funding is the food security budget line 21 02 01.

4.4. Performance monitoring

The performance of the project will be closely monitored by FAO on the basis of key indicators established in the Logical Framework Matrix (Annex 4). The EU Delegation will supervise monitoring, analyse and approve progress reports and participate in relevant meetings. External Results Oriented Monitoring missions may be carried out by European Commission services.

4.5. Evaluation and audit

FAO will undertake a baseline survey of the selected beneficiaries before implementation to obtain a benchmark for food insecurity, nutritional status and livelihoods 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 beneficiaries to determine the extent of changes and attainment of the graduation thresholds established.

It is expected that independent mid-term and final evaluations of the project will be carried out. The Terms of Reference of these evaluations will be agreed between FAO and the European Commission, in consultation with Governmental counterparts. The detail of evaluations and audits obligations will be detailed in the contractual arrangements with FAO. If deemed necessary external evaluations and audits may also be carried out by independent consultants recruited directly by the European Commission in accordance with EU Regulations.
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 Guatemala. 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. Standards regarding visibility will be derived from the "EU visibility guidelines for external actions" http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/index_en.htm.
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FICHE D'ACTION POUR LE PROGRAMME THEMATIQUE DE SECURITE ALIMENTAIRE
PRIORITE STRATEGIQUE 3: "TRAITER L'INSERURITE ALIMENTAIRE AU SEIN DES POPULATIONS PAUVRES ET VULNERABLES DANS LES PAYS EN SITUATION FRAGILES".

BURKINA FASO

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intitulé</th>
<th>Appui au renforcement des bases de la sécurité alimentaire à travers le renforcement de la filière semencière au niveau des communautés rurales affectées par les chocs climatiques au Burkina Faso. DCI-FOOD/2011/260-318</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Coût total | Coût total : 5 million d'EUR  
Contribution de l'UE: 5 million d'EUR (FSTP) |
| Méthode d'assistance / Méthode de gestion | Approche projet – gestion conjointe avec la FAO. |
| Code CAD | 52010  
Secteur  
Sécurité alimentaire |

2. MOTIF

2.1. Contexte sectoriel
Le Burkina Faso est un pays sahélien, enclavé, qui figure parmi les plus pauvres du monde, avec une population de 15,2 millions d’habitants (FNUP 2010) et une superficie de 274 000 km². Disposant de peu de ressources naturelles et d’un environnement qui se dégrade rapidement, il subit en outre les aléas d’un climat sahélien dont la pluviométrie est souvent insuffisante ou mal répartie. L’économie est centrée sur un secteur agricole fortement dépendant des pluies et des chocs climatiques, qui occupe environ 81% de la population active et représente 40% du produit intérieur brut (PIB), mais aussi sur un secteur des services, en partie informel, en croissance constante. Elle souffre des coûts des facteurs de production élevés et d’une forte dépendance aux exportations du coton et des produits de l’élevage. En outre, l’évolution du taux de change avec le dollar, des prix mondiaux du coton et des produits pétroliers a été très défavorable ces dernières années.

Face à la situation d’extrême pauvreté et de vulnérabilité de la population, le Burkina Faso s’est engagé dans la formulation d’une Stratégie de Croissance Accélérée de Développement Durable (SCADD), qui est une nouvelle et ambitieuse vision stratégique de développement, lui permettant d’accélérer ses mutations socio-économiques et d’offrir de meilleures conditions de vie à sa population. Quatre (4) axes stratégiques sont identifiés pour relever le défi de l’accélération de la croissance et du développement durable sur la période 2011-2015. Ce sont : (i) le développement des piliers de la croissance accélérée, (ii) la consolidation du capital humain et la promotion de la protection sociale, (iii) le renforcement de la gouvernance, et (iv) la prise en compte des priorités transversales dans les politiques et programmes de développement.

---

1 La promotion des pôles de croissance, le développement des filières porteuses, la promotion des niches et des grappes d’entreprises, et la promotion d’une croissance pro-pauvre pour lutter efficacement contre la pauvreté.

2 Réduction des inégalités de genre, maîtrise de la croissance démographique, gestion de l’environnement et utilisation optimale des ressources naturelles, politique d’aménagement du territoire, et renforcement des capacités.
En matière de développement de l'agriculture il faut noter que la différence entre production et croissance démographique a un impact important sur la sécurité alimentaire des populations, le taux de malnutrition étant de l’ordre de 12,4% (ENIAM 2009). Pour juguler ce taux élevé (au dessus du niveau des 10% qui est le seuil d’alerte défini par l’OMS), une des solutions est l’augmentation de la productivité du secteur agricole qui passe par l’utilisation de facteurs de production de qualité, adaptés aux conditions agro écologiques du pays.

La semence est un des facteurs majeur à prendre en compte, car elle permet à elle seule d’accroître la productivité d’une culture de l’ordre de 40%. Le taux actuel d’utilisation d’une semence de qualité est estimé entre 15 et 17%, c’est dire qu’il reste une grande marge de manœuvre à ce niveau pour atteindre un niveau d’utilisation optimal ; l’objectif du Gouvernement étant d’arriver à un niveau d’utilisation de la semence améliorée de 50% à l’horizon 2015.

La filière semencière est au centre des préoccupations du gouvernement. Ceci s’est matérialisé par des initiatives tel le projet Facilité Alimentaire financée par l’Union européenne dont des avancées considérables en termes de mise en place de la filière semencière ont été enregistrées ; il reste néanmoins encore beaucoup à faire pour consolider les acquis et assurer sa pérennité.

2.2. Enseignements tirés

La présente fiche d’action, qui s’inscrirait dans le plan d’investissement national, répond à ce souci et est en ligne avec les recommandations de la mission d’évaluation à mi-parcours dite ROM (Result-Oriented Monitoring) de juin 2010, mandatée par l’Union européenne, quant au renforcement de l’ensemble des acteurs de la filière semencière, depuis la recherche jusqu’à la commercialisation, et quant à l’importance de l’opérationnalisation de la stratégie semencière. La fiche d’action propose un cadre approprié d’interventions basé sur l’expérience des activités antérieures, et en tirant les leçons et mettant à profit la connaissance des partenaires, du milieu rural et de tous les acteurs de la filière pour mener à bien cette phase de consolidation au profit de l’ensemble de la population burkinabé et de l’amélioration de la sécurité alimentaire dans le pays.

Le "Plan d’urgence pour la réalisation de la sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle", document stratégique du Gouvernement rédigé en juin 2008, a fait l’objet d’un financement (18,7 millions d’Euros) de l’UE au titre du budget alloué à la Facilité alimentaire. Le projet qui s’en est suivi a été exécuté par l’Unité d’urgence et de réhabilitation de la FAO en collaboration étroite avec le Ministère chargé de l’agriculture. De nombreux résultats sont à mettre à l’actif de ce projet en termes (1) d’augmentation des capacités de production agricoles des populations vulnérables, et en découlant d’amélioration de leurs sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle, (2) de renforcement des capacités infrastructurelles et techniques, de la crédibilité et de la viabilité des producteurs de semences de qualité et de leurs organisations, (3) de renforcement des capacités nationales de certification des semences, et (4) d’adoption de la stratégie semencière nationale, en étroite collaboration avec l’ensemble des acteurs nationaux de la filière.

Les actions entreprises au cours du projet pour la structuration de la filière semencière se sont concentrées sur les producteurs semenciers en visant l’amélioration de leurs capacités de production, leur structuration organisationnelle, le renforcement de leurs capacités techniques ainsi que la gestion de leurs productions, mais ceux-ci ne sont qu’un maillon, certes essentiel, de la filière semencière.

Notamment, l’UNPSB a profité de l’appui du projet en termes de suivi de la production, de l’enregistrement de ses membres au registre des multiplicateurs, et du suivi logistique de l’écoulement de ses semences. Ces efforts méritent d’être soutenus et renforcés, surtout en ce qui
concerne les aspects formation, gestion et promotion commerciale, comme le recommandent les conclusions de la mission ROM.

L’UNPSB est une structure filière qui regroupe plus de 2 500 producteurs semenciers. Cette organisation professionnelle possède une structuration pyramidale à trois (3) niveaux (national, régional et provincial), qui couvre l’ensemble du territoire national.

Cette structure fonctionne essentiellement sur base de cotisations de ses membres et de prélèvements sur le prix de vente des semences aux acheteurs.

En amont, le projet a aussi soutenu l’INERA, qui a bénéficié d’un appui restreint en termes de rachat de semences de bases et d’un protocole pour la production de pré base. Mais, au vu de sa position en tant qu’intervenant incontournable de l’amont de la filière, cet appui doit se poursuivre et s’intensifier pour ce qui est de la planification, de la production et du renforcement des capacités, notamment administratives et commerciales, en ligne avec les recommandations ROM. De plus, le projet a travaillé en étroite collaboration avec les ONG bénéficiaires de la Food Facility à l’appui à la mise en œuvre de leurs activités entre autre en ce qui concerne les volets formation et coordination des activités et la synergie avec le projet European Union Food Facility (EUFF) de la FAO.

Le projet EUFF a également joué un rôle important d’appui/conseil, de ciblage des bénéficiaires et de la distribution des intrants au niveau de nombreuses ONG et associations intervenant dans le secteur semencier.

Enfin, lors du projet EUFF, une stratégie de la filière semencière accompagnée de son plan d’opération a été élaborée et sera validée lors d’un atelier national, ce qui constitue selon l’évaluation à mi-parcours l’extrant durable majeur. L’opérationnalisation de cette stratégie doit être effective et soutenue, surtout en termes de diffusion et de politique des prix des semences. Des mécanismes restent à trouver pour que la semence de qualité produite reste accessible au plus grand nombre d’agriculteurs tout en préservant la plus-value liée à ce type de production en faveur des multiplicateurs de semences ; une réflexion portant sur des systèmes de subventions est donc nécessaire, comme souhaité par la mission ROM. L’expérience récente de la FAO en matière de stratégie semencière appliquée, notamment au Togo et en Côte d’Ivoire, constitue un atout important en termes de retour d’expérience et de diffusion de bonnes pratiques.

Au regard de tout ce qui précède la structuration et la consolidation de la filière semencière apparaissent comme essentielles pour garantir la durabilité des activités entreprises précédemment au bénéfice du secteur du développement rural du Burkina Faso.

2.3. **Actions complémentaires (UE) et coordination des bailleurs de fonds**

En matière de sécurité alimentaire, l’Union européenne fait partie des partenaires du Comité Technique du Conseil National de Sécurité Alimentaire, organe paritaire Etat/Partenaires qui gère le dispositif national de sécurité alimentaire. La Délégation anime également la coordination inter-bailleurs sur toutes les questions intéressant la sécurité alimentaire. Dans ce domaine, l’appui de l’UE va aussi aux ONG à travers les lignes budgétaires et thématiques, ainsi que via l’aide humanitaire de l’UE.

La Commission, via son bureau régional humanitaire à Dakar, participe aussi aux efforts du Gouvernement national et de ses partenaires. Outre une intervention destinée à répondre aux

---
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besoins immédiats des victimes des inondations de 2009 et 2010, la Commission met également en œuvre une "Stratégie Sahel" appuyée par un Plan Global qui se focalise sur les questions de lutte contre la malnutrition aiguë et sur la réduction de la vulnérabilité des populations via des projets d'accès à l'eau et aux moyens de subsistance.

La présente action va mettre un accent sur l'accompagnement des populations bénéficiaires vulnérables définies par les enquêtes permanentes agricoles auxquelles la FAO participe systématiquement. Ces enquêtes déterminent les populations ayant subis des chocs climatiques spécifiques, les populations en déficit de bilan céréalière et les populations plus structurellement affectées par les crises.

L'aspect « accessibilité » de la semence de qualité aux populations vulnérables (bénéficiaires indirects de cet appui) est pris en compte afin qu'elle profite au plus grand nombre et renforce la sécurité alimentaire des populations. Afin d'y parvenir la subvention reste le moyen approprié pour répondre aux besoins des populations vulnérables, le tout s'appuyant sur le lien entre leur vulnérabilité et une meilleure sécurité alimentaire à leur égard. Conformément au document de stratégie semencière, le projet accompagnera et appuiera le Gouvernement dans le choix et la mise en œuvre de sa politique de subvention des intrants agricoles (semences et engrais en particulier) en faveur des populations les plus vulnérables. L'action se situe donc dans une approche LRRD en complémentarité des actions humanitaires mises en œuvre par la Commission en particulier celles liées aux inondations de 2010.

Cette intervention sera une opportunité pour préparer un "Cadre Commun Humanitaire Développement" tel que mentionné dans l'article 5.1.3 du PSTP.

L'accessibilité des plus vulnérables aux semences améliorées sera renforcée à travers la mise en place d'un système de distribution de semences, ciblé en faveur des populations les plus vulnérables, sur base des enquêtes permanentes agricoles et de l'identification des zones à risque auxquelles participe systématiquement la FAO, le Gouvernement et les partenaires techniques et financiers. L'expérience de la FAO d'identification des plus vulnérables en collaboration avec les structures compétentes de l'Etat et des autres parties prenantes est un moyen sur lequel il faut s'appuyer.

Le présent projet contribuera au maintien des acquis du projet Facilité Alimentaire et ce en accord avec la nouvelle stratégie du Programme Thématique de Sécurité Alimentaire qui traite les causes structurelles de l'insécurité alimentaire dans les pays en situation fragile.

Dans le cadre du 10ème FED, outre les activités des projets mis en œuvre via les ONG sur lignes budgétaires qui se poursuivront, la dimension "sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle" a été prise en compte dans l'appui budgétaire contrat "Objectif du Millénaire pour le Développement" (OMD) adopté sous Programme Action Annuel 2008 notamment en sa partie sécurité alimentaire. L'objectif est de travailler avec le Gouvernement pour lui permettre d'assurer une meilleure prise en charge des systèmes d'information sur la sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle.

En matière de coordination des appuis au développement, l'UE participe à plusieurs cadres de concertation des PTF (partenaires techniques et financiers) au niveau général et à ceux liés au développement rural et sécurité alimentaire.

Toujours dans un cadre de concertation avec le Gouvernement et l'ensemble des PTF, d'autres acteurs mettent en œuvre des programmes de sécurité alimentaire d'échelle nationale. Relativement au domaine qui occupe le présent projet, on signalera notamment les interventions des institutions financières, telles que Banque mondiale, Banque africaine de développement, et Banque islamique de développement, qui participent aussi à l'accessibilité des semences certifiées, notamment par des programmes de distributions d'intrants à travers le gouvernement. Cinq (55) ONG ont bénéficié du soutien de l'Union européenne dans le cadre de la Facilité alimentaire pour mettre en œuvre des programmes de sécurité alimentaire ; de même, ces programmes sont coordonnés et mis en
cohérence avec l’ensemble des activités du cluster sécurité alimentaire, en sus de la coopération étroite existant entre les acteurs de la Facilité au niveau national (Gouvernement, UE, FAO, ONG). De nombreux programmes et projets de dimension locale sont aussi présents sur le territoire, mis en œuvre par des ONG et associations autant nationales qu’internationales, avec soutien de partenaires techniques et financiers qui participent aux coordinations sectorielles. Enfin, on pourra aussi mentionner le projet FAO financé par la coopération japonaise portant sur la filière riz, depuis la production semencière jusqu’à la commercialisation et l’introduction d’activités parallèles (élevage, aquaculture, ...).

3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectifs

Objectif général : Contribuer à l’amélioration de la sécurité alimentaire des populations affectées par les chocs climatiques à travers l’amélioration de la qualité des semences et leur disponibilité sur les marchés ruraux.

Objectif spécifique : Consolider la filière semencière à travers un système durable de multiplication et de certification de semences.

3.2. Résultats escomptés et principales activités

Résultat 1: Les capacités des producteurs de semences (qu’ils soient individuels ou collectifs), membres de l’Union Nationale des Producteurs de Semences du Burkina Faso (UNPSB), du secteur semencier privé (grossistes, détaillants, transporteurs, etc.) (a) ainsi que des bureaux des Unions des producteurs de semences (nationale, régionales et provinciales) sont renforcées (b).

Pour ce qui est de la sélection des bénéficiaires, celle-ci sera réalisée selon des critères d’efficacité et d’impartialité, en s’appuyant sur l’expérience du projet Facilité alimentaire mis en œuvre depuis 2009. Les producteurs ayant démontré les meilleurs résultats et dispositions lors de la première phase du projet pourraient être renforcés, ainsi que les acteurs, incluant les privés, ayant prouvé leurs compétences techniques et de gestion, notamment en termes de maintenance et de disponibilité pour ce qui concerne les équipements.

Activités:
- Formations en techniques de gestion d’entreprise, en gestion des stocks et logistique, ainsi qu’en stratégie de communication ; (a) et (b)\(^4\)
- Formation en technique de conservation des semences ; (a)
- Mise en place de champs de démonstration de semences certifiées ; (a)
- Mise en place d’un système de promotion de l’offre en semences certifiées (disponibilités, sites de production, variétés disponibles, prix, ...); (a)
- Mise en place d’un système de distribution et d’accessibilité des semences aux plus vulnérables
- Promotion / facilitation de l’accès au crédit de campagne pour les producteurs semenciers ; (a)
- Renforcement des capacités des producteurs affiliés aux organisations professionnelles agricoles (transformation, conditionnement, commercialisation, ...); (a)
- Rachats partiels des dernières semences certifiées produites dans la cadre du projet EUFF ; (a)
- Suivi durant la campagne de saison humide 2010/2011 des aménagements de bas-fonds de type PRP\(^5\) réalisés dans le cadre du projet EUFF ; (a)

\(^4\) (a) : secteur privé et (b) : Union National des Producteurs Semenciers du Burkina

\(^5\) Projet Riz Pluvial
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- Fourniture de trieuses/calibres aux au niveau des principales zones de production (à proximité des lieux d'implantation des laboratoires) ; (a)
- Construction de 13 boutiques d’intrants (une par région : semences, engrais, petit outillage, produits phytosanitaires, ...), gérées par des membres de l’UNPSB ou des privés (cette dernière alternative sera privilégiée) ; (a)
- Renforcement organisationnel et institutionnel de l’UNPSB. (b)

Résultat 2: Un plan de production de semences de pré-base et base auprès de l’INERA sur cinq ans est mis en place et soutenu dans sa phase de démarrage.
Comme dans le projet EUFF, les semences de nouveau visées par la présente proposition seront le riz et le maïs d’une part, en ligne avec les priorités gouvernementales, mais aussi d’autre part le sorgho, le mil et le niébé. Il s’agit de variétés adaptées au contexte tant hydro-climatique qu’organoleptique du Burkina-Faso, choisies selon leur potentiel agronomique mais aussi en fonction des retours d’expérience provenant des services agricoles gouvernementaux et des producteurs eux-mêmes. Ces semences, qui sont déjà passablement diffusées sur le territoire, sont susceptibles d’être conservées et réutilisées par les producteurs jusqu’à trois campagnes. A ce jour, aucun ravage phytosanitaire majeur n’a été signalé, qui aurait été en relation avec l’introduction de nouvelles spéculations ou variétés. La FAO reste toutefois vigilante, en collaboration avec le MAHRH, et continue de dispenser du matériel, des produits et des conseils pour une gestion phytosanitaire respectueuse de l’environnement.
Activités:
- Elaboration d’un plan de production sur 5 ans pour les semences de pré-base et base en cohérence avec le plan d’action de la stratégie;
- Définition « d’un contrat plan » entre le Ministère de l’Agriculture et l’INERA pour la production de semences sur les 5 ans ;
- Soutien à la production des semences de pré-base et base durant les 2 premières années (Protocole d’Accord) ;
- Formation à la gestion financière et commerciale.
- Formation à la planification.

Résultat 3: La stratégie de développement du secteur semencier et son plan d’opération incluant l'accessibilité des plus vulnérables aux semences améliorées sont adoptés, diffusés et mis en application.

