



European Commission

Terms of Reference for the Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP) - Mid-term Review (2007-2009)

Final Report

Project No. 2009/204265 - Version 1





HTSPE Limited
Thamesfield House
Boundary Way
Hemel Hempstead
Herts HP2 7SR
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0) 1442 202400
Fax: +44 (0) 1442 266438
Email: htspe@htspe.com
Web: www.htspe.com



This publication has been produced with the assistance of the European Union. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of HTSPE Limited and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.

(5009043)

Food Security Thematic Programme

MID TERM REVIEW (2007-2009)

Final Report

September 2009

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS	I
PREFACE	IV
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	V
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 EC STRATEGY AND INTERVENTION	1
1.2 PURPOSE OF THIS REVIEW	2
2. METHODOLOGY	3
3. ANALYSIS OF THE CURRENT STRATEGY AND MULTI ANNUAL INDICATIVE PROGRAMME	5
3.1 MAIN FINDINGS REGARDING STRATEGY	5
3.1.1 From Mandate to Strategic Priorities	5
3.1.2 From Strategic Priorities to Programme	5
3.1.3 From Programme to Food Security	7
3.1.3.1 FSTP Objectives and Food Security Needs at the Supra-National Level	7
3.1.3.2 Focus on the Poor and Vulnerable	7
3.1.3.3 Balance between the 'Pillars' of Food Security	8
3.1.4 Overarching Themes	9
3.1.4.1 Gender	9
3.1.4.2 Vulnerability	9
3.1.4.3 Climate Change	10
3.1.5 Stakeholder Consultation (during formulation and implementation)	10
3.1.6 Emerging Issues	11
3.2 MAIN FINDINGS REGARDING STRATEGY - BY STRATEGIC PRIORITY	13
3.2.1 Supporting the delivery of international public goods contributing to food security: research and technology	13
3.2.2 Linking information and decision making to improve food security response strategies:	14
3.2.3 Exploiting the potential of continental and regional approaches to improve food security	16
3.2.4 Linking Relief and Rehabilitation to Development (LRRD) in Exceptional Situations of Transition and in Fragile Situations	17
3.2.5 Promoting Innovation to Combat Food Insecurity	18
3.2.5.1 Promoting Innovation	18
3.2.5.2 Special Final Allocation for ALA and EU Neighbourhood Countries	18
3.2.6 Fostering advocacy and advancement of the food security agenda, harmonisation and alignment with development partners and donors:	20
4. ANALYSIS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION	21
4.1 MAIN FINDINGS REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION	21
4.1.1 Complementarity, Coherence and Continuity	21
4.1.2 Technology Development	23
4.1.3 Monitoring	24
4.1.4 Administration	26
4.2 MAIN FINDINGS REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION - BY STRATEGIC PRIORITY	27
4.2.1 Supporting the delivery of international public goods contributing to food security: research and technology	27
4.2.2 Linking information and decision making to improve food security response strategies	28
4.2.3 Exploiting the potential of continental and regional approaches to improve food security	30
4.2.4 Addressing Food Security in Exceptional Situations of Transition and in Fragile Situations	33
4.2.5 Promoting Innovation to Combat Food Insecurity	35
4.2.5.1 Promoting Innovation	35
4.2.5.2 Special Final Allocation for ALA and EU Neighbourhood Countries	36
4.2.6 Fostering advocacy and advancement of the food security agenda, harmonisation and alignment with development partners and donors:	37
5. STRATEGY - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PHASE II	39