Activités:
- Traduction (mooré, dioula et fulfuldé) d’une synthèse de la stratégie et du plan d’opération de la stratégie et mise en forme d’un document de communication ;
- Diffusion de la stratégie et du plan d’opération aux acteurs de la filière et aux partenaires techniques et financiers ;
- Réalisation d’actions de lobbying pour la prise en compte des personnes vulnérables dans l’accès aux semences améliorées
- Appui à la mise en place du comité national semencier ;
- Appui à la tenue des premières réunions du comité national semencier dans l’objectif d’activer le processus d’inscription des activités du plan d’opération au budget de l’État ;
- Réalisation d’une étude approfondie des coûts de revient, des prix de cession des semences certifiées vivrières et d’une étude de marché pour les semences certifiées et propositions d’une politique de subvention de l’État ;
- Mise en place d’un comité d’homologation des variétés.

3.3. Risques et hypothèses
Des chocs climatiques (sécheresse ou inondation), des épidémies ou des invasions acridiennes pourraient potentiellement affecter la production de semences. Un suivi régulier afin de prendre les dispositions adéquates dès qu'un danger se présente est donc très important afin de pouvoir opter pour les meilleures solutions dans les plus brefs délais (irrigation, lutte contre les maladies, ...).

Un manque d'engagement fort ou de disponibilité soutenue du Gouvernement ainsi qu'un manque de capacité organisationnelle de la part de l'UNPSB, ou encore une trop forte tutelle du secteur public sur son fonctionnement, pourraient aussi hypothéquer les efforts entrepris.

3.4. Questions transversales

Les questions transversales les plus relatives au projet, qui seront prises en compte dans le cadre de l'exécution du projet et en ligne avec la politique de la FAO et des autres partenaires et les objectifs de développement du millénaire, seront l'environnement, le genre, la décentralisation, le renforcement des capacités à la base, la gestion des risques de catastrophe et les droits de l'homme. Plus particulièrement, les aspects de conservation environnementale liés à la production de semences de base (utilisation de pesticides, ...) seront pris en compte comme pour toutes les autres composantes de ce projet (par exemple dans les constructions des boutiques d'_intrants) ; la mission ROM avait d’ailleurs déjà mis en avant la prise en compte de cet aspect par la FAO dans le projet EUFF. L'expérience documentée de la FAO en matière de conservation des eaux et sols, défense et restauration des milieux agricoles sera un atout pour une mise en œuvre des activités tout en respectant l'environnement. Le transfert de technologies appropriées pour les bénéficiaires sera assuré.

Quant à la question du genre, il est important pour la FAO de donner les mêmes chances à tous d'accéder à de nouvelles techniques, nouvelles connaissances et nouveaux moyens de production et de subsistance. Dans le cadre de la mise en œuvre de ce projet, et comme pour tout les autres projets mis en œuvre par la FAO au Burkina Faso, l'aspect genre sera un critère primordial de sélection des bénéficiaires, sachant que les groupements sont généralement mixtes et que certains sont exclusivement féminins, confirmant les bonnes impressions recueillies par l'évaluation à mi-parcours. Les formations notamment continueront d'appliquer les principes nécessaires de participation démocratique et d'égalité.

3.5. Parties prenantes

Les bénéficiaires finaux des semences de qualité seront les agriculteurs du Burkina Faso, y compris les producteurs en situation d’excédents agricoles.

Les producteurs semenciers ne font pas partie des populations vulnérables mais par leur production de semences de qualité, ils amènent les autres agriculteurs à une meilleure production vivrière. En général, au Burkina Faso, les agriculteurs possèdent de la terre, parfois limitée en superficie ou peu fertile, ce qui justifie l'utilisation d'une semence de qualité pour améliorer la productivité de la parcelle.

L'UNPSB en tant qu'organisation fédératrice du secteur, et à travers elle les multiplicateurs de semences, mais également les organisations de producteurs (OP) concernées seront des bénéficiaires directs du projet.

Le secteur privé évoqué plus haut sera aussi considéré comme partenaire essentiel dans les activités de promotion, d'organisation / structuration et de renforcement des capacités du projet.

Des ONGs ayant une expertise dans la mise en œuvre de projets d'urgence et de développement seront identifiées par la FAO et impliquées pour l'exécution des activités destinées aux populations vulnérables.

Enfin, la Direction Générale des Productions Végétales (DGPV) du Ministère en charge de l'agriculture, et ses services déconcentrés, participeront étroitement à la mise en œuvre des activités décrites.
Environ 10 000 personnes seront touchées dont des producteurs semenciers, des acteurs du secteur privé, des techniciens et chercheurs, etc. En plus de ces personnes environ 10 000 ménages vulnérables sont visés. La taille moyenne d'un ménage étant de 7 personnes, environ 70 000 personnes vulnérables seront touchées par le projet.

Le Gouvernement, en tant que partenaire principal dans la coordination des activités du projet, suivra de près le bon déroulement de la mise en œuvre du projet.

Un coordinateur national sera nommé par le Ministère de l’Agriculture, il jouera le rôle d’interface entre l’équipe opérationnelle du projet et les Directions Générales impliquées dans les activités du projet, il sera le garant de l’implication du Gouvernement pour une meilleure capitalisation des expériences et une prise en compte des besoins et contraintes réelles de la filière semencière et de son impact en termes d’amélioration de la sécurité alimentaires des populations vulnérables.

4. QUESTIONS DE MISE EN OEUVRE

4.1. Mode de gestion

Gestion conjointe via la signature d’une convention avec une organisation internationale ajouter avec la FAO, sur la base de l’Article 29 du Règlement (CE) No 215/2008 sur le règlement financier applicable au 10e FED.

La FAO a été choisie à travers son Unité d’urgence et réhabilitation pour gérer ce projet dû au fait qu’elle a mené à bien le précédent projet Food Facility dont ce projet est une consolidation ; elle possède donc l’expérience nécessaire, les ressources humaines et les moyens logistiques pour sa mise en œuvre. L’organisation internationale remplit les critères prévus par le Règlement financier applicable et elle est couverte par l’Accord Cadre Financier et Administratif entre la Commission et les Nations Unies (FAFA – Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement between the European Commission and the United Nations) signé le 29 avril 2003.

Le changement du mode de gestion constitue un changement substantiel à la présente décision sauf dans le cas où la Commission "re-centralise" ou diminue le niveau de tâches préalablement déléguées au pays bénéficiaire (gestion décentralisée), à l’organisation internationale (gestion conjointe) ou à l’organisme délégataire (gestion centralisée indirecte) en question.

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 standards établis et publiés par l’organisation internationale concernée.

4.3. Budget et calendrier

Le projet sera mis en œuvre sur une période de 24 mois, à compter de la date de signature de la convention de contribution.

Le budget indicatif pour cette action est de € 5.000.000 et est financé à 100% par la ligne budgétaire Sécurité Alimentaire 21 02 01.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dépenses</th>
<th>Coût (€)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convention de contribution avec FAO</td>
<td>5.000.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1 - Les capacités des producteurs de semences (qu’ils soient individuels ou collectifs), membres de l’Union Nationale des Producteurs de Semences du Burkina Faso (UNPSB), du secteur semencier privé (grossistes, détaillants, transporteurs, etc.), ainsi que des bureaux des Unions des producteurs de semences (nationale, régionales et provinciales) sont renforcées</td>
<td>2.860.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4. Suivi et exécution
Le suivi de l'exécution du projet sera assuré par la FAO qui assurera la disponibilité des données de base pour le suivi des indicateurs grâce à un personnel expert mis à disposition. Un Comité de Pilotage sera mis en place, dont le mandat et les modalités d'organisation seront définis dans la description de l'action annexée à la convention de contribution.
La Délégation de l'Union européenne présente dans le pays assurera également un contrôle du projet sur base des indicateurs clés établis dans le cadre logique, des rapports d'activité et des réunions ou comités se rapportant au projet.

4.5. Evaluation et audit
Le projet fera l'objet d'une évaluation finale mise en œuvre par l'Union européenne. Les audits seront organisés par la FAO dans le respect de ses règlements financiers, règles internes et directives. L'Union européenne se réserve le droit d'effectuer une vérification des dépenses si elle le juge nécessaire.

4.6. Communication et visibilité
Les normes se rapportant aux actions de visibilité sont décrites dans le manuel de visibilité de l'Union européenne pour les actions extérieures :
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/index_fr.htm
ACTION FICHE
LIBERIA – FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Improved Food Security in Foya District, Lofa county, Northern Liberia, through promotion of value chain approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Total cost | EUR 2 200 000:  
2,000,000 EUR, EU Contribution  
200,000 EUR, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH (GIZ) contribution |
| Method/Form of management | Indirect centralised management - delegation agreement with GIZ |
| DAC code | 52010 | Sector | Food Security |

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Context

Liberia’s economy, institutions, and human capacity were almost completely destroyed by the conflict that pervaded the country between 1989 and 2003. The protracted war devastated the country’s basic infrastructure and rendered access to most productive inputs, services, and markets impossible. Public and private institutional capacities, at both the national and local levels, were severely disrupted or destroyed. The political situation has experienced marked improvement since the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement in August 2003. A democratically elected government was formed in 2006, the re-establishment of state authority and rule of law are progressing, and institutions and systems relevant to peace consolidation and national security are being strengthened.

Liberian agriculture comprises food and tree crops, fisheries, and livestock. The sector accounted for 42.2% of real Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 2008. Approximately 70% of the country’s population depends on agriculture for its livelihood. The sector is a significant contributor to the economy in terms of employment and foreign exchange earnings, and a primary determinant of nutrition, education, poverty reduction, and rural transformation.

However, Liberia is still too dependent on food imports as the country produces 230,000 tonnes of the 491,000 tonnes of rice required for utilization according to Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in 2010. As observed in the Comprehensive Food Security and Nutrition Survey conducted in October 2010, food security status is improving compared to 2006 but remains unacceptably high with 41% of the population food insecure. Poor agricultural productivity is caused by structural impediments, inadequate policies, degraded transport and processing infrastructures, and diminished productive capacities such as assets and skilled personnel.

The action will be implemented in the Foya district in the county of Lofa (north-east Liberia, bordering Sierra Leone and Guinea.) Lofa is one of the counties were there has been

---

1 The FAO estimated figures for 2010 are consistent with the recently released Crop Survey results of 2009 conducted by Ministry of Agriculture and Liberia Institute of Statistics and Geo-information Systems (LISGIS) with support from FAO, Africa Rice Center and Central Agriculture Research Institute (CARI) showing a milled local production of 167,600 Tonnes covering approximately 40% of the total needs requirement for Liberia (425,000 Tonnes).
substantial progress since 2006, probably linked to the fact that this one of the areas with a strong agricultural tradition.

Prior to the Liberian civil war, Foya farmers' cooperatives were among the most productive farmers organizations in Liberia. The region was known as the 'food basket'. Like many other institutions and organizations, the cooperatives fell apart during the war. The organizations' cash investments were pillaged and the infrastructures ruined. Foya farmers now say cooperatives must regain their lost integrity as precondition for them to become members again.

In the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS, 2008-2011), agriculture's contribution to Liberia's economic recovery is fully recognised. One of the Government's priorities is to expand agriculture production by about 3.6 percent per year.

During 2010, Liberia has prepared a Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) post-Compact investment plan, and subsequently obtained a CAADP technical review report. The Liberia Agriculture Sector Investment Program (LASIP) presents the strategic choices that Liberia has made for agricultural growth and development over the next five years in an environmentally friendly and sustainable manner. It is within this pro-poor, conflict-sensitive context that the LASIP is concentrating its actions and efforts on smallholders with a focus on food crops (rice, cassava, and vegetables) productivity enhancement, value chains development (including market access), and capacity strengthening.

In keeping with the Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP) 2011-13 strategy, the Action provides distinctive added value and complements EDF programmes in Liberia. Presently, Food Security and rural development has not been integrated in the current National Indicative Programme but support to the Education sector, the Public Health System and infrastructure rehabilitation are complementing this Action.

In relation to the Linking of Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD), medium term funding instruments such as the Food Facility and the FSTP are already addressing food security needs in the country, taking over from ECHO (Humanitarian Aid & Civil Protection) who has already closed its food security interventions. In accordance with article 5.1.3 of the FSTP a Joint Humanitarian Development Framework will be prepared. Actions will contribute to reducing vulnerability and strengthening resilience to shocks.

This Action will complement as much as possible the other FSTP and Food Facility interventions, offering a potential LRRD-based consolidation process beyond the life of the specific projects. In fact, this particular Action is building on a Food Facility intervention with the objective of achieving its full potential to improve food security of the poor and vulnerable in Liberia.

2.2. Lessons learnt

In order to allow economic reintegration and longer term rehabilitation, there is a need to further consolidate the achievements of the implementation of the currently ongoing project ("Improved Food Security in Foya District") which will be completed by October 2011 and is implemented by Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH (GIZ). The project has been successful in repairing productive and social assets, destroyed during the war, that are vital for food security such as swamp rice production areas, cocoa plantations and irrigation systems.

Economic reintegration requires a longer term intervention in the area than was possible under the previous Food Facility actions, involving the whole value chain of agriculture investment (production, irrigation, infrastructure, storage and marketing). Through this value chain-
driven approach, the communities benefiting from the Action should be better equipped to improve their economic situation and reduce their vulnerability to shocks.

Additionally, it is important to recognize the central government's limited capacity to deal with agriculture sector issues and in parallel the need to strengthen the local institutions to monitor and evaluate the various projects implemented in the regions. Capacity building of local and central institutions, in particular the Ministry of Agriculture is highly relevant for the creation of a participatory strategic framework related to food security in Liberia.

Furthermore, the social cohesion component has proved as an extremely efficient way to engage and motivate communities to participate in the previous Food Facility interventions as it has brought together young and old people, villages and towns, promoting good collaboration at the local level in Foya District. This is particularly relevant as Liberia is still highly vulnerable politically due to high unemployment of youth and the elections at the end of 2011, which may create tension in the country. A Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) mission carried out in August 2010 reflects positively on the sound approach used by Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ, now GIZ) in the project, in particular by not paying the farmers to work on their farms in order to enhance ownership. Ownership by the farmer beneficiaries is paramount to the project's success.

2.3. Complementary action

A number of EU grants and food security measures (often via contribution agreements) were awarded in 2008 and 2009 under the Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP) budget line and the Food Facility, linking to Humanitarian Aid & Civil Protection's past interventions. has now phased out from food security operations in Liberia.

At the beginning of 2011, the EU was supporting programmes in the agriculture and nutrition sectors for a total value of almost 24 million, including funding from the Food Facility, the FSTP and EDF Envelope B. In Foya, food security interventions build on operations funded by the Commission which ended mid 2010, aiming at increasing the availability of staple food for targeted vulnerable returning households.

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH (GIZ) has been present in Lofa County since 2006. The main achievements have been the rehabilitation of 2,000 ha of swamp land and start of rice production, the rehabilitation of 500 ha of cocoa, the transformation of 29 palm log bridges to reinforced concrete structures, the repair of major road spots, the support to income generation activities though community revolving loans, literacy for women, the support to youth clubs reactivation and support to community development training.

Other EU funded interventions complementing this Food Security action, include the support to the Education sector, support to the Public Health System and infrastructure rehabilitation at national and county level, including major roads, feeder roads, markets and water and sanitation. This is done via the A Envelope of the National Indicative Programme (NIP) of Liberia (focal sector: Linking of Relief, Rehabilitation and Development in a post-conflict fragile state.)

2.4. Donor coordination

Formal coordination has been structured around the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) and through the Liberia Reconstruction and Development Commission (LRDC) attached to the Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs.

A sector forum, the Agriculture Sector Working Group, was created in 2010 and includes the donor representatives as United States Agency for International Development (USAID), EU, Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), Japan International
Cooperation Agency (JICA), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD),
African Development Bank (AfDB), World Bank, International Finance Corporation (IFC),
Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), World Food Programme (WFP) and Deutsche
Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH (GIZ). This is in line with the
Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) which is a strategic
framework developed by African leaders to restore agriculture growth and enhance food
security and nutrition. The Liberia Agriculture Sector Investment Programme (LASIP) was
developed in line with the National Food Security and Nutrition Strategy, and the CAADP.
The creation of the Agriculture Sector Working Group enhances donor coordination and
decreases duplication of activities in the agriculture sector which includes a food security and
nutrition security component.

3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectives

General Objective

Improve food security for the poorest and most vulnerable and to help achieve the first
Millennium Development Goals (MDG, eradicating poverty and hunger).

Specific Objective

Improve Food Security in Foya District through promotion of value chain approach.

3.2. Action planned and expected results

1. Improved productivity and production of rice and cocoa in Foya District

Availability of labour has been a major constraint in food production by food insecure
households in rural Liberia. All activities surrounding production are done manually. The
proposed Action is envisaged to improve farmers’ productivity through the introduction of
sustainable labour saving devices and methods.

The most demanding of this labour, in both rice and cocoa (which includes transplanting,
weeding, harvesting, fermenting, drying, handling, transportation of produce and processing),
largely involves women. Most of this labour can be reduced by making use of locally
manufactured agriculture tools and specialized, gender friendly labour saving devices.

Two specialist manufacturers of labour saving tools will be identified and employed by
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH (GIZ) to train the artisans in
the manufacturing of these. GIZ will then identify 5 artisans to be trained in the
manufacturing of paddy rice threshers, paddy rice winnowers and sickle harvest knives. The
specialist manufacturers will establish 1 manufacturing training workshop in Foya District
from where the trained artisans will work during and after training to manufacture the labour
saving tools. The established manufacturing workshop will produce 150 paddy threshers, 150
winnowers, 1,300 sickle knives initially. The Action will also provide 10 units of mini power
tillers to the farmers’ association to be used in particular by vulnerable farmers (women and
incapacitated people) who would otherwise have to pay cash for land preparation. Assured
proper use of these power tillers will save arduous labour (land preparation) and will
encourage farmers to produce two crops of rice per season instead of one. These labour saving
tools and devices will be purchased by the Action and given to the Foya Rural Women’s
Association (an established, recognized women farmers organization represented throughout
Foya District and currently bargaining for and supporting its more than 500 members) and
probably to two other farmers’ organizations, as a means of strengthening their capacity to
improve their services to members’ needs. From farmers’ organizations, the tools can be
accessed by farmers through the organization’s loan arrangements (for example by giving part of their harvest to the farmers’ organization.) Sickle harvest knives are used to replace local harvest knives used in panicle harvest of rice to improve on harvest labour and time. Paddy threshers are used to separate rice grains from harvested rice stalk and the winnowers to separate the threshed rice from chaff and unfilled grains - activities that are traditionally the responsibility of women.

The Action will employ rice and cocoa technicians to train 790 rice and cocoa farmers group leaders how to use the labour saving devices and tools. The farmers targeted for training are community working group leaders who – during 2009 (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, BMZ, Project) and 2010 to 2011 (EU-BMZ Food Facility Action) - headed the 140 cocoa and 650 rice working groups during rehabilitation of their fields.

The aim of manufacturing these tools and devices using local artisans is a) to empower local artisans, b) to give sustainability to the availability of tools and devices at the village level, c) to promote the provision of maintenance services to the tools and devices, and d) to initially provide these devices to the farmers’ organizations who in turn will loan them for farmers’ use through an organizational arrangement.

The time and labour saved by the use of labour saving tools and devices could be utilized to expand and sustain rice and cocoa production, add value to produce and/or used for other development/economic activities.

In addition to the labour saving tools and devices, the Action will also give follow-up to Food Facility Project activities aiming increase of production such as seed banks and dam utilization and maintenance.

2. **Appropriate post harvest handling, processing and marketing of rice and cocoa in Foya District is ensured**

Amongst the impacts of the 2009 BMZ Project and the EU-BMZ Food Facility funded Project in Foya District) is related the training of 7,000 rice-farmers, and 2,500 cocoa farmers. These are predominantly young people and have no knowledge or experience with farmers’ organizations, how they function and how they can benefit communities and farmers. This Action will provide basic education to leaders of farmers groups on the merits of organizing and becoming members of farmers’ organization movements.

The Cooperative Development Agency (CDA) is the arm of the Government of Liberia which is responsible for facilitating the establishment of farmers’ and non-farmers organizations including their registration, training and regulation. The government is striving to restore the CDA, which was destroyed by the civil war. This Action will provide collaboration and support to the CDA, by providing an Organizational Development Consultant who will work with the CDA to analyze its internal structures and organizational strengths and weakness. An efficiently structured and qualified CDA will be able to better assist farmers to organize cooperatives and farmers’ organizations and train them to function properly.

A properly organized and functioning farmers’ association will protect their members against poor prices (during adverse market conditions) by providing them with needed funds to tide them over their immediate financial needs (which is the main reason they sell their rice for very low prices during and just after harvest.) The association will also process unprocessed rice (value addition, saving the beneficiary the labour of milling by hand-pounding). The farmers’ organizations will in turn sell the processed rice for the beneficiary at a better and stabilized price or return the rice to the farmer minus processing fees which could be deducted in kind. For this purpose the project will supply 3 rice mills to the farmers’ associations.
These support measures will result in attracting more farmers to the associations. Acting together as associations, members could benefit from economies of scale, increased bargaining power and receive better prices for their produce (rice and cocoa but also other crops), get other services otherwise not available (mentioned above) and have improved access to markets.

Additionally, the Action will provide 150 drying floors to about 220 communities for drying rice and other crops and thermal plastics for construction of 150 cocoa solar dryers to about 140 cocoa communities. For the construction of these processing facilities, local material will be provided by beneficiaries and utilized where possible within a training framework which will give them skills for care and maintenance of the structures. The farmers targeted for training are framers’ group leaders who – during 2009 (BMZ Project) and 2010 to 2011 EU BMZ FF Action - headed the cocoa working groups during rehabilitation of their fields. The cocoa solar dryers will be constructed to accommodate cocoa harvests of 2 or more farmers at a time and reduce the drying time from a minimum of 12 days to not more than 6. The dryers provide continuous uninterrupted protection during drying while keeping out rain and animals. The dryers could also be used to dry other crops produced by farmers.

The direct beneficiaries of the Action who will receive training are 1,000 farmer group and local leaders. The training will have impact on 10,500 rice, cocoa and plantain farmers.

In addition to the rice and cocoa activities, the Action will also give follow-up visits to 1,000 female plantain farmers who cultivated plantain on 100 ha in 2009 (BMZ Project) and 2010 – 2011 (EU BMZ Food Facility Project) and support those who are interested in increasing and improving their plantations and link them to the farmers’ organizations/cooperatives.

3. **Improved access to market for rice and cocoa in Foya District**

Rehabilitation and construction of farm-to-market roads and bridges (using reinforced concrete ring and box culverts) will result in improved and more sustainable access of vehicles to production and market communities, which will save farmers’ labour and time used for transporting farm produce to market centres.

Furthermore, many farm produces are highly perishable. Quick access to market community’s will help farmers sell off highly perishable produce and avoid them rotting in store for lack of and/or delay in transportation. Farmers become dissuaded to produce more and produce only what their family can consume when they lose valuable production due to lack or delay in transportation, which reduces production sustainability.

In the past, local authorities often requested GIZ to assist with the temporary rehabilitation of critical road spots and bridges. The Action will support reduction of this degradation by rehabilitating around 8 - 10 road spots/bridges, depending on the size, giving road access to several market communities. The involvement of community workers within the cash-for-work scheme will enable about 100 daily workers from surrounding villages to increase their income during 2 months as well as give them hands-on training for maintenance of the structures and a sense of ownership. Rehabilitation of bridges and bad road spots will open up access between farms and market places and encourage production of rice and cocoa.

4. **Improved capacity of stakeholders and institutions involved in rice and cocoa sector in Foya District**

In order improve the sustainability of the established value chain structure for the rice and cocoa sector, stakeholders and local institutions must take ownership and guide, monitor and evaluate its activities periodically. In order to enable them to perform this critical task, their capacities must be improved. The sustainability of the rehabilitated structures supporting
improved food security in Foya District including dams, roads, bridges, road spots and the proposed value chain for rice and cocoa must involve these stakeholders.

Foya District suffers from an eroded perception of civic responsibility, as a result of the high number of returnees accustomed to being remunerated for their own benefit in refugee camps. This action will also support local authorities to educate the villagers on their civic responsibilities. The education will enable those in the community to know and appreciate their civic responsibilities and take ownership for the communal structures and maintain them properly. The Action will target local leaders in 175 villages corresponding to half of the villages where the 2009 BMZ Project and the 2010 – 2011 EU BMZ Food Facility Action was implemented. Workshops will cover civic education and responsibilities, leadership responsibilities, and the importance of maintenance of communal structures such as roads, bridges and dams. The Action will also organize capacity building workshops within the areas of monitoring and evaluation. Local leaders should be able to monitor and evaluate the established value chain structure, including the functioning of the farmers’ association, maintenance of rehabilitated dams, bridges, road spots, uses of communal crop processing equipments, etc.

3.3. Stakeholders

The stakeholders are District authorities; farmers association authorities; Ministry of Agriculture; non-governmental organizations (NGOs) present in the District; trained farmer leaders; marketing associations; cocoa buying agents; transport businesses; local banks and particularly the population vulnerable to food insecurity.

Beneficiaries are most vulnerable farmers and farmers’ association leaders; the Cooperative Development Agency (CDA); local and traditional authorities; the District Development Committee (DDC) and farmers’ organizations.

District authorities, farmers and farmers’ associations have participated in discussions concerning the approach of the Action. A planning workshop will be held together with the involved District and local authorities and other stakeholders to discuss further details of the proposed Action. To coordinate the proposed Action, meetings will be realized with other potential implementing partners/donors in the area.

3.4. Risks and assumptions

The main risks relate to the political and security situation of the country that could be compounded by the general elections in 2011 and the situation in neighbouring Cote d’Ivoire (although it has no border with Lofa County). However, the political and security situation has improved since the inauguration of the new Government after the 2005 elections and progressively consolidated with the support of the international community. Political stability should further induce the social and economic stability required for the implementation of this Project.

In relation to the decentralization process to be carried out by the Government, limited progress has been made so far and it may affect the capacity of the local authorities in Foya District.

The main assumptions are:

- Farmers accept new methods of post harvest handling and processing of rice and cocoa.
- The cocoa price does not fall below cost of production.
- No outbreak of rice and cocoa diseases affecting harvest.
- Political situation in Foya does not interfere with the functioning and management of
the farmer's associations.

- Bad access roads do not stop cocoa buyers from accessing cocoa production areas. Environmental risks are being addressed. The Action promotes cultivation of rice in swamps by incorporating plant biomass back into the soil during land preparation which improves soil tilth and fertility. The use of agrochemicals (synthetic fertilizers and pesticides) are neither promoted nor supported in rice and cocoa production. Swamp rice production is done on permanent plots, which discourages shifting and burning cultivation practices, while cocoa production promotes agroforestry (land management involving the growing of trees) by promoting judicious, economic forest cover in an area threatened by grassland and are therefore not harmful for the soil and surrounding nature.

3.5. Cross-cutting issues

The social cohesion component of the 2009 Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, BMZ, Project and the 2010-2011 EU - BMZ Food Facility Action has established community peace initiatives, which are benefiting the target group and surrounding villages. This has also created conditions for economic activities and trade. The proposed Action will conduct training workshops to build up and sustain the capacities of the communities to prevent, manage or resolve their conflicts so that they do not end up in violence. The approach will ensure that communities take ownership of their processes of conflict transformation in a sustainable way. To motivate villagers to take self initiative, training in community development planning will be implemented. Experiences showed that several villages after participating in those training workshops, started to improve conditions of their villages. Promotion of peace and democracy for young people will be supported through sports and cultural activities. Exchange of ideas between different generations – especially between elders and youth – together with other cross-cutting issues like HIV/AIDs, gender equality, teenage pregnancy among others will be streamlined in the Action. The proposed Action will also support literacy and numeracy classes for those women who are involved in economic activities. Given the chance to learn how to read and write will enable women to act in markets independently and will empower them. It will also reduce gender inequality existing in the implementation area. Additionally, the ability to read and write - no matter how limited - is generally conducive for development.

Part of these activities will be implemented by a local non-governmental organization through a service contract. Other activities will be implemented by Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH (GIZ) itself.

4. IMPLEMENTATION

4.1. Method of implementation

The action will be implemented under indirect centralised management via a Delegation Agreement with the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH (GIZ), in accordance with Article 56 of the EC Regulation 1605/2002 (financial regulation).

The reasons for selecting GIZ are the appropriate development approach, the excellent performance of GIZ during the monitoring missions and the need to increase the impact of the Food Facility project with a longer term and market driven intervention in those communities. This project has been agreed directly with GIZ.

The change of management mode constitutes a substantial change except where the Commission "re-centralises" or reduces the level of tasks previously delegated to the
beneficiary country, international organisation or delegate body under, respectively, decentralised, joint or indirect centralised management.

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 Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH (GIZ), which are in line with the principles of the 10th EDF regulation. For implementing the action, GIZ will besides (sub)contracting also draw on its own expertise in-house.

4.3. **Budget and schedule**

The maximum EU contribution for this action is **EUR 2 000 000** financed by the Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP) 2011-13. The total eligible cost of the action is EUR 2 200 000. The source of funding is the food security budget line 21 02 01.

The co-financing from Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH (GIZ) own resources is EUR 200 000.

The indicative operational duration of the action will be 24 months as from the signature of the Delegation agreement with GIZ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>EU contribution (€)</th>
<th>GIZ contribution (€)</th>
<th>TOTAL (€)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegation agreement with GIZ GmbH</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>200,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,200,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. **Performance monitoring**

Key indicators will be incorporated in the action’s design for regular assessment of progress on the individual components. This mechanism will be specified in the action plan and performance will be described in the regular progress reports.

The logical framework (attached) will be the tool utilised for the regular monitoring of indicators and performance during the implementation of the action.

A baseline survey will be conducted by October 2011 during the implementation of the Food Facility funded project. Before the end of the action, a final survey will be conducted in order to draw conclusions about the achievement of various results.

4.5. **Evaluation and audit**

A mid term evaluation of the Action, including impact carried from the Food Facility intervention, is expected during the implementation of the action by an independent evaluator contracted by Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH (GIZ) and funded by the Action.

4.6. **Communication and visibility**

Visibility of the EU will be ensured by Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH (GIZ), e.g. through support to information and communication activities included in the project document.

**Appendices:**

1. Logical framework
2. Appendix to the action fiche regarding the verification of the conditions for indirect centralised management provided for in art. 56 of the EC Regulation 1605/2002 (financial regulation).
FICHE D'ACTION POUR LE PROGRAMME THÉMATIQUE DE SECURITÉ ALIMENTAIRE
PRIORITÉ STRATÉGIQUE 3 : "TRAITER L’INSECURITÉ ALIMENTAIRE AU SEIN DES POPULATIONS PAUVRES ET VULNERABLES DANS LES PAYS EN SITUATION FRAGILES.

NIGER

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intitulé/Numéro :</th>
<th>Appui à l’amélioration de la santé de la reproduction et à la maîtrise de la croissance démographique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coût total :</td>
<td>Financement Union Européenne : 4,5 millions d'EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Méthode d'assistance</td>
<td>Approche projet gestion conjointe avec l’UNFPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode de gestion :</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code CAD :</td>
<td>52010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secteur : Sécurité alimentaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. MOTIF

2.1 Contexte du secteur

Pays sahélien saharien enclavé (1.267.000 km2), dont plus de la moitié du territoire est désertique, le Niger, souffre d’une pluviométrie aléatoire, irrégulière et insuffisante dans le temps et l’espace. Il est sujet à une forte croissance démographique de 3,3% par an, plus élevée que la croissance agricole actuelle de 2,2%. La population nigérienne est à 84% rurale avec 70% de la population active du pays, essentiellement dans les activités agricoles et pastorales dont les productions alimentaires suffisent à peine à la subsistance des populations. L’agriculture nigérienne, mis à part les cultures de rente, est une agriculture vivrière de subsistance, essentiellement céréalière. Elle contribue à 40% de la valeur du PIB.

Le Niger est l’un des pays les plus pauvres au monde : la pauvreté est très grande surtout en milieu rural avec un PIB par habitant estimé à 197 US$ en baisse de plus de 40% au cours des 20 dernières années. Ainsi, il est estimé que 62,1% de nigériens sont pauvres1 avec une incidence plus élevée en milieu rural (66%) qu’en milieu urbain (52%) et une disparité importante selon les régions : de 79,7% à Maradi, 46 % à Agadez et 27 % à Niamey. De même, plus la taille du ménage est grande, plus la proportion des pauvres augmente. On peut constater que 68,8% des pauvres sont issus des ménages agricoles nombreux².

Il est admis que la pauvreté mène à un mauvais état de santé (y compris la malnutrition) en limitant l’accès et l’utilisation des services. De même, un mauvais état de santé contribue à la pauvreté par le paiement direct du coût des soins par le patient, accroissant d’autant la vulnérabilité et la précarité alimentaire : faute de protection sociale, les ménages assurent l’essentiel des paiements directs (97% des dépenses).

---

1 SDARP 2007
2 Rapports d’analyse des résultats du Questionnaire des Indicateurs de Base du Bien-être (QUIBB_2005)
Le Niger connaît une situation de crise chronique démographique, nutritionnelle et sanitaire accentuée par une faible disponibilité des ressources et une grande inégalité de genre. En effet, l'Indice Synthétique de Fécondité (ISF) très élevé, de l'ordre de 7.1 enfants/femme (EDSN 2006)\(^3\), constitue une préoccupation majeure pour la santé aussi bien des femmes que des enfants. Le fort taux d’accroissement démographique de 3,3%/an, dépasse souvent le taux de croissance économique et renforce de ce fait la paupérisation du pays.

Cette forte croissance démographique constitue une des causes sous jacentes de l’insécurité alimentaire et de la malnutrition chez les enfants et les femmes. En effet, cette croissance démographique non maîtrisée a des impacts sur la répartition et l’exploitation des terres agricoles, exposant ainsi les populations à une insuffisance de la production qui se traduit en partie par une malnutrition chronique chez les plus pauvres en général et chez les femmes et les enfants en particulier.

Il est évident que le niveau élevé de morbidité constitue un obstacle à la productivité et à la croissance économique tout comme de faibles états de santé et de nutrition associés à une fécondité élevée constituent des facteurs clés de la pauvreté\(^4\). Même en « situation normale », le ratio de mortalité maternelle est parmi les plus élevés du monde (648 décès/100.000 naissances vivantes).

De plus, l'utilisation des services de santé en général et des services de la santé de la reproduction (SR) en particulier demeure insuffisante. Plusieurs facteurs contribuent à cette situation dont les problèmes d’accessibilité socioculturelle, géographique et financière ainsi que la disponibilité et la qualité de l’offre des soins et services pour les bénéficiaires.

Avoir accès au planning familial, c’est un moyen de juguler la malnutrition infantile par le retardement de l’âge de la première grossesse, l’espacement des naissances et finalement la diminution de la charge sur les ressources du terroir qui s’amenuisent avec la pression anthropique. Permettre aux populations d’avoir une connaissance des interrelations entre la croissance démographique et l’insécurité alimentaire est essentiel pour aboutir à un changement de comportement. L’accès aux soins de santé est normalement gratuit pour la contraception, la prise en charge des enfants de moins de cinq ans, les césariennes, les fistules, le cancer du col de l’utérus. Néanmoins, le processus de remboursement des centres de santé n’est pas optimal et beaucoup de centres se trouvent dans la nécessité de facturer leurs services et les médicaments, entraînant de fait une désaffection des bénéficiaires potentiels qui délaissent les soins de santé. Cette situation entraîne une hausse rapide de la malnutrition des enfants, une mauvaise santé des mères (anémie, carences...) ce qui pénalise le développement du facteur voire entraîne des accidents plus graves (avortements, décès de la mère...). Assurer l’accès aux soins de la santé de la reproduction, c’est permettre aux plus pauvres d’utiliser leurs ressources pour l’achat prioritaire de nourriture.

La mise en place d’une politique "Stratégie de Développement accéléré de Réduction de la Pauvreté" (SDRP), d’une "Stratégie de Développement Rurale" (SDR), du "Plan de Développement Sanitaire" (PDS) 2011-2015 dans sa composante relative au développement des services de la santé de la reproduction, la DGPP\(^5\), ainsi que l’Engagement du Niger en faveur de la Santé de la mère et de l’enfant (2010), de la loi sur la Santé de la Reproduction,

\(^3\) Enquête Démographique et de Santé et à Indicateurs Multiples 2006 (EDSN)
\(^5\) Déclaration du Gouvernement en matière de Politique de Population (DGPP)
de la loi sur la prévention du VIH/SIDA, reflètent l’engagement de l’État pour confronter les problèmes exposés ci-dessus.

Le projet présenté dans cette fiche s’inscrit dans le cadre du renforcement de la politique du pays en matière de population, santé, genre et jeunesse dans un contexte d’insécurité alimentaire chronique. Il aura un effet direct sur les Objectifs Millénaire du Développement du (OMD) 4 et 5 (réduction de la mortalité infantile; amélioration de la santé maternelle), indirect sur l’OMD 1 (éradication de l’extrême pauvreté et de la famine à travers une croissance démographique mieux maîtrisée) ce qui cadre avec l’objectif visé par le financement FSTP dans ses aspects OMD.


2.2 Enseignements tirés

L'année 2009/2010 a été très mauvaise d’un point de vue alimentaire. D’après la Direction de la Statistique, la production céréalière a enregistré un déficit de 411 000 tonnes. Des données officielles des enquêtes nationales de décembre 2009 et avril 2010 montrent que plus de 7 millions de Nigériens étaient en état de vulnérabilité alimentaire, état aggravé par la cherté des denrées alimentaires. Sur le plan pastoral, la situation a été catastrophique avec un déficit fourragé de plus de 16 Mtonnes de matière sèche (contre 5 Mt en 2008) ce qui représente les besoins alimentaires de 2/3 des effectifs du cheptel. Le phénomène conjoncturel d’insécurité alimentaire, accentué par une situation identique au nord Nigéria a eu un impact sur la situation nutritionnelle avec certaines régions qui ont dépassé le seuil d’urgence : taux de 17,4% (Diffa) et 15,4% (Zinder), situation qui ne s’est guère améliorée courant 2010 avec une forte incidence du paludisme qui a occulté les efforts de réponse nutritionnelle.

Il est ressorti de cette nouvelle crise, un besoin fondamental d’agir sur les causes structurelles dès leur stade initial afin d’éviter le retour cyclique des problèmes de malnutrition et d’insécurité alimentaire. La forte croissance démographique constitue une de ces causes sous jacentes de l’insécurité alimentaire et de la malnutrition7. Les inégalités de genre, souvent structurelles elles aussi, font que les femmes et les enfants en particulier sont atteints de malnutrition dès que la situation socio économique se détériore.


7 Enquête de Nutrition et Survie, INS-Niger/UNICEF/PAM/HKI, 2010
Le Bureau de UNFPA a conduit en 2008 une évaluation de la Composante Santé de la Reproduction de son programme. De cette évaluation sont ressortis que le renforcement des capacités des services de santé en soins obstétricaux et néonataux d’urgence dans les régions vulnérables contribue à réduire de façon significative la mortalité maternelle et que la gratuité effective et l’accessibilité aux soins de santé en matière de reproduction (notamment les services de planning familial, l’accouchement assisté et les soins obstétricaux d’urgence) sont nécessaires afin de permettre aux femmes dans les situations d’insécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle de pouvoir mener à terme leur grossesse et contribuer à la réduction de la mortalité maternelle et à la préservation de la santé et de l’état nutritionnel du futur nouveau né.