5.1	STRATEGY OVERALL	39
5.1.1	From Mandate to Strategic Priorities	39
	5.1.1.1 Conclusions.....	39
	5.1.1.2 Recommendations.....	39
5.1.2	From Strategic Priorities to Programme	39
	5.1.2.1 Conclusions.....	39
	5.1.2.2 Recommendations.....	39
5.1.3	From Programme to Food Security	40
	5.1.3.1 Conclusions.....	40
	5.1.3.2 Recommendations.....	40
5.1.4	Overarching Themes	40
	5.1.4.1 Conclusions.....	40
	5.1.4.2 Recommendations.....	41
5.1.5	Stakeholder Consultation	41
	5.1.5.1 Conclusions.....	41
	5.1.5.2 Recommendations.....	41
5.1.6	Emerging Issues	42
	5.1.6.1 Conclusions.....	42
	5.1.6.2 Recommendations.....	42
5.2	STRATEGY - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PHASE II – BY THEME 42	
5.2.1	SP1: Supporting the Delivery of International Public Goods Contributing to Food Security	42
	5.2.1.1 Conclusions.....	42
	5.2.1.2 Recommendations.....	43
5.2.2	SP2: Linking information and decision making to improve food security response strategies	43
	5.2.2.1 Conclusions.....	43
	5.2.2.3 Recommendations.....	44
5.2.3	SP3: Exploiting the potential of continental and regional approaches to improve food security	44
	5.2.3.1 Conclusions.....	44
	5.2.3.2 Recommendations.....	44
5.2.4	SP4: Addressing Food Security in Exceptional Situations of Transition and in Fragile Situations	44
	5.2.4.1 Conclusions.....	44
	5.2.4.2 Recommendation.....	45
5.2.5	SP5: Promoting innovation to Combat Food Insecurity	45
	5.2.5.1 Conclusions.....	45
	5.2.5.2 Recommendations.....	45
5.2.6	SP6: Fostering advocacy and advancement of the food security agenda, harmonisation and alignment with development partners and donors	46
	5.2.6.1 Conclusions.....	46
	5.2.6.2 Recommendations.....	46
6.	IMPLEMENTATION - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PHASE II	47
6.1	OVERALL	47
6.1.1	Complementarity, Coherence and Continuity	47
	6.1.1.1 Conclusions.....	47
	6.1.1.2 Recommendations.....	47
6.1.2	Monitoring (ROM) and Evaluation	47
	6.1.2.1 Conclusions.....	47
	6.1.2.2 Recommendations.....	48
6.1.3	Project Size and Administrative Costs	48
	6.1.3.1 Conclusions.....	48
	6.1.3.2 Recommendations.....	48
6.2	IMPLEMENTATION - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PHASE II – BY THEME	48
6.2.1	SP1: Supporting the Delivery of International Public Goods Contributing to Food Security	48
	6.2.1.1 Conclusions.....	48

6.2.2.2	Recommendations.....	49
6.2.2	SP2: Linking information and decision making to improve food security response strategies	49
6.2.2.1	Conclusions.....	49
6.2.2.2	Recommendations.....	50
6.2.3	SP3: Exploiting the potential of continental and regional approaches to improve food security.....	50
6.2.3.1	Conclusions.....	50
6.2.3.2	Recommendations.....	51
6.2.4	SP4: Addressing Food Security in Exceptional Situations of Transition, and in Fragile Situations	51
6.2.4.1	Conclusions.....	51
6.2.4.2	Recommendations.....	51
6.2.5	SP5: Promoting Innovation to Combat Food Insecurity.....	52
6.2.5.1	Conclusions.....	52
6.2.5.2	Recommendation.....	52
6.2.6	SP6: Fostering advocacy and advancement of the food security agenda, harmonisation and alignment with development partners and donors	52
6.2.6.1	Conclusions.....	52
6.2.6.2	Recommendations.....	52

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Bangladesh: Evolution of Country Allocation, 2003 to 2013 (Geographic & Food Security Budget Lines).....	19
---	----

LIST OF ANNEXES

Annex 1 Mission Terms of Reference	54
Annex 2 Inception Report.....	62
Annex 3 List of Documents Consulted.....	64
Annex 4 List of People and Organisations Consulted (through questionnaire and directly) and Meeting Notes.....	69
Annex 5 Questionnaire and Summary of Questionnaire Responses	78
Annex 6 Programming Table	123
Annex 7 Reconstructed Logframes	125
Annex 8 LRRD Questionnaire.....	139
Annex 9 Additional Information FSTP and the other Millennium Goals	145
Annex 10 Additional Information on SP3	147
Annex 11 Implications of recent Strategic Policy on “World Food Crisis” and IFPRI Proposal	154

ABBREVIATIONS

AAA	EC Communication "Advancing African Agriculture" COM (2007)440
AAFEX	Association Afrique Agro Export
AAP	Annual Action Plan
AF	Action Fiche
AFAAS	African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services
AIDCO	EuropeAid Cooperation Office
ALA	Asia, Latin America
AMERT	AUC Monitoring and Evaluation Tool
ARD	Agricultural Research for Development
ASAL	Arid and semi arid Lands
ASARECA	Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern, Southern and Central Africa
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian States
AU (C)	African Union (Commission)
BS	Budget Support
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme
CARBAP	Centre Africaine de Recherches sur Bananieres et Plantains
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women
CCR-SAN	Regional FNS Consultative Committee
CEDEAO	Communauté économique des États d'Afrique de l'Ouest
CFA	Comprehensive Framework for Action (HLTF)
CFS	(World) Committee on Food Security (FAO)
CG(IAR)	Consultative Group (on International Agricultural Research)
CILSS	Comité interétatique de lutte contre la sécheresse au Sahel
CoC	Committee of the Council (FAO)
COM (2006) 21	Commission Communication - "Advancing the Food Security Agenda to achieve the MDGs"
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CORESAS	Conseil régional de sécurité alimentaire
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CSP	Country Strategy Paper
DAC (OECD)	Development Assistance Committee (of the OECD)
DCI	Financing Instrument for Development Cooperation
DEC	Delegation of the European Commission
DEV	Directorate General for Development
DfID	Department for International Development (UK)
DPRK	Democratic People's Republic of Korea
DRM	Disaster and Risk Management
ECART/NATURA	European Consortium for Agricultural Research in the Tropics and Network of European Agricultural Universities Related with Agricultural Development
EAC	East African Community
EC	European Commission
ECHO	European Commission Humanitarian Aid Office
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EDF	European Development Fund
EFARD	European Forum on Agricultural Research for Development
EIARD	European Initiative on International Agricultural Research for Development
ENPI	European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FARA	Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa
FEWS-NET	Famine Early Warning Systems Network
FIVIMS	Food Insecurity and Vulnerability Information and Mapping Systems
FF	Food Facility
FNS	Food and Nutrition Security