Dans ce sens, le projet « Facilité Alimentaire » en cours (201/240231), permet d’appuyer la gratuité soins de la santé de la reproduction à travers des subventions aux actes médicaux et la mise à disposition des kits santé de la reproduction, de transférer les connaissances sur le planning familial et les incidences sur la nutrition, d’assurer le plaidoyer pour une prise en compte régulière de la planification familiale par les services de l’État, de réaliser la capitalisation des interventions démographie/nutrition à base communautaire.

Les différentes interventions, en cours d’achèvement, menées par les ONG sur financement FOOD de la Commission nous permettent de tirer les premières conclusions suivantes :

L’approche santé à base communautaire (qui vient en complément des appuis « classiques » apportés aux Ministères, permettent de pallier leurs insuffisances en ressources humaines et d’accélérer les processus de transfert (connaissances, prises en charge) au niveau local sous réserve d’appliquer de simples recommandations, peu onéreuses. Il s’agit :

- D’inclure la planification familiale dans le paquet minimum d’activités des formations sanitaires et à tous les niveaux : vaccinations, consultations pré et post natales, malnutrition,

- De systématiser le conseil au planning familial dans les CRENAS et CRENI° auprès des mamans des enfants malnourris.

- D’intégrer les consultations de planning familial dans les sorties foraines des agents de santé (suivi/ encadrement des relais communautaires)

- D’associer les associations islamiques dans les différentes stratégies de santé communautaire.

Les interventions prochaines doivent promouvoir une meilleure connaissance des interrelations croissance-démographique, nutrition-santé, sécurité alimentaire parmi la population afin de compléter les mécanismes déjà en place: Dispositif National tourné vers les réponses à l’insécurité alimentaire, Ministère de la Santé Publique et partenaires (UNICEF en particulier et ECHO de manière plus ponctuelle) pour les réponses nutritionnelles et l’appui à la gratuité des soins.

° CRENI : Centre de Réhabilitation Nutritionnelle Intensif ;
CRENAS : Centre de Réhabilitation Nutritionnelle Ambulatoire pour malnourris Sèvères
Le projet présenté permet cette vision plus complète des causes de la malnutrition tout en renforçant les efforts du gouvernement par des ressources techniques et financières dans l’État fragile qu’est le Niger.

2.3 Actions complémentaires


Ce projet accompagnera les programmes financés par UNFPA, le Canada et la Banque Mondiale dans le cadre de la maîtrise de la croissance démographique. Le projet permettra également de consolider et de pérenniser les acquis d’un financement régional 2004-2008 de l’UE/ACP consacré à la santé de la reproduction dans la Région de Zinder pour plus de 2 millions d’euros.

Dans le même secteur de la santé de la reproduction, UNFPA a bénéficié de financements consécutifs de l’Espagne de plus de 2 millions d’euros qui ont servi à la mise à l’échelle et la redynamisation des soins obstétricaux d’urgences dans les Régions de Maradi, Zinder, Tahoua, Niamey et Agadez.

L’UNFPA a appuyé l’élaboration et la mise en œuvre d’un plan de sécurisation des produits de santé de la reproduction de 2007-2010, qui permettra de mieux évaluer les besoins en médicaments et consommables dans le cadre de la gratuité des soins de santé de la mère et de l’enfant et de réorienter la planification familiale en garantissant la disponibilité constante des produits contraceptifs sur l’ensemble du territoire nigérien.

En outre, ce projet s’inscrit dans la continuité du projet "Facilité Alimentaire" 2010/2011 qui permet de renforcer une série d’actions dans le domaine de la SR (planning familial, accès à l’accouchement, relations nutrition/démographie), tout en permettant d’agir à moyen terme sur les causes structurelles conformément à son objectif principal.

Il continuera à travailler de manière concertée avec les autres agences des Nations Unies en particulier l’UNICEF, le PAM et la FAO (projets 2010 réfléchis conjointement à la demande de la CE) pour une vision plus globale de la réponse à l’insécurité alimentaire en général et à la malnutrition en particulier. On peut résumer de manière racourcie que l’UNFPA contribue à apporter une réponse à la malnutrition en amont, que l’UNICEF traite la malnutrition aiguë, le PAM prend en charge la malnutrition modérée et la FAO développe les capacités socio économiques des familles sujettes à la malnutrition.

Cette nouvelle thématique (approche des causes structurelles de la malnutrition en améliorant les aspects santé de la mère et de l’enfant) vient compléter les opérations actuellement mises en œuvre à travers l’UNICEF (les sept pratiques essentielles – divers bailleurs dont l’UE, en dehors des appuis directs pour la prise en charge de la malnutrition, il s’agit de l’accès aux soins de santé à travers la gratuité, appui au secteur développement rural pour accroître la production agricole, appui à l’hydraulique pour permettre un meilleur accès à l’eau potable, appui au Dispositif National de prévention et de gestion des crises alimentaires. Ce projet apporte une nouvelle dimension à la réflexion générale sur la réponse à l’insécurité alimentaire qui a tendance à être abordée de manière trop réductrice (mandat du Dispositif National issu principalement des analyses en disponibilité et accessibilité des céréales) malgré la prise en compte progressive, dans la réflexion mais pas forcément dans les financements.
réguliers FED, de la nutrition (prise en charge actuelle sur des fonds humanitaires EU et facilité alimentaire).

Cette intervention est une opportunité pour préparer un "Cadre Commun Humanitaire Development" tel que mentionné par l'article 5.1.3 du FSTP.

### 2.4 Coordination des bailleurs de fonds

L’UNFPA collabore d’une manière globale avec les organisations internationales présentes au Niger. La collaboration avec entre autre l’Union Européenne et le système des Nations Unies porte sur les projets dans le domaine de la santé en général et vise une harmonisation des interventions.

En particulier, ce projet travaille en étroite relation avec les opérations menées par les autres agences des Nations Unies suite à la mise en place d’un cadre de coordination animé par la DUE, avec UNICEF (malnutrition aigüe), PAM (malnutrition modérée) FAO (activités socio économiques) mis en place depuis la réflexion des projets financés sur Facilité alimentaire(fin 2009). Les mécanismes de coordination humanitaire, tels que les Cluster Santé/Nutrition/Sécurité Alimentaire permettent d’harmoniser les interventions dans ce sens.

A cela s’ajoute la collaboration avec les institutions bilatérales, en particulier avec la Coopération Espagnole, la Coopération Canadienne, la Coopération Danoïse et la Coopération Luxembourgeoise, qui sont des partenaires privilégiés dans le cadre du mandat de l’UNFPA ainsi qu’avec de nombreuses ONGs qui œuvrent dans le domaine de la santé reproductive à travers le Cadre de Concertation Santé des PTF, ONG internationales et le MSP pour consolider les appuis.

A ce titre, un autre forum d’échanges d’expériences relatives à la santé de la reproduction et à la nutrition, est actif avec les ONG Médecins du Monde, Care UK, Hellen Keller International, Aquadev et leurs partenaires locaux, la DUE étant facilitatrice.


Une évaluation faite par les services de la Commission pourrait permettre de proposer que la santé, et en particulier les aspects qui ont un impact évident sur les OMD 1, 4, 5, 6 (malaria, méningite) ainsi que la nutrition des enfants de moins de cinq ans soit mieux prise en compte pour les FED à venir. Actuellement, ces aspects sont soutenus par les interventions humanitaires, de courte durée, et les projets UE à travers la Facilité alimentaire (fonds exceptionnel, non durable) et la ligne budgétaire 21.020100 sécurité alimentaire (fonds qui ne permettent pas une réelle appropriation par les services régaliens).
3. DESCRIPTION

Le présent projet viendra appuyer les efforts du Gouvernement et des Partenaires Techniques et Financiers (PTF) en matière d’amélioration de l’état de santé de la population nigérienne. Le projet est axé sur la promotion de la planification familiale, la maîtrise de la croissance démographique en soutenant la gratuité de certaines prestations (Césarienne, Planification Familiale, Consultations Pré/Post Natales, accouchement), en apportant une subvention aux accouchements assistés, et en prenant en charge les complications obstétricales qui ne sont pas encore couvertes par les mesures de gratuité. Un plaidoyer pour l’adoption d’un décret permettant la gratuité de l’accouchement est prévu. Les PTF, ensemble avec le gouvernement, réfléchissent sur la pérennisation de ce type de gratuité à travers le budget national pour assurer la durabilité de cette stratégie à long terme.

Le projet vise également un appui aux activités de changements de comportements pour améliorer la demande et l’accès aux services de santé de la reproduction y compris la planification familiale, ce qui est complémentaire au Plan stratégique de la sécurisation des produits de santé de la reproduction, qui assurera la disponibilité des produits sur l’ensemble du territoire nigérien. Grâce à ces différents volets, le projet permettra d’agir sur les causes structurelles de malnutrition au Niger en ciblant les actions à moyen terme qui contribueront à rompre l’effet cyclique des crises alimentaires.

Le projet s’inscrivant dans la continuité du projet « Facilité Alimentaire » intervient dans tout le Niger avec un accent particulier sur les mêmes quatre régions cibles particulièrement touchées par la question d’insécurité alimentaire, notamment Tahoua, Tillabéry, Zinder et Diffa.

3.1. Objectifs

L’objectif global est de contribuer à l’amélioration de la santé en matière de reproduction (santé génésique) et à la maîtrise de la croissance démographique dans un contexte d’insécurité alimentaire chronique.

Objectifs spécifiques :

- Améliorer la prévalence contraceptive dans les régions de Tahoua, Tillabéry, Zinder et Diffa ;

- Améliorer l’accès à l’accouchement assisté par un professionnel de santé pour la population couverte dans un rayon de 5 km d’un centre de santé au niveau national et en particulier dans les régions de Tahoua, Tillabéry, Zinder et Diffa ;

- Améliorer les connaissances des populations en vue d’un changement de comportement pour une maîtrise de la croissance démographique dans les régions de Tahoua, Tillabéry, Zinder et Diffa ;
3.2. Résultats escomptés et principales activités

Résultat 1. La demande des services liés à la santé en matière de reproduction, la planification familiale et la prévention et traitement du SIDA accrue

- Sensibiliser au moins 30% des femmes en union en âge de procréer et leurs conjoints à la SR/PF\(^9\) et les IST/VIH/SIDA\(^10\), à travers les ONG et les radios communautaires dans les quatre régions cibles (Tahoua, Tillabéry, Zinder et Diffa) ;

- Appuyer le système de référence et contre référence des quatre régions cibles à travers l’organisation de la communauté ;

- Appuyer les 140 Ecoles des Maris\(^11\) pour accroître l’implication des hommes dans la promotion de la SR/PF (y compris l’âge du premier enfant) ;

- Développer et diffuser 2 types des supports IEC/CCC\(^12\) pour la promotion de la SR/PF et la prévention VIH/SIDA.

Résultat 2. L’accès aux services de SR/PF amélioré

- Appuyer la formation de 160 prestataires de services de santé en SR/PF et SONU\(^13\) dans les quatre régions cibles (idem) ;

- Appuyer la gratuité de l’accouchement pour 390 000 femmes enceintes dans les quatre régions cibles (idem) ;

- Fournir 30 kits SR (césarienne, accouchement, hygiène) dans l’ensemble du pays ;

- Assurer une supervision et un appui technique de proximité au MSP à travers quatre médecins, un/e Coordinateur/trice de projet et un/e comptable.

Résultats 3. Les interrelations entre la croissance démographique et l’insécurité alimentaire sont mieux connues par la population

- Mener une étude sur les interrelations entre la forte croissance démographique du Niger et l’insécurité alimentaire sévissant ;

- Documenter et diffuser les résultats de l’étude et les bonnes pratiques en matière de santé génésique et planification familiale à travers un atelier national ;

---

\(^9\) Santé en matière de reproduction/Planification familiale
\(^10\) Infections Sexuellement Transmissibles/Virus de l’ImmunoDéficience Humaine/Syndrome d’ImmunoDéficience Acquise.
\(^11\) L’Ecole des Maris est une stratégie d’implication des hommes dans la promotion de santé de la reproduction au niveau communautaire. Cette stratégie a commencé dans deux districts de la région de Zinder en 2008, et a été étendu à tous les districts de cette région en 2010 comptant un total de 138 écoles. Une école de mari c’est un assemblage de maris bénévoles qui travaille en lien étroite avec le Centre de Santé pour changer les comportements et les obstacles d’accès aux services de SR/PF
\(^12\) Information Education Communication/Communiquer pour Changer les Comportements.
\(^13\) Soins Obstétricaux et Néonatales d’Urgences (SONU)
• Sensibiliser au moins 30% les femmes en union en âge de procréer et leurs conjoints sur les interrelations entre la forte croissance démographique et l’insécurité alimentaire à travers les ONG et les radios communautaires dans les quatre régions cibles.

3.3. Risques et hypothèses

Les risques suivants paraissent improbables mais peu maîtrisables par le projet:
- un climat politique instable perturberait les interventions du projet,
- une forte mobilité causerait la non disponibilité de personnels de santé qualifiés,
- une non adoption du décret de la gratuité des accouchements assistés perturbera la pérennité des acquis du projet ;
- des problèmes d’insécurité rendraient certaines zones inaccessibles.

3.4. Questions transversales

Ce projet mettra l’accent sur les droits individuels des femmes et des hommes comme souligné dans le Programme d’Action de la CIPD\textsuperscript{14} qui constitue des lignes directrices des interventions de l’UNFPA.

Le projet présenté dans cette fiche d’action soutiendra ainsi un accès plus équitable et égalitaire à la santé reproductive, incluant les services de planification familiale pour arriver à une maîtrise de la croissance démographique. L’objectif sera de permettre à toutes les catégories de population d’avoir accès aux meilleurs services possibles conformément aux droits humains fondamentaux. Pour ce faire, le projet liera les efforts globaux, régionaux et nationaux dans ces domaines.

3.5. Parties prenantes

Les directions du gouvernement nigérien, en particulier la Direction de la Santé de la Mère et de l’Enfant (DSME) du Ministère de la Santé Publique, auront un rôle clé dans la coordination et la supervision des activités. Le projet appuiera les services techniques déconcentrés de la santé dans le cadre de l’intégration des activités (nutrition et santé) et de leur suivi–contrôle.

Les autres parties prenantes de l’opération sont les ONG qui permettront une démultiplication des interventions. Les projets en cours intervenant sur la même thématique seront impliqués afin d’assurer une bonne cohérence et complémentarité entre les actions des partenaires et l’opération financée.

D’autres partenaires de développement y compris des agences de Nations Unies, conformément à l’esprit du « One UN – Delivering as One », tels que l’UNICEF, le PAM et la FAO seront des partenaires clé pour coordonner et harmoniser les stratégies d’intervention.

\textsuperscript{14} Conférence Internationale sur la population et le développement.
Les interventions prévues dans le cadre de cette action couvriront toutes les zones à risque du Niger avec un accent particulier sur les régions les plus gravement affectées par l’insécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle, qui sont Tillabéri, Tahoua, Zinder et Diffa. Le projet vise en terme de nombre de bénéficiaires finaux pour les activités de sensibilisation au moins 5 554 496 personnes\(^{15}\), pour la gratuité des accouchements assistés 390 000 femmes, et pour les formations des prestataires de services 160 personnes.

4. **QUESTIONS DE MISE EN ŒUVRE**

4.1. **Mode de gestion**


Les procédures de l’UNFPA en matière d’exécution de programme selon la modalité NEX\(^{16}\), régiront sa mise en œuvre. Une convention sera signée pour la période entre UNFPA et le MSP. Elle précisera les obligations des parties en matière de gestion des ressources financières, matérielles et humaines du projet. En outre, elle précisera les conditions de demande de fonds trimestriels et les modalités de leur justification selon les procédures en vigueur au niveau de l’UNFPA.

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**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Montant (Euros)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel, suivi et évaluation, recherches</td>
<td>897 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrat de Services (Formations, sensibilisation PF, développement écoles des maris, production matériel éducatif)</td>
<td>2 880 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{15}\) Calculé sur la base des statistiques régionales de l’INS 2010  
\(^{16}\) Modalité d’Exécution Nationale.
4.4. Suivi de l’exécution


Il s’agit:

- du plan de suivi et évaluation du projet
- du plan et rapport de suivi des activités sur le terrain ;
- des rapports techniques de progrès semestriels
- des rapports techniques et financiers annuels
- de l’évaluation finale.

Les indicateurs de suivi des progrès réalisés contenus dans le cadre logique du document de projet, seront conformes à ceux définis dans la matrice des résultats du plan d’action du 7ème programme.

La Délégation de l’Union Européenne présente au Niger assurera également un contrôle des projets sur base des indicateurs clés établis dans le cadre logique, des rapports d’activité et des réunions ou comités se rapportant au projet.

4.5. Evaluation et audit.

Le projet fera l’objet d’une évaluation finale mise en œuvre par la Commission Européenne.

Conforme à la modalité ‘gestion conjointe’, le projet sera géré selon les règlements financiers, règles internes et directives de l’UNFPA, y compris le système d’audit de l’organisation. En respectant les conditions générales applicables aux contrats de subvention, la Commission Européenne aura le droit d’effectuer une vérification si elle le juge nécessaire.

4.6. Communication et visibilité

Les actions d’information, de communication et de visibilité seront effectuées de manière conjointe par la Commission Européenne et l’UNFPA comme indiqué dans la clause "Visibilité" du Contrat Cadre Financier et Administratif signé entre la Commission Européenne et l’UNFPA.
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Les normes se rapportant aux actions de visibilité sont décrites dans le manuel de visibilité de l'Union Européenne pour les actions extérieures:
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/

Les activités de communication se concentreront sur les résultats et l'impact du projet, et s'adresseront à la population dans son ensemble mais également à un public plus spécifique tant au niveau national que dans l'Union Européenne.

Les actions de communication seront alignées sur la stratégie de communication institutionnelle de l'UNFPA.

Des actions de visibilité de qualité seront assurées par un expert en matière de communication, et seront financées sur la base d'un partage des coûts entre les projets concernés, avec les contributions suivantes : (i) appui conseil sur la visibilité des plans de travail, de visibilité, des budgets, des rapports et des évaluations (ii) assistance technique pour la mise en œuvre d'actions de visibilité de projets spécifiques acceptés, (iii) accès facilité aux équipements de production et au réseau médiatique.
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ACTION FICHE FOR SIERRA LEONE

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>Support to smallholders production and strengthening social protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>EUR 3 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>EU Contribution: EUR 3 000 000</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method / Method of implementation</td>
<td>Project approach – Joint management with WFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC-code</td>
<td>52010  Sector  Food Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

Sierra Leone remains a chronically food insecure country. It progressed in 2010 from the 167 to the 158 position in the Human Development Index and some progresses were also registered in the Global Hunger that progressed from 33.8 in 2009 to 28.9 in 2010. However, the FAO “The state of food insecurity in the world - 2010” includes Sierra Leone in the list of countries in protracted crisis. This encompasses weak governance, lack of capacity, unsustainable livelihoods systems and persistent norms of social exclusion. The report on the Nutritional Situation of Sierra Leone 2010 from UNICEF confirmed the presence of critically poor indicators of malnutrition, even though baseline data were not provided. The report provided data at regional and district level and prompted the decision from ECHO (Humanitarian Aid & Civil Protection) to grant a 12 months support to UNICEF for the supply of essential drugs and therapeutic feeding inputs. World Food Programme (WFP) issued in 2011 a Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis based on data collected in June-July 2010, which incorporates the findings of the UNICEF survey and provides the basis for prioritizing and targeting food security and nutrition actions at national level. The report includes a Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM).

The Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security (MAFFS) prepared a comprehensive medium-term plan, the Smallholders Commercialization Programme (SCP), to boost agricultural production and improve safety nets country-wide. The Programme was launched as the Country Compact under the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP). In addition to other components aiming at increasing production and productivity, component n. 5 of the SCP reads “Strengthening Social Protection, Food Security, Productive Social Safety Nets”. It aims to support food insecure households in meeting basic food security and nutritional needs at the same time contributing to creation of productive assets. The action here presented will be implemented in the framework of this component and therefore monitored by the MAFFS. As regards targeting the Government of Sierra Leone decided that “beneficiary selection will be aligned with ongoing target methods of WFP and other related programs, based on calculations using the Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping”. The latest VAM exercise carried out by WFP
in 2010 (published in 2011) identified “most food insecure” Chiefdoms in all the 13 Districts following a participatory approach.

The strategy of the EU in Sierra Leone is aligned to component n. 1 of the SCP (Production intensification, diversification, value addition and marketing), via the 10th EDF Agriculture for Development Project; and to component n. 5 of the SCP via the support to food security and safety nets country-wide targeting most vulnerable areas and households, contributing to the creation of productive assets in the framework of a comprehensive government-owned strategy.

2.2. Lessons learnt

A Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) of the EU/WFP Food Facility carried out in December 2010 confirmed that: “the Overall Objective and the Project Purpose are consistent with the Sierra Leone policies; the project is aligned with the National Sustainable Agriculture Action Plan (NSADP) and the Smallholders Commercialization Programme (SCP); the project directly responds to the critical needs of the target groups”. In terms of impact the ROM recorded the increased food availability in the hunger months and the development of productive assets. While in terms of sustainability it recognized the commitment of the Government of Sierra Leone and its partners. The ROM recommended strengthening the organizational, technical and business capacity of the Farmers Based Organizations (FBO). This recommendation is reflected in the food for training component of this action.

The Smallholders Commercialization Programme has been promoted by the President as a key component of the Agenda for Change and has received support from international donors. In particular 50 Million USD were granted under the Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme in support of components n. 1 (smallholders agriculture commercialization), 2 (small scale irrigation development) and 6 (planning coordination monitoring and evaluation), action expected to start in June 2011 thus ensuring continuity of the EU/FAO food facility.

2.3. Complementary actions

The EU signed in November 2010 financing agreements with the Government of Sierra Leone for: Agriculture-for-Development (A4D) programme worth €16 million which will facilitate the development of key export crops and the decentralisation of services in the agriculture sector; Decentralised Service Delivery worth €5 million will support the role of local councils in decision making. Additionally 9 food security actions are currently implemented by NGOs.

The ECHO (Humanitarian Aid & Civil Protection) funded allocation of €6 million to UNICEF under the B envelope supplies essential drugs and therapeutic feeding for 12 months in 2010-2011.

The 9th EDF Support to the rehabilitation of 650 Km of feeder roads in 4 Districts (ending 2011) and the EU support to the preparation of a national policy on feeder roads.

The EU-FAO food facility (€10.26 million), the EU-WFP food facility (€5.4 million) and the WFP action in response to soaring food prices (€2.7 million) will come to an end in the first semester of 2011.

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) supported by Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) will implement the €50 million Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme which will support directly the Government of Sierra
Leone Smallholders Commercialisation Programme giving continuity to the EU-FAO food facility.

FAO supports the rural sector under its technical cooperation programme and also supports seed production and the implementation process of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP).

The WFP USD 20 million "Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation" which provides food assistance to vulnerable population across the country; the USD 10 million Country Programme with focus on health and education and the Purchase for Progress initiative which aims at procuring food items from local farmers.

Component n. 3 of the SCP “Market access expansion through feeder roads rehabilitation” will be supported by WFP via food/cash for work. In accordance with article 5.1.3 of the FSTP a joint Humanitarian Development Framework will be designed.

2.4. Donor coordination

The component n. 6 of the Smallholders Commercialization Programme (SCP) reads “Planning, coordination, monitoring and evaluation”. Coordination is promoted at three levels: a Presidential Task Force whose membership consists of line ministries and representatives of Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), World Food Programme (WFP), World Bank, African Development Bank (ADB), Islamic Development Bank Group (IDB), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) and EU, meets once in a quarter, is responsible for key policy decisions and mobilisation of resources; the Agriculture Advisory Group meets monthly and is the body responsible for policy and technical issues; the SCP Secretariat is the third layer for the implementation of the programme. All components of the SCP, including the present action, report to these bodies.

3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectives

The overall objective of the intervention is to mitigate the impact of the protracted crisis on consumption levels and nutritional status of food insecure households in rural communities. The project will also contribute to enhancing long-term recovery prospects of rural communities.

The specific objective is to restore and rebuild livelihoods in a protracted crisis situation through participation in food and cash-assisted productive asset rehabilitation and food-assisted agriculture training sessions.

3.2. Expected results and main activities

The project will provide continuity and consolidate the current EU-WFP food facility and in specific it will rehabilitate key agricultural infrastructures using the food for work and cash for work approaches; it will furthermore promote the training of members of Farmers Organization through food for training.

The main activities are:
Food for Work: will target the rehabilitation of key agriculture productive assets identified in liaison with the Smallholders Commercialization Programme (SCP), and in specific, at local level, with farmers' Field Schools and Agriculture Business Centres. Beneficiaries will be targeted in the most food insecure Chiefdoms in all the Districts, according to the Vulnerability Map Analysis 2010. At local level beneficiaries will be selected with the support of local NGOs, using participatory approaches with the involvement of paramount chiefs and local communities’ representatives. Project Management Committees, with a target in terms of women participation, will be formed locally and will be responsible for overseeing food distribution and works progresses. Households highly vulnerable to food insecurity, such as those including resource-poor women, unemployed youths and elderly-headed households will be targeted.

Cash for Work: This pilot initiative will be expanded to urban and peri-urban areas of main district headquarters towns. Cash is used in the place of food in these areas, where markets are fully functional and food is available, thereby giving the recipient families more choice in what they consume and stimulating the local economy. The agricultural assets for rehabilitation will be identified in the framework of the SCP. As with Food for Work, vulnerable groups, including resource-poor women, unemployed youths, and elderly-headed households will be targeted using participatory approaches.

Food for Training: Training of the members of about 410 Farmers' Organizations will be done through Farmers' Field Schools. This represents approximately 12,300 individual small-holder farmers in total. The trainees will receive food rations for each training day attended. The training will be undertaken in the framework of component 1 of the SCP by the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security (MAFFS) with support from Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO).

The expected results are:

Result 1 Food consumption of targeted beneficiaries improved through food for work and cash for work activities.

Result 2 Agricultural assets created/rehabilitated through food for work and cash for work activities.

Result 3 Participation of women in food management and decision making committees at local level significantly improved.

Result 4 Technical skills of members of FBOs enhanced though food for training activities.

The proposed project will be part of the current WFP Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PPRO 10554.0).

The action will target vulnerable areas and vulnerable households within each area country-wide, in the context of a protracted crisis, which encompasses lack of capacity, unsustainable livelihoods systems and persistent norms of social exclusion. Providing food and cash for work the project will improve access to food for the poorest segment of the population. The “Food Consumption Score” (FCS) will be used as a proxy indicator of caloric intake and diet quality. The FCS is a composite score based on dietary diversity, food frequency and relative nutritional importance of different food groups. At the same time the rehabilitation of key productive assets and agricultural infrastructure in the framework of the Government owned
Smallholders Commercialization Programme (SCP), and in close collaboration with Farmers’ Field Schools and Agriculture Business Centres, will contribute to increase production and productivity country-wide and strengthen the capacities of communities. The Community Asset Score will be used as an indicator to capture increase in functioning productive community assets over base level. Increasing Government ownership and parallel implementation of the other components of the SCP which build on the rehabilitated infrastructures provides the framework for eventual exit strategy and hand-over.

3.3. Risks and assumptions

The key assumption is that targeting will be efficient and transparent. A second assumption is that Sierra Leone will be able to pursue its strategy for supporting smallholders’ commercial farming and that the rehabilitated infrastructures and productive assets will be functional to the extensification and intensification of agriculture. Perspectives in the medium term are positive considering the commitments of the Government and the support granted by the donors’ community.

A risk factor is identified in the possibility of civil strife in relation to the incoming presidential election of 2012. If this should happen the geographical distribution of the action may have to be redesigned taking into account accessibility and safety.

3.4. Crosscutting Issues

Special attention will be given to the gender component as women groups and households with pregnant and lactating women are already special targets.

The promotion of smallholders farming in the framework of agro forestry and watershed management will enhance the environmental sustainability of the action.

This action will take place in the framework of the decentralisation of services towards regional and local councils. The selection of the beneficiaries will be followed up according to a well-tested methodology ensuring transparency and promotion of good governance. The projects will closely work with Community Based Organisations thus enhancing the sense of ownership at all levels.

3.5. Stakeholders

The final beneficiaries will be the most food insecure segment of the rural population and of the urban and peri-urban population: the first group will receive food support increasing at the same time the potential for increased production and thus have a better household income and the second group will have a better access to cheaper food.

The Direct beneficiaries will be poor households to be reached through the Farmers Based Organisations (FBO) and Agriculture Business Centres (ABC). The FBOs and ABCs are farmer-based organisations and consist of Farmer Field School graduates, youth groups, women’s cooperatives and other community-based organisations.

The Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security (MAFFS) will be the lead Government counterpart of World Food Programme (WFP) to implement the intervention.
4. **Implementation issues**

4.1. **Method of implementation**

The project will be implemented in joint management with the World Food Programme (WFP) via the signature of a Contribution Agreement that will be signed in accordance with the Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) between the European Commission and the United Nations (FAFA) signed on 29 April 2003. The project will make use of the logistic network of the WFP and implemented parallel to the Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation. The close partnership between the Government of Sierra Leone and WFP, which has been appointed as focal point of component n. 5 “Strengthening Social Protection, Food Security, Productive Social Safety Nets” will ensure increasing government ownership laying the foundation for eventual hand-over.

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**

EU maximum contribution: €3 million from the Food Security Thematic Programme. The source of funding is the food security budget line 21 02 01.

**Estimated Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>TOTAL (EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution agreement with WFP</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The duration will be 24 months as from the signature of the contribution agreement.

4.4. **Performance monitoring**

The performance of the project will be closely monitored by World Food Programme (WFP) and it will fall within the mandate of the coordination bodies of the Government owned Smallholders Commercialization Programme (SCP), namely the presidential task Force and the Agriculture Advisory Group. The EU Delegation in Sierra Leone will ensure adequate monitoring on the basis of key indicators established in the Logical Framework, progress reports and participation to relevant meetings/committees.

External Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) missions by European Commission may be carried out.

4.5. **Evaluation and audit**

Audits will be carried out by World Food Programme (WFP) according to its Financial Regulations, Rules and Directives. In addition, expenditure verifications may be carried out by the European Commission.

4.6. **Communication and visibility**

In accordance with the visibility provisions under the European Commission-UN Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) and with the European
Commission-UN Joint Action Plan on Visibility signed in September 2006, the European Commission and the implementing organisations will work together to ensure appropriate visibility actions for the programme as a whole, as well as for specific interventions and activities under the programme.

Standards regarding visibility will be derived from the "EU visibility guidelines for external actions"
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1. **IDENTIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>Support to agricultural productivity and grain storage in irrigated areas of south Somalia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRIS Number</td>
<td>DCI-FOOD/2011/ 260-138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>€4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method / Method of</td>
<td>Project approach –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation</td>
<td><em>Joint management with FAO</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC-code</td>
<td>52010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Food Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **RATIONAL**

2.1. **Sector context**

Agriculture is the main source of livelihood for the rural population in South Somalia. Ninety percent of irrigated and rain-fed crop production comes from the alluvial plains and inter-riverine areas of the Juba and Shebelle rivers in South Somalia (Figure 1) where 60% of the Somali population lives. Considering that rain-fed agriculture is dependant on limited and erratic rainfall, irrigated agriculture is crucial for food security and livelihood.

Irrigation infrastructure collapsed in the 90’s but part has been rehabilitated with EU funding since 2006¹. In particular between 2009 and 2010, 140 km of main canals and 1200 km of secondary canals have been rehabilitated with EU Food Facility support and World Bank funding. 73 canal intake gates have also been constructed.

As a result the area has experienced a considerable increase in production which has mitigated the effects of the withdrawal of food aid in 2009 and 2010. The bumper harvest registered in Somalia during Gu 2010 was the best in the last 15 years². The bulk of this production (81%) comes from the Lower Shebelle region in South Somalia where most of the irrigated land has been rehabilitated.

However, much more needs to be done particularly in the rehabilitation and maintenance of irrigation infrastructure, increase in productivity and reduction of post harvest storage losses.

In the 80’s before the war Somalia had more than 165 000 hectares under irrigation. Meanwhile the EU has financed the rehabilitation, the maintenance and the crop development of approximately 80,000 ha of the irrigable areas. The total rehabilitated area considering also the intervention of the private sector is around 100,000 hectares. This means that around

¹ EU has rehabilitated over 80,000 hectares of arable land on South Somalia since 2006. The total amount of land that could irrigated is estimated around 165,000 hectares. Considering that 20,000 hectares have been rehabilitated by private Somali entrepreneurs, there are about 50 to 60,000 hectares that are still potentially used as irrigable land.

² FSNAU – 2010 Post Gu analysis
65,000 hectares are in strong need for rehabilitation. The specific activities of the required rehabilitation include rehabilitation of primary and secondary canals, construction of canal intake gates and water distribution structures, rehabilitation of river embankments, construction of flood control gates, establishment of terraces, construction of water catchments, training of farmers on best irrigation practices, training of water management committees on operations, maintenance and management of the infrastructure, provision of tractors hours, rehabilitation of feeder roads, rehabilitation/construction of road crossings and rehabilitation/construction of market places.

Meanwhile, maize and sesame have emerged as important crops for food security in Somalia, but despite the effort the yields are still far below the corresponding potential.

The present productivity of maize is low while the potential productivity with the application of improved seeds and Good Agricultural Practices (GAP)\(^3\) can increase production significantly.

It is worth noting that sesame has become the most important export crop for Somalia after the collapse of the banana production, having therefore an important role in food security and livelihoods.

Moreover in Somalia grains sustain severe losses due to damages caused by insects and rodents and undergo qualitative changes. This reduces the quantities to be marketed and also lowers considerably their market value. In Somalia post-harvest losses, including storage, are estimated at 20-30% of the total production. Moreover, the production is often affected by aflatoxins. The economic importance of such losses is better grasped if we consider that, in South Somalia alone, they may range between 50,000 and 80,000 tonnes per year worth between US$ 15 and 25 million.

Somalia agricultural sector has shown a positive trend during the last 3 years. In 2009 and 2010 the crop production has reached a level above any expectation but this result cannot be related to any specific agricultural policy because the government does not control neither is present in the production area (South Somalia).

There are a few reasons that could help us to understand the success of the sector: a) road blocks have been abolished during the last two years and therefore agriculture goods can be transported with limited control and taxation within the productive areas (South Somalia); b) there has been in 2009 – 2010 above average rain fall; c) most important of all the canals have been rehabilitated and EU financed project implemented by FAO has distributed agricultural inputs on time and to the targeted people.

Finally, it must be taken into account that during 2010 there has been almost no distribution of food aid in South Somalia South of Mogadishu. The lack of WFP food in the market has generated high expectation in Somali agricultural sector that the price of agricultural products in Somalia will be stable throughout the year. When farmers are confident that the price will be stable many more hectares of land that have been idle in the past will be used to produce

\(^3\) Good Agricultural Practices are a collection of principles/activities to apply for on-farm production and post-production processes, taking into account economical, social and environmental sustainability.
food. The present proposal is based on the above consideration and suggests continuing the action that Food Facility has successfully started.

2.2. Lessons learnt

The proposed Action will take into consideration and incorporate lessons learned from past and on-going EU-funded interventions in Somalia, from broad consultations with partners and stakeholders and from experience in other countries that have been in transition from conflict to reconstruction and development.

The experience of Food Facility and other projects have demonstrated that long term development interventions are possible within a conflict context. However, a key challenge in Somalia is to better understand the complexities of conflict, and then to apply that knowledge to improve conflict-laden situations through an integrated approach of agriculture development programming.

The main lessons learnt include: (i) interventions must build on successes. So the successful implementation of Food Facility and of the Banana Budget Line interventions has provided a momentum that will benefit the Action under consideration (ii) Community Based Organizations (CBOs) are key to effective implementation, ownership and sustainability; (iii) collaboration between private and public sectors is crucial to economic growth and development.

Furthermore, the chosen UN agency (FAO) and implementing NGOs have in Somalia established a set of "working environments" that permits them to tackles the difficult issues of implementing development projects in the South and Central Region.

2.3. Complementary actions

The EU is by far the most important donor in Somalia for the economic and food security sectors. Particularly in the South of Somalia where the present proposal will based there are very few to almost none activities related to the agricultural sector.

The present interventions in agriculture (EDF or Budget funded) are mainly from EU and are the following: (i) Food Facility programme (implemented through FAO and AU-IBAR) that we are proposing to continue through the present proposal; (ii) Banana Budget Line supporting the rehabilitation and management of irrigation and flood control infrastructure and crop development; (iii) EDF funded improving varieties and establishing a commercial seed sector implemented by FAO that is in synergy with the above mentioned FF; (iii) EDF funded improving post-harvest and storage techniques partially implemented by FAO and CEFA (Italian NGO); (iv) Food Security Thematic Programme and EDF financing technical assistance to farmer associations and the private sector to improve production and marketing implemented by CEFA that has assisted the development and the consolidation of a very promising sesame internal and export market.
Emergency responses are not concerned with development and are at times counter productive to the existing national agricultural production. However, emergency needs have been addressed by EU humanitarian support and a number of UN agencies. The emergency interventions are of a short term nature mostly concern with food distribution, cash for work, water tracking, seeds and tools distribution but rarely addressing canal rehabilitation and other issues involving agricultural production. The World Bank has also funded irrigation rehabilitation and agricultural development in the Lower Shebelle.

Furthermore, EU in Somalia has been active in promoting projects that link relief and rehabilitation to development (LRRD). The EU Food Security Programme for Somalia has financed projects throughout the country that are aiming to strengthen well known Somali coping strategy to overcome emergency situations. In South of Somalia, for example, Oxfam UK has been awarded a programme that empowers the community toward direct action in prevention of water scarcity. The project is matching funds with the Diaspora. Another interesting case worth mentioning in relation to LRRD is in the North of Somalia where emergency for climatic reason (droughts) are recurrent. In Sool and in Puntland the Food Security Programme has financed CARE, Save the Children and Horn Relief on the implementation of a cash based intervention that aims to distribute cash to the most vulnerable population. Although cash distribution is often seen as an emergency tool, in case of pastoralist population in the North of Somalia cash enables the poorest households to retain or build up productive assets, improve pastoral and no-pastoral livelihood and reinforce coping strategy. This intervention will be an opportunity for designing a "Joint Humanitarian Development Framework" as mentioned by article 5.1.3 of the FSTP.

Table 1. EU projects in the productive agriculture sector of South Somalia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main activity</th>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Contract amount (EUR)</th>
<th>Duration before ending</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeds</td>
<td>Integrated support to rural livelihoods</td>
<td>9,975,933</td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>Ends in June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plant genetic resource programme</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>26 months</td>
<td>Ends in April 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain storage</td>
<td>Reduction of grain post harvest &amp; storage losses</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Ends in April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement of Post-harvest &amp; storage</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>Ends in June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Agricultural rehabilitation in irrigation schemes (ARDOPIS IV)</td>
<td>1,088,000</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>Ends in Dec. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved agriculture</td>
<td>Sustainable management of rehabilitated irrigation schemes</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>34 months</td>
<td>December 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4. **Donor coordination**

The 2008-13 Joint Strategy Paper (JSP) resulted from a joint coordination effort by the EU with several Members States and Norway as a response to the UN/WB Reconstruction and Development Programme. The 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 (i.e. the Food Security and Economic Development Sector Committee). Other donors active in the sector are Denmark, Italy, Norway, Sweden and US. All stakeholders based in Nairobi and the Somali Authorities at central and state level have been consulted during the preparation of this programme through specific workshops and meetings involving the Agriculture and Environmental Working Group (AEWG).

3. **DESCRIPTION**

The proposed action aims at addressing the three main problems: (i) poor condition of the irrigation infrastructure; (ii) poor agriculture techniques and insufficient access to inputs (seeds, fertiliser etc) and agricultural services such as mechanization; (iii) poor post harvest storage techniques and facilities.

3.1. **Objectives**

Overall objective: *Income increased and food insecurity reduced through private sector-led economic growth.*

Specific objective: *Irrigated agricultural production improved in Central and South Somalia.*

Expected results and main activities

- **Result 1:** Irrigated area rehabilitated
- **Result 2:** Increased capacity of community-based organizations in irrigation, water management and productivity
- **Result 3:** Strengthened awareness and capacity of farmers in improved post-harvest and storage techniques.

**Activities of Result 1: Irrigated area rehabilitated.**

The rehabilitation of selected irrigation infrastructures (canals, gates, etc.), including support to suitable management and operation systems and provision, if needed, of water pumps and structures associated with irrigation water conveyance and distribution such as pump outlets, canals, division boxes, culverts, etc;

- Rehabilitation of primary and secondary canals,
- Construction of canal intake gates and water distribution structures,
- Rehabilitation of river embankments,
• Construction of flood control gates,
• Establishment of terraces,
• Construction of water catchments
• Rehabilitation of main feeder roads,
• Rehabilitation/construction of road crossings and
• Rehabilitation/construction of market places.

• Activities of Result 2: Increased capacity of community-based organizations in irrigation and water management

Increased capacity of community-based organizations in irrigation and water management
• Promotion and capacity building of community based organizations such as water users’ groups and professional associations on irrigation and water management and community organization, participatory planning, participatory monitoring, conflict resolution, gender, environment, etc;
• Capacity building of relevant emerging authorities and civil society organisations on irrigation infrastructure management, conflict resolution, gender, environment, etc.
• Increase productivity through use of improved genetic material (improved maize and sesame seeds adapted to Somali environment that are available within Somalia).

Activities of Result 3: Strengthened awareness and capacity of farmers in improved post-harvest and storage techniques

• Awareness creation on the problem of losses and aflatoxins contamination
• Promotion of the use of improved post harvest techniques
• Promotion of the improved facilities such as locally produced drums

3.2. Risks and assumptions
The political situation and insecurity due to the presence of armed forces in particular has been and continues to be the main constraint to work in Somalia. However the EU and its implementing partners have been able to operate in Somalia during the last two decades despite the continuing unrest and civil strife. Implementing partners have developed a considerable capacity on the ground with the support of local staff and NSAs to ensure a relatively satisfactory level of implementation of activities, even when the security situation in Somalia does not permit the permanent presence of expatriate staff.

3.3. Cross-cutting Issues
Sustainable environment management, gender, conflict prevention, institution and capacity building will be embedded in all interventions. Particular attention will be paid to the participation of women and youth in decision-making through gender sensitization of the NGO partners and communities at large, support and capacity building of women and youth Community Based Organizations to ensure achievement of gender equality results of the project in terms of equal share participation, decision making, benefits of the project and
empowerment of female farmers to advocate their rights. Local authorities, local communities and relevant stakeholders will be involved to ensure ownership and to prevent and manage possible conflicts.

By promoting good agricultural practices farmers can be trained in the management of natural resources and this can only be positive in the fragile environmental situation where water is a scarce resource.

3.4. Stakeholders

The Final beneficiaries of the programme will be the rural households of Lower Shebelle and Lower Juba, most of them poor and vulnerable. Small and medium scale farmers, traders and small entrepreneurs who did not receive assistance through Food Facility interventions which has reached to date 153,000 households will be the main targets. The number of Households that are targeted for the extension of Food facility is 50,000. Given the limited capacity of all government institutions (at central and regional level) a total of 47 Community-Based Organisations that have identified and assessed by the Food Facility project will be the main associates of implementing agencies in any rehabilitation and development intervention. The Somali private sector and local organisations will also play a major role in project implementation and economic development. Both the Community-Based Organisations and the Somali Private sector have proven to be capable of continuing the development action at the end of EU programme. According to FSNAU data, production of food has increased and Somali have invested in the agriculture sector which is an important element to consider when evaluating sustainability of the proposed project. UN agencies and NGOs will be the main implementers of donor-funded programmes in Somalia, but the programmes will be developed and implemented in full consultation with, and support by Somali local authorities, which were already involved in the identification phase.

4. Implementation Issues

4.1. Method of implementation

As Somalia is not a signatory of the Cotonou Agreement, the European Commission holds the role of National Authorising Officer on behalf of the Somali people. The method of implementation will be joint management through the signature of a standard contribution agreement with FAO is proposed for certain components of the programme. Joint management can be applied as a long term agreement exists with the United Nations.

FAO is chosen because of its extensive experience and previous work in South Somalia specifically, Food Facility project has established an efficient project management set up which is still operational and can proceed with implementation of the proposed interventions.

4.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

Contracts

In the case of Joint Management with an International Organisation all contracts implementing the action must be awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents lay down and published by the International Organisation concerned.
**Budget and calendar**

The overall cost of the EU contribution will be EUR 4 million. The implementation period is 24 months and the closure period is 24 months. In total the execution period of action will be 48 months. The source of funding is the food security budget line 21 02 01.

It is expected that the contribution agreement with FAO will be signed during the second semester of 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-SECTOR</th>
<th>EU (€MIO)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Contribution agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result 1: Irrigation infrastructure rehabilitation and management</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 2: Improvement of agricultural production</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 3: Improvement of post-harvest and storage techniques and facilities</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect cost (FAO administrative cost 7%)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3. Performance monitoring**

Performance of this programme will be monitored as per indicators detailed in the Logical framework attached to the Action Fiche.

**4.4. Evaluation and audit**

The evaluation will be carried out by independent consultants contracted by FAO. The cost of the evaluation will be included in the contract to be signed by the EU Delegation in Somalia and the FAO. The Commission shall review the conclusions and recommendations of the mid-term evaluation and decide on the follow-up action to be taken and any adjustments necessary, including, if advisable, its re-orientation.

The standard audit procedures of FAO will apply.

**4.5. Communication and Visibility**

The EU and FAO will ensure appropriate implementation of EU visibility guidelines at Action level. Financial provisions for visibility are included in standard Contribution Agreement budget. At programme level the EU Delegation (Somalia Operations Unit) will ensure the distribution of relevant information utilizing internet and other means FAO will prepare a communication and visibility plan that will present during the inception phase, complying with the Communication and Visibility manual for EU External Actions, in which joint visibility guidelines for EU-UN actions are incorporated. The positive experience with Food Facility will help the programme manager to choose the proper visibility action. An update on visibility activities will be included in each project report. Communications and
visibility-related activities will include all possible actions, local and international, that the situation in Somalia will allow.
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COMPONENT 3: ADDRESSING FOOD SECURITY FOR THE POOR AND VULNERABLE IN FRAGILE SITUATION

"SUSTAINABLE HOUSEHOLD FOOD SECURITY AND MARKET LINKAGES FOR SMALLHOLDERS IN CAMBODIA"

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>Sustainable Household Food Security and Market Linkages for Smallholders in Cambodia. CRIS number 2011/260-121</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>EUR 4 million (100% EU contribution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method / Method implementation</td>
<td>Project approach. Joint management with an International Organisation (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC-code</td>
<td>52010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Sector context

Cambodia’s population is approximately 14 million. 80% of the Cambodians live in rural areas, and a 71% depend primarily on agriculture (largely rice) and livestock for their livelihoods. Cambodia’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP) consists for 30% of the agriculture sector, in which paddy rice contributes the most (20% of GDP). According to 2008 Population Census, 92% of the poverty is rural. Around 35% of the population live below the official income poverty line, and 18% were below the food poverty line in 2007, rating food security as one of the major problems faced by Cambodia today. The latest Cambodian Anthropometric Survey of 2008 shows an increase in acute malnutrition (wasting) of children under five with a rate of 8.9% by end of 2008 compared to 8.4% in 2005.

Major constraints to sustainable improvement of rural livelihoods in Cambodia include limited productivity, low profitability and limited off-farm diversification and intensification possibilities in crops, livestock and fisheries. Irrigation is an essential requirement for crop, livestock and enterprise diversification and intensification. Small scale, community based and well managed schemes have a potential to increasing resilience and mitigating food insecurity, even if effective maintenance and management still remain a challenge and requires significant capacity building efforts.

The National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP) 2006-2013 highlights the role of agriculture as a vehicle for macroeconomic and rural development. The National Strategy for Agriculture and Water 2006-2013 (SAW) adopted in 2007 and the Harmonised SAW\(^1\) adopted in 2010 have the overall goal to contribute to poverty reduction, food security and economic growth through enhancing agricultural productivity and diversification, and improving water resources development and management. Part of the National Strategy for Agriculture and Water, the Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (SFFSN)

\(^1\) For more information: [http://www.foodsecurity.gov.kh](http://www.foodsecurity.gov.kh)
2008-2012, is the reference policy document on the cross-cutting issue of food security and nutrition. It was written by the Council for Agricultural and Rural Development (CARD) in consultation with the Technical Working Group on Food Security and Nutrition (TWG-FSN). The proposed intervention directly addresses four out of the six programs areas identified in the Strategy for Agriculture and Water and built on achievements and lessons learned from the EU FAO Food Facility project “Improving the Food Security of Farming Families Affected by the Soaring Food Prices” implemented by FAO since June 2009 in 10 provinces, and which ends in June 2011.

2.2. Lessons learnt

The EU Food Facility in Cambodia accounts for a total of EUR 17.9 million and targets about 80,000 households in 14 provinces. The largest project in scope and in scale is implemented by FAO in 10 provinces. Progresses on the ground are significant; however, the short duration of this project limits the prospects for sustainability. A ROM mission was conducted in March 2010 and a Sustainability and Exit Strategy Workshop has been organized in December 2010. Among the lessons learned are:

- Further interventions should thus support diversification of agricultural production into crops other than rice (vegetables, maize, beans) based on market opportunities, to promote a balanced diet and to diversify incomes.
- Access to water is the base for all-year round production of vegetables and crop diversification.
- Link with economic opportunities and better access to markets associated with remunerative prices is a key for the sustainability of interventions in the agricultural sector.
- The delivery of assistance to smallholder farmers through the Food Facility has been efficient and effective, but there is a need to consolidate further the investments, capacity building and technology transfer introduced in the most vulnerable provinces.

2.3. Complementary actions

There is an opportunity for the EU to capitalize on past investments in agricultural development, food security and nutrition and thereby achieve a multiplier effect. Key past and on-going EU-funded projects include ECOSORN, projects funded under the FSTP and the Food Facility, ECHO Disaster Risk Reduction, as well as regional projects like EU's support to Food Security information for decision making.

EU intervention is characterized by a pro-poor approach and a good presence and visibility in remote and highly food insecure provinces of the North and North-East. Complementarities are sought, including in geographic coverage, with the other donor-supported initiatives focusing on the agricultural sector to reduce poverty in Cambodia.

2.4. Donor coordination

The Council for Agricultural and Rural Development (CARD) is the main government body responsible for coordinating relevant ministries, local authorities, international and local organisations to support implementation of activities focussing on agricultural and rural development. The Technical Working Group Agriculture and Water, co-chaired by the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) and the Ministry for Water Resources and Meteorology (MoWRAM) – co-facilitated by FAO and USAID, and the Technical Working Group Food Security and Nutrition, chaired by the CARD, provide the forum for policy dialogue between the government and development partners.
The consultation and coordination mechanisms will be embedded in existing national and provincial mechanisms. Through its role as facilitator of the Technical Working Group on Agriculture and Water (TWG-AW), the FAO has a de facto coordination role amongst Development Partners and vis-à-vis the Government. The oversight of this project will be done through the joint EU Food Security projects Steering Committee recently established under the co-chairmanship of CARD, MAFF and EU Delegation.

3. **DESCRIPTION**

3.1. **Objectives**

The **overall objective** of the EU support is to contribute to the National Food Security Support Programme (FSSP) and to the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger in Cambodia (CMDG-1), with a focus on vulnerable rural families depending on agriculture for their main source of livelihoods. The **specific objective** of the EU support is to improve the nutritional status and the resilience to external shocks of vulnerable smallholder farmers by increasing agricultural productivity and diversification and improving the integration of smallholders in value chains. In addition, this intervention will **consolidate and sustain the achievements made under the EU Food Facility**: all four results are built on ongoing activities.

3.2. **Expected results and main activities**

**Result 1. Strengthened agricultural production and market linkages for income generation and improved food security**

**Activity 1.1. Provide better access to agricultural inputs and improved technologies**

The project strategy for dealing with food insecurity is to diversify production and diet and to better link smallholders to market opportunities. To achieve this, complementary cash crops to rice will be promoted: e.g. vegetables, maize, soybean and/or other crops based on local assessments and on the interest of farmers. Small livestock production will be supported in combination with actions to address sanitary constraints and quality assurance. Seed multiplication by smallholders will improve availability of quality seeds and provide additional income. Nutrition is "integrated" in this project: training materials developed under current project will be used, in combination with technical training in livestock, fish or crop production.

**Activity 1.2. Improved market access for smallholders and link with existing market opportunities**

The intervention will strengthen existing supply chains and marketing channels, working in collaboration with input suppliers, collectors, processors and traders, to improve market share and value addition for smallholder producers. Where demand is identified, training and basic business advisory services will be provided, to improve links to market opportunities and access to credit or cash facilities. Further support to post-harvest activities and handling practices is needed: after analyzing the sources of loss, from threshing to post harvest in transport, storage and processing, suitable technologies will be promoted.

**Result 2. Improved water availability to secure and diversify agricultural production**

**Activity 2.1. Rehabilitation and maintenance of small scale irrigation infrastructures**

Small scale and quick impact irrigation improvements are important for agricultural productivity and to complement crop production, fisheries and livestock raising activities. The project will focus on small scale and high quality structures: canals, family or community
ponds and wells, with lower recurring maintenance costs. Public and private service providers will be used for survey and design, and private contractors will be hired for infrastructure works. The project will support training in operations, repairs and maintenance. Modern water management techniques at field level, including land levelling will be introduced.

**Activity 2.2. Support to water users association and improved water management**

Strong emphasis will be given to supporting existing Farmer Water User Groups (new ones may be formed if necessary) or informal farmer associations for sharing water resources, and on training users on sustainable operation and maintenance of schemes. Attention will be given to raising awareness on costs and membership fees required to sustain the infrastructures; to achieve this, provisions to monitor and record water use will be introduced.

**Result 3. Better management of fishery resources and building of sustainable supply chains**

**Activity 3.1. Improve the productivity of family fish pond and market linkages**

Fish production can contribute to greater diversification and resilience in the Cambodian farming system. Fish are very important in the diet of rural Cambodians, providing proteins, oil and essential nutrients. The intervention will increase productivity of small scale, local fish production, in combination with improved hatchery services. Conservation of fresh water fish stocks will be promoted through community fish refuge ponds (CFRP), sustaining the work done under the ongoing Food Facility Project. Target households and members of community fish refuge ponds will be trained and supported in implementing techniques for fish replenishment, feeding, pond management and harvest. Where there is significant fish surplus and market demand, a supply chain approach will be promoted, which will include capacity building in quality improvement, post handling and transportation.

**Activity 3.2. Support access to quality inputs and advisory services for fish production**

Fish hatcheries provide the basis for a fish supply chain and for restocking fish ponds, although they are not widely available outside the southern provinces in Cambodia. The project will build on the experience of current Food Facility support to fish hatcheries, to strengthen the technical and marketing capacity of fish producers and hatcheries managers and to facilitate links between hatcheries, CFRP, fish supply chains and legitimate credit service providers. For supply of fingerlings, and where needed, the project will link support from hatcheries to mechanisms for credit and/or vouchers to resource poor farmers.

**Result 4. Capacity building and policy development in relation to food security objectives**

**Activity 4.1 Capacity building of implementing partners in Extension and Business Services**

Capacity development is a major element of the ongoing project. Under the new intervention, there will be an increased focus on effective service provision in relation to marketing and business development. A strong emphasis will be to continue assistance to provincial coordination of development and to improve the capacity of NGOs and of the private sector.

**Activity 4.2. Mainstreaming of project activities and results into national policy**

In continuation to the ongoing EU FAO Food Facility, this component will focus on specific areas of intervention of the project for which there is a gap in policy and capacities resulting in structural constraints and a poor enabling environment for smallholder farmers. It will capitalize on lessons learnt from project implementation and complement these by expert analysis, in order to support policy development in specific areas of the Strategy for Agriculture and Water, with the conditions that the outputs are relevant to project intervention
and can contribute to improving significantly the food security situation of smallholder farmers.

3.3. Risks and assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of risks</th>
<th>Mitigation strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Absorption of development assistance at the central level at expense of impacts on smallholder nutrition and resilience to shocks. | 1. Focus on provincial level arrangements and local government with direct involvement of Commune Councils.   
2. Decentralised project management.                                           |
| Mismangement or misappropriation of funds                                     | Internal and external audits, rigorous management of Letters of Agreements (LOAs) with implementing partners and contracts, and close scrutiny of all purchase arrangements, in respect of FAO's set of rules and procedures. |
| Misuse of inputs by targeted farmers                                         | Inputs will be supplied on basis of partial contribution by recipients, with support from farmers' group leaders, commune councils and village chiefs, to coordinate and guide the process, together with the implementing partners. Input delivery will be systematically combined with training and on-farm advisory services. |
| Failure to sustain project results                                           | 1. Sustainability aspects built into design and reviewed on a regular basis   
2. Multiple pathways to sustain results through public sector, NGOs and private sector. |
| Lack of coordination with other development assistance activities and government | 1. Through its role of facilitator of the TWG-AW, FAO will be actively involved in a coordination role with the different stakeholders to ensure harmonization and non-overlap.   
2. Involvement in provincial coordination mechanisms.                          |

Assumptions are presented in the Annex I of the Draft Contribution Agreement.

3.4. Cross-cutting issues

Women are very active in on-farm production and trade in rural Cambodia, and this further supports the importance of a strong gender focus in project activities. Women with children will be targeted in priority for activities like vegetable production and livestock raising; as well as awareness on improved nutrition and a balanced diet - especially for pregnant women and children under 24 months - based on local availability of food across the year. Disaster Risk Management principles and practices will be integrated in farmers training, and coordination with the National Committee for Disaster Management at governmental level will be enforced. In accordance with article 5.1.3 of the FSTP this intervention will be an opportunity to design a Joint Humanitarian Development Framework.

3.5. Stakeholders

The intervention will primarily target smallholder farming families who are facing food insecurity. Community Based Organisations engaged in production, processing or marketing of agricultural products, will be strengthened whenever possible. Special attention will be paid to ensuring that the most vulnerable and food insecure members, women and youth, benefit from capacity building and enhanced market access.

This intervention was prepared in close consultation with the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF). The project will be overseen by a National Coordination Committee which has been established recently with co-chairmanship from CARD, MAFF and EU Delegation to monitor EU-funded food security projects in Cambodia. Project achievements
and lessons learnt will be presented to the Technical Working Groups on Agriculture and Water (TWG-AW) and on Nutrition (TWG-FSN).

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Implementation method

The method of implementation for this action is Joint Management through signature of a Standard Contribution Agreement with Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) which complies with the provisions of the Commission's Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA). The FAO is currently implementing a large-scale 'Food Facility' project, it has a significant experience in Cambodia and the technical capacity required to link support to small scale agriculture, irrigation and fisheries with food security objectives. The new intervention will build on existing and successful structures, partnerships and resources is will concentrate on four of the most 'food insecure' provinces (Otdar Meanchey, Preah Vihear, Siem Reap and Kampong Thom) currently covered, prioritized for their high food insecurity levels, remoteness, absence of other donor-funded interventions.

4.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

The modality is a Joint management, through the signature of a Contribution Agreement (CA) with FAO. The total cost is estimated at EUR 4,000,000 of which EU contributes 100%.

All contracts implementing the action are awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents laid down and published by the FAO.

4.3. Budget and calendar

The operational implementation phase will have duration of 42 months from the signature of the CA. An inception phase of 3 months is foreseen. The project will start preferably on 1\textsuperscript{st} of August 2011, after the current EU-funded Food Facility project ends. The indicative budget and implementation calendar are presented in the Annex I and III of the Draft CA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category breakdown</th>
<th>EU (EUR)</th>
<th>Total (EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Joint management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Contribution Agreement with FAO</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. Performance monitoring

FAO will be responsible for monitoring on the basis of key indicators defined in the Logical Framework Matrix (Annex I of draft CA) and as specified in the Contribution Agreement.

The EU Delegation will carry out additional monitoring as deemed necessary, review progress reports and will participate in relevant meetings and committees. The M&E framework developed by FAO under the current Food Facility project will be used.

Reporting will follow the requirements set in the Contribution Agreement. It is expected that independent mid-term and final evaluations of the project will be carried out. The detail of evaluations and audits obligations will be detailed in the contractual arrangements with FAO.

If deemed necessary external evaluations and audits may also be carried out by independent consultants recruited directly by the European Commission in accordance with EU regulations.
4.5. Communication and visibility

In accordance with the visibility provisions under the EC-UN Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) and with the European Commission-UN Joint Action Plan on Visibility signed in September 2006, the EC and the FAO will work together to ensure appropriate visibility actions. A communication and visibility plan will be prepared during the inception phase, which will be compliant with the Communication and Visibility guidelines for EU external actions.
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Annex – Draft Contribution Agreement (Special Conditions, Annex I)
ANNEX XVI

ACTION FICHE FOR THE FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME

Strategic Priority 3: “Addressing food security for the poor and vulnerable in fragile situations”

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>Support to the Institutionalizing of the Nepal Food Security Monitoring and Analysis System (NeKSAP) in Nepal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>€ 4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU contribution</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method / Method of implementation</td>
<td>Project Approach – Joint management through the signature of a contribution agreement with the World Food Programme (WFP) - with a Financing Agreement with the Government of Nepal</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

With a per capita GDP estimated at USD 427\(^1\), Nepal is the poorest country in South Asia and the 15\(^{th}\) poorest country in the world. Poverty is associated with high levels of food insecurity\(^2\) that currently affect as many as 3.5 million people. Moreover, 41% of the population is estimated to be undernourished\(^3\). According to the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MoAC), the edible cereal deficit for 2009/2010 was as high as 330,000 MT, which is 140 percent higher than the previous year and the largest ever recorded deficit in the country. With a Global Hunger Index (GHI) of 20.6, the severity of hunger in Nepal is "alarming" while the hunger index at sub-regional level\(^4\) indicates significant regional disparity. Severe levels of hunger prevail in the Mid- and Far-Western Hill and Mountain regions, where the hunger index scores 40.17 ("extremely alarming")\(^5\).

This is the inevitable result of severe chronic poverty, geographical isolation of much of the poorest populations, high demographic growth coupled with relative stagnation in both food production and other development\(^6\) and utilization problems such as inadequate access to health services, water and sanitation. In recent years, sluggish cereal production growth has not kept up with growth in population and increasing demand\(^7\). The alarming food insecurity in the country is also due to a protracted peace process and continued political instability, a succession of natural disasters including a series of severe droughts coupled with

---

\(^1\) GDP per capita current prices 2009, “World Development Indicators”, The World Bank

\(^2\) Food Security Bulletin, 2009 - 2010, WFP

\(^3\) "Food Security Assessment Mission to Nepal", 2007, FAO and WFP


\(^5\) This ranking is just above the average for the Democratic Republic of Congo, which is the worst scoring country globally. The Far-Western Mountain sub-region fares very poorly as well with a ranking similar to Ethiopia.

\(^6\) Although the agriculture sector contributes 33% of GDP and employs more than two-thirds of the population, over the past 3 decades, the percentage of government expenditure on agriculture steadily fell from around 30 percent in the 1980s to below 20 percent in the 1990s and to 5 percent in 2008.

\(^7\) During the period 2001-2008, the average cereal production growth was 1.7% while the average population growth was 2.1%. Likewise, over the past 5 years, overall cereal production has increased by only 5 percent, whereas the consumption requirement has increased by more than 20 percent.
incidences of flooding, two years of steep and sustained food price inflation\(^8\), consistent edible cereal food deficit, limited capacity to manage food shocks, poor food access, and a lack of technological backup and of irrigation facilities despite heavy reliance on water intensive crop agriculture.

The Government of Nepal recognizes the prevailing situation of food insecurity across the country and attaches high importance to ensuring food security for all its citizens. The 2007 Interim Constitution has recognised food sovereignty as a basic human right. Since then, food security has figured in planning and policy documents, including the 2007-2010 Three Year Interim Plan, which devoted an entire chapter to food security. The Government of Nepal is in the initial phase of developing the first comprehensive national food and nutrition security strategy. It is also developing a new 20-year agricultural development plan as a follow up on the current 1995 Agricultural Perspective Plan. There is a need to develop within the Government of Nepal a significant capacity in food security planning, monitoring and evaluation to provide reliable and timely information to support this policy making process as well as to tackle the significant challenges posed by the considerable prevalence of food insecurity in the country.

This has been initiated with the EU Food Facility under which WFP has started institutionalizing its Nepal Food Security Monitoring System (hereafter referred to as NeKSAP (Nepal Khadhiya Surakshya Anugaman Pranali\(^7\) in Nepali) within the government system under the overall guidance of the National Planning Commission (NPC). This process has included a large capacity development exercise to transfer the food security phase classification approach to the MoAC, the establishment and technical and physical strengthening of both a Food Security Monitoring Technical Unit (FSMTU) within the ministry and a District Food Security Network (DFSN) in 72 districts across the country. As anticipated in the FF project proposal, longer-term support remains essential for the Government of Nepal to be fully able to take over and operate a comprehensive and integrated food security monitoring system. The proposed project is, thus, meant to refine the monitoring methodology and tools and to capacitate the Government of Nepal with other components of food security monitoring to build upon what has been achieved under the Food Facility project.

In summary, although the proposed project will not directly "address food insecurity" as expected from Priority 3 of the FSTP Strategy, it will contribute to this objective in a more reform-oriented way by strengthening the capacity of the Government of Nepal to have a more accurate picture of who the people affected by any form of malnutrition in the country are, where and why and, on this basis, to be in a better position to formulate and implement appropriate policies.

2.2. Lessons learnt

During implementation, the first phase of the project under the EU Food Facility encountered the following challenges:

The high turn-over of government officials, especially at the central level, has been one of the major challenges for the capacity development process. WFP mitigated the impact of this turn-over through an implementation strategy that involved capacity development activities at all levels including central, regional and district levels. WFP will continue with the same strategy, taking advantage of its field outreach in districts and of its strong technical team at the central level to continue to work with the government. In addition, a number of recent developments with the Food Facility project demonstrate that broader central level engagement with food security is developing. Having a larger number of players involved in food security under the auspices of the NPC will minimise the impact of staff movements among MoAC's senior figures.

Food security is a cross-sectoral issue, which does not fall under the mandate of a single ministry and requires a leadership with a solid inter-ministry coordination capacity. The Government of Nepal has decided that the MoAC would take up the responsibility for operating the NeKSAP. A Food Security Monitoring Technical Unit (FSMTU) has been established at the ministry towards this end. This implies that the MoAC must play this inter-ministerial coordination role. As a result, the Food Facility project has faced significant

\(^8\) The 2010 Consumer Price Index for food was 13%.
challenges when dealing with issues that required the MoAC’s leadership to coordinate between different line ministries and other central agencies. Moreover, coordination has been found to be more challenging at central level than at district level due to bureaucratic and political changes.

The lack of a clear and agreed upon institutional framework that would enable a systematic utilisation of the food security monitoring information has also been a constraint. The advocacy and capacity-development support provided under the EU Food Facility has contributed to increasing interest and involvement in food security monitoring and analysis within the MoAC as well as within the NPC. This has clearly manifested itself through the establishment of a multi-sectoral Food and Nutrition Security Steering Committee under the NPC’s leadership. As a result, while supporting greater inter-ministerial coordination on food security as well as stronger vertical and horizontal linkages, WFP will also aim at rationalising and strengthening the most appropriate institutional set-up for the food security monitoring system within the Government of Nepal.

Until now the main emphasis has been placed on developing the Government of Nepal’s capacity to monitor and analyze food security. Whereas a significant number of various institutions, including the Government of Nepal, have used the NeKASAP-produced food security monitoring information, the process of utilizing these data, for what purpose and to what extent, has been left open. Under the proposed project, these aspects will be addressed through piloting district-based response analysis with a view to helping central and local governments translate the information available into policy actions including resource allocation, policy and programme planning, review, monitoring and evaluation. Likewise, the existing monitoring methodology will be reviewed and improved under Result 2 on the basis of an overall reflection with policy makers at all levels on their needs and the use they will make of the information generated by the NeKASAP in relation with the response analysis module. As a result, the NeKASAP will switch from an initially supply-driven to a more demand-driven approach.

Having access to quality, timely and reliable monitoring data on the food security situation in the country will be of critical support to the definition, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies on agricultural development and nutrition. In this context, the EU Delegation will also take advantage of the implementation of the proposed project to sustain its ongoing dialogue with the Government of Nepal towards much needed institutional and technical reforms in the rural development sector. Towards this end, the Delegation will remain closely associated with the two ongoing policy processes aimed at the development of an Agriculture Development Strategy (ADS) and a National Food and Nutrition Development Plan (NFNDP). The present project is expected to be a key component to support the formulation of these two policies. Moreover, the Delegation is going to provide direct support to the ADS through the provision of technical assistance via a framework contract. It will contribute to both policy processes through its active participation and inputs on the occasion of country-wide public consultations.

The Delegation is planning to investigate the relevance and best ways to integrate rural development and associated sub-sectors such as food security, agriculture, nutrition, sustainable livelihoods in the next MIPCSP for Nepal.

2.3. Complementary actions

WFP is the only organization that provides food security monitoring support on a country-wide basis.

Management Information Systems exist to some extent for other thematic areas such as poverty, district poverty and health management. They are managed by the NPC, the MoLD and the MoHP respectively with the support of several donors such as WB, UNDP, WHO and UNICEF. When/where appropriate, the activities under the proposed project will be coordinated and close collaboration shall be made with existing initiatives towards effective implementation of activities and towards avoiding duplication of efforts. Moreover, the capacity of the MoAC’s FSMTU and of other concerned stakeholders to perform extensive analyses on the household monitoring dataset will be strengthened to enable them to produce estimates of key food security and child nutrition indicators to be used for the production of various information products. However, several donor agencies and development partners are involved in the agriculture and food security sectors. They include the following:
The EU has allocated €23.5 million to Nepal under the Food Facility. The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the World Food Programme (WFP) are delivering a €17 million joint programme of short and medium term interventions in ten districts focusing on: productive safety nets to maintain and improve agricultural infrastructure; quick impact support through agricultural inputs and livestock provision; improved sustainable agricultural practices through capacity building of both farmers and the MoAC; and the transfer of a for food security monitoring system within the Government.

In addition, 4 international Non-Governmental Organisations i.e. Save the Children Norway, Oxfam GB, Practical Action and Dan Church Aid have been selected on a competitive basis to implement community-based agricultural projects for a total budget of €6.5 in close consultation with the Government of Nepal. The EU Delegation is willing to capitalise on the results of the Food Facility as well as of the proposed project to sustain the policy dialogue it has initiated with the Government of Nepal towards a more reform-oriented EU involvement in the interlinked sectors of rural development, agriculture and food security that could be considered for inclusion as one of the three priorities in the CSP for Nepal in 2014. The proposed project will be critical for the EU to make such a decision as it will support the Government of Nepal efforts to develop and implement a sound policy framework towards alleviating food insecurity in the country. Indeed, the lack of a clear strategic vision of how the Government of Nepal is planning to address food security issues has been a major impediment for donors to be able to get engaged in this sector through a long-term, programmatic, reform-oriented approach.

EU humanitarian aid also provides food aid worth €0.9 to highly food insecure households in the Karnali region as well as to Bhutanese refugees. While this humanitarian aid is being phased out, DIPECHO remains. Any relevant synergies between DIPECHO and the NeKSSP will be exploited. Several INGOs involved in the FF are currently working under DIPECHO on linking food security and disaster risk reduction (DRR) and preparedness in a LRRD approach. Likewise, efforts are made by a Task Force set up within the framework of the UN Food Security Cluster and made up of representatives of the MoAC, FAO, WFP, ECHO, EU and several international/local NGOs to define ways to effectively link DRR and relevant technologies to address food security. The proposed project will contribute critically to these two processes. One way will be to make the NeKSSP more responsive to climate change factors through the inclusion of related indicators.

In 2010, WFP provided support to 2.2 million people across Nepal under its Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation. It provided 1.6 million people in 22 vulnerable, food insecure districts with both food and cash for community asset creation, along with micronutrient powder for children under five to combat high levels of anemia. It also provides nutritious mid-day meals of fortified wheat-soya-blend to 182,000 primary school students living in 11 Far-Western districts (School Feeding Programme). Finally, WFP is working with the MoAC under the EU Food Facility to transfer its food security monitoring system to the Government of Nepal.

The World Bank (WB) has provided the Government of Nepal with US$36 million under the Nepal Food Crisis Response Programme focusing on irrigation and water resource management and social safety nets. Another funding of US$47.8M will be used notably to improve access to nutritious food for vulnerable populations through public works programmes (food and cash for work). Finally, the WB assisted the GoN in developing its application to the Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme Trust Fund in October 2010. The Country Investment Plan drafted on this occasion mentions the need for a national food security monitoring system.

The Asian Development Bank (ADB) has two ongoing projects focusing on agriculture/rural development and irrigation for a total budget of US$ 38 million that is to be expanded through an additional funding of US$ 45 million. Another US$ 24 million project aiming at supporting high mountain agribusiness and rural livelihoods is under approval. The ADB has also been heavily involved in rural micro-finance through supporting the Rural Micro-Finance Development Centre under which a country-wide network of micro-finance institutions provides micro-loans to small-scale farmers’ groups.

USAID is involved in the agriculture sector notably through the so-called Feed the Future Facility. It co-finances with SDC (see below) a Hill Maize Research Programme aimed at developing improved varieties of maize, while strengthening the country’s maize seeds’ supply. The project has a total budget of US$ 2 million and a duration of 4 years. Finally, some limited funding is to be made available through the
Government of Nepal red book to support main cereals crop production, breed improvement of large ruminants and goat roasting.

→ The Swiss Development Cooperation has an extensive experience in supporting agriculture development in Nepal. Its current portfolio includes a project for the Promotion of the seed sector through maize seeds - for food production – (4th phase of US$ 5 million from August 2010 to August 2014 in partnership with USAID) and vegetables - for income generation – (3rd phase of CHF 1.45 million).

→ The International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD) also has a large agriculture-related portfolio including a High Value Agriculture Project to link agricultural production and markets (US$ 18 million for 6 years starting in July 2010). In accordance with article 5.1.3 of the FSTP this intervention will be an opportunity for designing a "Joint Humanitarian Development Framework".

2.4. Donor coordination

A number of multi-agency fora to coordinate activities related to agriculture, food security and nutrition are in place in Nepal. Several are currently in a process of being revitalised after a recent “dormant” phase.

First, there are two Technical Level Donor Groups on food security and nutrition respectively. They meet regularly and bring together donors and UN agencies involved in food security- and/or nutrition, namely EU, DFID, USAID, WB, ADB, FAO, UNICEF and WFP. The Nutrition Group has managed to play a critical role in supporting the Government of Nepal in the (ongoing) formulation of a nutrition development strategy.

A Food Security Cluster has also been re-activated under the MoAC's chairmanship. It is co-chaired by WFP and FAO on a six-monthly rotating basis with the participation of government and UN agencies and INGOS. The purpose of this group is to share information on and coordinate response activities for disaster risk reduction and management in relation to agriculture and food security.

There are other coordination fora in the agriculture and food security sectors such as the MoAC-chaired Agricultural and Rural Development (ARD) thematic group, which generally meets twice a year and involves relevant stakeholders and development partners.

Finally, whenever needed and relevant, food security and/or agriculture are also brought to the agenda of the “Utstein Group”, the bi-monthly meeting of like minded donors and agencies.

3. DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectives

Overall objective: to improve the food security situation in Nepal through capacitating the Government to design, plan and implement evidence-based food security policies.

Specific objective: to strengthen the capacity of the GoN to monitor and analyze the country's food security status through strengthening and institutionalizing the comprehensive Nepal Food Security Monitoring System (NeKSAP) within the government structure.

3.2. Expected results and main activities

The proposed project is articulated around the following three main pillars (or results):

Result 1 focuses on strengthening the existing national food security monitoring system both at the policy and technical levels towards one single, integrated framework; Result 2 aims to further improve and integrate the NeKSAP district-based food security phase classification methods into the national system; and Result 3 promotes the adoption of the NeKSAP analytical framework by existing national monitoring systems.

To this end, WFP will implement capacity development activities towards full ownership of the monitoring system by the Government of Nepal and complete phase out by WFP that is the ultimate goal of the proposed project. This process has already started under the EU Food Facility project with the roles and
responsibilities of WFP staff both at field and central levels switching from those of implementing agents to those of facilitators and catalysts.

Close collaboration with FAO will be ensured as both UN agencies are currently developing a “Joint Strategy on Information Systems for Food and Nutrition Security” aimed at setting out a strategic framework to allow both organizations to effectively channel support to Member States to enable them to strengthen their own food and nutrition security information system.

Result 1  Strengthened capacity of Government Institutions to manage and operate an integrated Food Security Monitoring System (referred to as NeKSAP)

Activity 1.1 Institutional Support to the NPC and relevant line ministries for Food Security Policy and Planning

Activity 1.1.1 To provide support to the NPC and relevant line ministries to define an overall policy framework for food security through the secondment of a WFP senior staff to the NPC to support the multi-sectoral Food and Nutrition Security Steering Committee under the NPC’s Vice-Chairman direct leadership, consultation workshops, field visits for officials at policy and operational levels both in-country and abroad, technical and advisory inputs, consultancy services for specific thematic areas and the provision of equipment;

Activity 1.1.2 To provide support to the NPC to define an effective food security institutional set-up for food security analysis, policy planning and implementation building upon existing governmental and non-governmental structures;

Activity 1.1.3 To provide support to the NPC to enable it to fulfil the inter-ministerial coordination role required by the multi-sectoral dimension of food security.

Outputs:

- The GoN’s policy-making capacity for food security has been strengthened resulting in the formulation of a overall food and nutrition security policy framework;

- A food security institutional set up has been defined and is functioning on the basis of the NPC’s fully operational inter-ministerial coordination capacity needed to support the development and implementation of food security related policy and strategies;

Activity 1.2 Support to the MoAC’s Food Security Monitoring Technical Unit

Activity 1.2.1 To provide technical support to the MoAC’s Food Security Monitoring Technical Unit (FSMTU) and other relevant technical units including the Agribusiness Promotion and Marketing Development Department (ABPMDD) to enable them to produce free-of-charge, periodic information products of high quality and in a timely manner with special emphasis placed on strengthening their GIS mapping and analysis capacity. This will be done through the secondment of technical staff, training, workshops, observation trips in-country and abroad, and through the provision of equipment.

Activity 1.2.2 To provide similar technical support to MoAC’s regional offices to build upon basic skills in the above-mentioned areas to enable them to support the work of the FSMTU from a regional perspective;

Activity 1.2.3 To assist the FSMTU in strengthening the methodology and conduction in the field of market price monitoring currently jointly carried out by the MoAC’s ABPMDD, the Forum of Nepalese Chambers of Commerce and Industries, the Consumer Interests Protection Forum and WFP with a view to fully integrating this monitoring system within the NeKSAP;

Activity 1.2.4 To identify and implement practical ways to further refine the existing crop production monitoring methodology on the basis of increased formal collaboration between the MoAC,
WFP and FAO for the preparation and publication of related crop production updates and to fully integrate the system into the NeKsAP;

Activity 1.2.5 To continue to support the District Food Security Monitoring Network (DFSMN) at the field level through: 1) the identification and on-the-job training of relevant district stakeholders to facilitate the work of the DFSMN in place of the WFP's field staff; 2) conducting/coordinating food security monitoring and analysis training for field level staff including VDC secretaries; and through 3) identifying and meeting capacity development needs at grass-roots level.

Outputs:

- The FSMTU is better able to operate the NeKsAP at a technical level and produces food security related information products of high quality in a timely manner;
- Advanced GIS mapping and analysis capacity is developed at central level of the MoAC while basic GIS mapping capacity is built at regional offices;
- Market and price monitoring system is strengthened and fully integrated into the NeKsAP;
- Crop production monitoring is implemented on the basis of a refined methodology and clearer institutional inter-organisational arrangements;
- DFSMN are locally operated and able to conduct food security monitoring analysis in 72 districts.

Activity 1.3 Development of a Comprehensive Management Information System for the NeKsAP

Activity 1.3.1 To develop and implement a management information system (MIS) capable of capturing, processing, analyzing and disseminating the information generated by the NeKsAP to various levels in and various formats such as datasets, maps and reports. This system must be designed on the basis of a thorough analysis of the Government of Nepal’s financing capacities;

Activity 1.3.2 To provide the staff of the FSMTU with additional training on food security-related data analysis;

Activity 1.3.3 To provide district level staff and MoAC with training on the MIS use and maintenance;

Activity 1.3.4 To implement follow-up monitoring while user support capacity is developed at the MoAC for a sustainable implementation of the MIS.

Outputs:

- The flow of information across districts, regions and the centre is streamlined to ensure that information consistency, integrity and availability are maintained;
- The data generated by the DFSNs can be utilized with no delay at district, regional and central levels on the basis of the newly set up MIS;
- The information system users are able to perform dynamic analysis of the data, to create maps and to produce reports;
- A MIS technical support capacity has been developed at the MoAC in relation with the NeKsAP.

Result 2 Strengthened District-based Food Security Monitoring and Response Analysis

Activity 2.1 Review of the Food Security Phase Classification Methodology and its Implementation in Nepal
Activity 2.1.1 To review the Food Security Phase Classification methodology and its implementation in Nepal focusing on the indicators used for classification and their thresholds; monitoring frequency and its timing to better capture the seasonality of different geographical areas; and on the situation analysis tool to improve the quality of information in view of its validity, consistency, timeliness and accuracy. This later aspect will directly contribute to the Food Security Response Analysis pilot (see below Activity 2.2);

Activity 2.1.2 To review the DFSMN implementation modality with a view to strengthening its relevance and effectiveness with special attention paid on identifying skill development requirements at sub-district level where food security related information is mostly generated in line with Activity 1.2.5 above;

Activity 2.1.3 On the basis of consultations at various levels and following field investigations in some selected districts, to present the findings of the review and to reach an agreement with relevant stakeholders on the way forward towards improving the existing food security classification method and tools for the food security analysis in Nepal.

Outputs:

- A review report on the Food Security Phase Classification with recommendations and guidelines on how to improve the methodology, tools and implementation modality of the DFSNs towards greater efficiency and effectiveness agreed upon and ready for implementation;
- A practical approach to develop food security monitoring capacity at sub-district level recommended;

Activity 2.2 Pilot District-based Food Security Response Analysis

Activity 2.2.1 To develop and test a pilot district-based food security response analysis to strengthen district stakeholders' capacity to analyze the local food security situation and to design appropriate targeted responses;

Activity 2.2.2 To document and share with relevant stakeholders the lessons learnt during the pilot implementation and to produce a guidebook together with corresponding training modules.

Outputs:

- A pilot approach for District-based Food Security Response Analysis that would complement the existing Food Security Classification method adopted by the DFSMN is developed and tested in ten pilot districts resulting in ten food-security friendly district development / investment plans;
- On the basis of the lesson learnt during pilot implementation, a Guidebook on the District-based Food Security Response Analysis is prepared together with corresponding training modules.

Activity 2.3: District-based Food Security Response Analysis Training Roll-out

Activity 2.3.1 To implement district-based food security response analysis training roll-out for all the DFSNs in 72 districts including local government officials, NGOs/INGOs, UN agencies and representatives from civil society. Training of trainees will be held prior to the training roll-out.

Activity 2.3.2 To complement the above-mentioned exercise with refresher training in food security monitoring and analysis so as to: 1) further strengthen the DFSN capacity to analyze and
report on the food security situation in Nepal and 2) acquaint the DFSN members with the refined tools developed under “Activity 2.1”.

Activity 2.3.3 To conduct a review exercise in the course of the response analysis training roll-out to gauge the latter’s effectiveness and to receive trainees’ feedback for further improvement of the tools and methodology.

Outputs:
- *All DFSN members in 72 districts have been trained on Response Analysis tool and methodology.*
- *Increased capacity of local governments to translate food security-related data into policy actions resulting in 10 food security friendly district development plans;*
- *Sub-district level capacity to implement food security monitoring is strengthened as per the recommendations made by the Activity 2.1;*
- *The process of institutionalizing the DFSN food security monitoring system within its member agencies has been enhanced through appropriate refresher training.*

Result 3 Increased integration of NeKSAP within other relevant national monitoring systems

Activity 3.1 Establishment of a National Baseline for Household Food Security

Activity 3.1.1 To provide technical support to the Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) and to the FSMTU to analyse food security- and nutrition-related data from the NLSS III and to establish a national baseline for household food security with clear definition and thresholds of officially recognised food security levels in Nepal;

Activity 3.1.2 To provide technical support to the CBS and FSMTU for them to contribute to developing a “Food Security and Nutrition” thematic report on the basis of the newly adopted baseline as active members of relevant technical review committee and methodology consultation workshops to be organised by the WB;

Outputs:
- *National baseline for household food security has been established using the NLSS III data;*
- *The capacity of the technical staff of the CBS and FSMTU to analyze and report on household food security has been developed.*
- *A “Food Security and Nutrition” Thematic Report has been published as one of the NLSS III thematic study products with significant inputs from the FSMTU;*

Activity 3.2 Mainstreaming of the household food security system in the monitoring of the impact of relevant food security policies

Activity 3.2.1 To design and implement household food security and child nutrition surveillance based on the NLSS III results and methodology leading to the production of yearly updates of the food security-related NLSS III;

Activity 3.2.2 To develop the capacity of the MoAC’s FSMTU and of other concerned stakeholders to perform extensive analyses on the surveillance dataset to produce estimates of key household food security and child nutrition indicators to be used for the production of various information products;
Activity 3.2.3 To develop a better understanding among food security related key stakeholders about the impact of crises and relevant food security policy and programme interventions on household food security and child nutrition status

Activity 3.2.4 To develop and implement a hand-over plan of the food security and child nutrition surveillance system.

Outputs:
- Household food security and child nutrition surveillance has been designed and is implemented on a yearly basis on the basis of the NLSS III results and methodology;
- Information products using the surveillance data including food security and child nutrition bulletins are produced on a quarterly as well as annual basis;
- The findings from the surveillance activity have been presented at an annual national workshop as part of the review process to monitor the impact of relevant food security policies;
- A hand-over plan and a strategy for the surveillance activity has been developed and implemented so that the data collected remain accessible to and utilized by different thematic users.

3.3. Risks and assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Risk (Risk Level)</th>
<th>Mitigation Strategy</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of policy consistency due to high turnover</td>
<td>Advocacy across relevant ministries at all levels (central, regional and district as</td>
<td>Stable political and security situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of key GoN officials (High)</td>
<td>well as policy and technical)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate coordination between different line</td>
<td>Support the GoN to design an institutional framework that enforces inter-ministerial</td>
<td>National policies in associated sectors consistent with and supportive of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ministries and organizations (High)</td>
<td>coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate motivation of GoN officials towards</td>
<td>WFP staff allocate substantial time to work with GoN officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the implementation of NeKKSAP promoted activities</td>
<td>- Arrangements of trainings and field visits for key officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of GoN sense of ownership (High-Medium)</td>
<td>- Joint information products with support from WFP with an aim to gradually increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the GoN involvement and thus ownership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakdown of the peace process resulting in wider</td>
<td>Policy level advocacy and influence to allocate GoN budget for NeKKSAP activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflict (Low)</td>
<td>- Technical and policy level support to continue at the central level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Work to be adjusted with less frequent field visits and higher dependence on DFSNs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- GoN interested in and committed to operating and funding the FS monitoring system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Active, efficient collaboration between gvt agencies at central and district levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Project activities supported and owned by mid-level gvt officials and local authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Political and security situation in the country stable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4. Crosscutting Issues

Climate change: Nepal being one of the countries in the world with the highest vulnerability to climate change, the impact of climate change on availability of land, agriculture production and on food security
shall be considered. The NeKSAP has already initiated some related works and will further concentrate on defining ways and indicators to incorporate climate change in the field surveillance tools.

**Environmental sustainability:** Food insecure people have to resort to unsustainable farming in the slopes and to overexploitation of natural resources (such as forest and NTFPs), which causes overall degradation of the living environment and contribute to increasing poverty and food insecurity. It is expected that a combination of sound food security policy and appropriate response mechanism supported by an effective food security monitoring system could contribute towards breaking this vicious trap of poverty and environmental degradation.

**Gender:** NeKSAP has been making efforts to incorporate the gender issues. The household food security and child nutrition monitoring, in particular, is designed to capture the gender aspects. It has been found through WFP's field surveillance that female-headed households are particularly vulnerable to food insecurity in rural Nepal. Similarly, various thematic assessments carried out by NeKSAP also include gender analysis. The DFSMN have representation from the Women's Development Offices. Gender considerations in food security surveillance and analysis will be continued and further strengthened where necessary/possible.

**Good governance:** Conflict resolution, peace and stability development have been the overwhelming focus in recent years at the expense of GoN's service delivery to its citizens. Basic service delivery at the local level has been a matter of particular concern in the absence of elected local authorities. The DFSMN, which forms an integral part of the NeKSAP, can be a valuable advocacy platform to attract proper attention to the needs of the populations at the local level. Notably because it is made up of local stakeholders with an in-depth knowledge of the situation in the ground, it can also provide information on governance-related indicators such as access to roads, health services, provision of water and sanitation etc. which impact food security.

**Human Rights:** The 2007 Interim Constitution has recognised food security as a basic human right. The NPC has also given high priority to food security. An effective food security monitoring system such as NeKSAP can be instrumental in ensuring that this basic human right is guaranteed for all the people of Nepal.

### 3.5. Stakeholders

The final beneficiaries will be the vulnerable, food insecure populations of Nepal with a focus on those living in the Far and Mid-West regions, which experience the highest levels of food insecurity and malnutrition. They will ultimately benefit from the proposed project through the GoN's increased capacity at central and local levels to assess the food security situation in the country and to design relevant and cost-efficient remedial measures through proper policy planning, implementation and evaluation.

The key stakeholders will mainly be the National Planning Commission and the Ministry of Agriculture. Several others will, however, intervene including:

**Ministry of Local Development (MoLD):** is responsible for the overall development activities at the local level. It is present at the district level through a network of District Development Offices. Many of the activities supported by District Development Offices are geared towards livelihoods improvement through the provision of basic services and towards poverty alleviation. The LDO also coordinates the activities of various line ministries within the district. Besides, there is also a District Planning Officer (DPO) responsible for preparing development plans for the district to be endorsed by the DDC and the district council. The VDC secretaries working within the district report to the District Development Offices through the LDO. MoLD's engagement will be critical for a successful implementation of the proposed activities, especially Result 2.

**Central Bureau of Statistics:** Under the NPC, is the national agency in charge of the design, collection, consolidation, processing, analysis, publication and dissemination of statistics. CBS conducts both a population and housing census and an agriculture census every ten years as well as a manufacturing establishment survey on a five-year basis. It also conducts the Nepal Living Standard Surveys (NLSS). The latest NLSS (NLSS III), currently ongoing, will provide the baseline for the household food security and child nutrition monitoring module of the NeKSAP.

**Ministry of Home Affairs:** has the lead role in relation with general administration for maintaining peace and security inside the country. They are also responsible for leading emergency responses in case of
disasters. The Chief District Officer (CDO), who is the main person responsible for general administration in the district, is hierarchically under this Ministry. Since food security is an issue of public concern, particularly in food insecure districts, CDOs are often expected to play a lead role in providing related assistance to most vulnerable communities.

**Ministry of Industry and Supplies:** is the lead ministry responsible for ensuring sufficient supplies of essential commodities, including food, across the country. Depending on the needs, the MoIS makes plans for commodities to be imported. The **Nepal Food Corporation** works under this ministry. It is the lead agency responsible for purchasing and for supplying food to remote, food deficient districts, where it is sold at a subsidized price given that transportation costs are being supported by the government. The distribution of the food is managed by the District Food Management Committee chaired by the CDO with the participation of various district-based organizations.

4. **IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES**

4.1. **Method of implementation**

The project will be implemented through the signature of a Financing Agreement with the Government. The method of implementation of the project will be joint management through the signature of a contribution agreement with the United Nations World Food Programme governed by the provisions of the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement between the European Commission and the United Nations (FAA). The international organisation complies with the criteria provided for in Article 53d of the applicable Financial Regulation.

WFP has been deemed the most relevant partner to implement the proposed project for several reasons. First, it was involved in establishing and operating the food security monitoring since 2002 while entering into a collaboration with the MoAC in recent years. Secondly, it supported the introduction in and adaptation to Nepal of the Integrated Phase Classification approach on which the current district-based system is based. Thirdly, it has already started on transferring the existing system to the GoN at both central and district levels under the ongoing EUFF project. It seems natural to allow the proposed project to build upon the extensive knowledge and experience that WFP has capitalised in the food security monitoring field in Nepal.

From the WFP side, the Vulnerability Assessment and Monitoring (VAM) Unit will be in charge of the project implementation. This VAM Unit has been in charge of developing and operating the food security monitoring system since its onset and has been supporting the MoAC in taking it over under the ongoing EU Food Facility. It will, thus, be the most appropriate partner to bring this transfer process to its full completion. Both staff members to be seconded have been selected among WFP senior personnel on the basis of their qualifications and professional experience with particular attention being paid to their recorded working interactions with the MoAC and NPC.

Under the EUFF project, the NPC nominated the MoAC as the lead government agency in relation with food security monitoring. As a result, the Food Security Monitoring Unit to be established under the project was hosted by the MoAC. The latter is, thus, expected to remain the main technical counterpart of the EU under the proposed project while the NPC and other relevant agencies will contribute through their participation in the Project Steering Committee (see below). The MoAC will nominate a National Project Coordinators (NPC) who will play a key role in the project implementation as an equal counterpart to WFP. This NPC will remain on the MoAC’s payroll for the whole duration of the project. Finally, a Steering Committee made up of representatives of relevant government agencies including the National Planning Commission, MoAC, MoLD, MoF as well as of WFP and European Commission will be set up under the MoAC’s chairmanship. It will meet on a quarterly basis to review project implementation and provide strategic guidance on further developments.

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 cost of the project is estimated at EUR 4 million of which the EU contribution is 100%.

The project will have an operational duration of 48 months as of the signature of the Financing Agreement.

The budget breakdown (in EUR) of the project is presented below. The in-kind contribution expected from the Government is not included in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Breakdown</th>
<th>M€ EU</th>
<th>Contracting Authority</th>
<th>Paying Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Services</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Evaluation</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Joint Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Contribution Agreement with WFP</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This in-kind contribution will include namely the salaries of the MoAC's FSMTU, office space, etc as defined in the Financing Agreement. It will progressively increase every year on the basis of discussions with WFP. Under the ongoing EUFF project, a Memorandum of Understanding describing respective roles and responsibilities, including financial, has been signed by WFP and the MoAC covering a period until April 2010. A new MoU will be prepared under the proposed project with the same purpose. It will include the details of the in-kind contribution to be provided by the Government and/or MoAC.

Project Workplan
4.4. Performance monitoring

Project activities will be regularly monitored on the basis of key indicators established in the Logical Framework matrix. WFP will conduct regular field visits jointly with GoN officials, as appropriate, to monitor project implementation and to provide technical assistance. WFP and GoN will also conduct periodic spot-checks in the field to ensure the project is on track.

The EU Delegation will follow up on project implementation and progress including through regular monitoring visits. It will analyse and approve progress reports (both narrative and financial) and will participate in relevant meetings/committees. It will also be possible to arrange for monitoring reviews to be carried out by external consultants under the EU-funded Results-Oriented Monitoring Programme.

4.5. Evaluation and audit

**Evaluation:** Two independent mid-term (end of year 2) and final (end of year 4) evaluations will be contracted by the EU Delegation and funded through the project’s budget. While the results of the first one will inform the last two years of project implementation, the second one will account for the project’s achievements, challenges and lessons learned to inform future related interventions.

**Audit:** The possibility of an audit will be considered in the course of project implementation if need be. In such a case, it will be contracted by the EU and funded through STTA.
4.6. Communication and visibility

In accordance with the visibility provisions under the European Union-UN Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) and with the European Union-UN Joint Action Guidelines for European Commission-UN Actions in the Field (April 2008), the EU Delegation and WFP will work together to ensure appropriate visibility for the project as a whole, as well as for specific interventions and activities under it.

Strong emphasis will be placed on the visibility of EU funding both to the beneficiary population and to the wider international community in and beyond Nepal. A communication and visibility plan will be prepared during the inception phase, complying with the Communication and Visibility Manual for EU External Actions, in which joint visibility guidelines for EU-UN actions are incorporated. An update on visibility activities will be included in each project report.

Communications and visibility-related activities will include 1) banners bearing the EU logo put up at workshop/training venue; 2) EU logo printed prominently on information products, such as quarterly food security bulletins, monthly market reports, thematic studies and training materials; and 3) a glossy pamphlet describing the Food Security Monitoring and Analysis System that will include the EU logo and will describe EU support. 100 copies will be provided to the EU Delegation to Nepal.
Action Fiche for FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME
“SUPPORT MEASURES”

1. IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Number</th>
<th>Support measures (under Priorities 1, 2, and 3) CRIS DCI-FOOD/2011/022-936</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>€ 827,445.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid method/</td>
<td>Direct centralised management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management mode</td>
<td></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.) might be implemented in the framework of any of the objectives of the programme.

2.1. Method of implementation

In the case of centralised direct management, procedures will be followed as laid down in the Commission's “Practical guide to contract procedures for EU external actions”.

2.2. Procurement and grant award procedures

The relevant procurement and grant award procedures established in the "Practical guide to contract procedures for EU external actions" not exceeding € 200,000 each will apply.

3. Basic act and financing source


The budget line is 21 02 01 for food security.