FP7	Seventh Framework Programme for Research
FP7-FAB	Framework Programme 7 - Food, Agriculture and Biotechnology (RTD)
FS	Food Security
FSBL	Food Security Budget Line
FSIA	Food Security Information for Action
FSI(S)	Food Security Information (System)
FSN	Food Security and Nutrition
FSTP	Food Security Thematic Programme
FSUP	Food Security of the Ultra Poor (Bangladesh)
GDPRD	Global Donor Platform for Rural Development
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIEWS	Global Information and Early Warning System
GHI	Global Hunger Index (IFPRI)
GPAFSN	Global Platform on Agriculture and Food Security and Nutrition
HLTF	High Level Task Force
IBAR	Interafrican Bureau of Animal Resources (AU)
ICIPE	International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology
IAASTD	International Assessment of Agriculture Science and Technology for Development
ICRAF	World Agroforestry Centre
IEE	Independent External Evaluation
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
IGO	Inter-governmental Organisation
IFPRI	The International Food Policy Research Institute
ILC	International Land Coalition
IMF	International Monetary Fund
INCAP	Institute of Nutrition of Central America and Panama
INTERFAIS	International Food Aid Information System
IPA	Immediate Plan of Action (for FAO Reform)
IPC	Integrated Phase Classification
IO	International Organisation
IP	Implementing Partner
IPG	International Public Goods
ISFS	Information Systems for Food Security
JRC	Joint Research Centre
LF(A)	Logical Framework (Analysis)
LGOPAD	The Chinese State Council Leading Group Office of Poverty Alleviation and Development
LRRD	Linking Relief Rehabilitation and Development
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MIP	Multi Annual Indicative Programme
MS	Member State(s)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NEPAD	New Economic Partnership for Africa's Development
NIP	National Indicative Programme
NRM	Natural Resource management
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PAEPARD	Platform for African-European Partnership on Agricultural Research
PD	Policy development
PRESANCA	Regional Programme for Food and Nutritional Security for Central America
PRESISAN	Regional Programme of Information Systems in Food Security and Nutrition in Central America
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
QSG	Quality Support Group
RIP	Regional Indicative Programme

ROM	Results Oriented Monitoring
ROPFA	Réseau des organisations paysannes et des producteurs agricoles d'Afrique de l'ouest
REC	Regional Economic Community
RELEX	Directorate General for External Relations
ROM	Results Orientated Monitoring
RSP	Regional Strategy Paper
RTD	EC Research and Technology Directorate
SAARC	South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
SBS	Sector Budget Support
SICA	Central American Integration System
SISAR	Système d'information sur la sécurité alimentaire régional
SP	Strategic Priority (also Component)
TS(P)	Thematic Strategy (Paper)
UEMOA	Union économique et monétaire ouest-africaine
UKZN	University of KwaZulu Natal, Pietermaritzburg
UN	United Nations
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UN-SG	Secretary-General (of the UN)
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
WB	World Bank
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organization

PREFACE

The EC has been a leading international donor in Food Security since the EC Food Security policy was established in 1996. Commission policy on the fight against hunger was amended in 2006 by a new regulation establishing a financing instrument for development cooperation.

From 1996 to 2006, the Food Security and Food Aid budget line (FSBL) formed the main instrument. Since 2007, food security interventions have been fragmented over a number of instruments. Country programmes aimed at eradicating chronic poverty and improving food security, which were previously financed by the FSBL, are financed through the geographical instruments, (DCI, ENPI and EDF), while the Humanitarian Instrument provides humanitarian food assistance in crisis and immediate post-crisis situations and delivers food aid where necessary and appropriate.

The Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP) addresses food security at global, continental and regional levels, and complements the geographical programmes where these instruments cannot fully operate, while ensuring the continuity of assistance in the transition from relief to development. In 2008 a Food Facility was established as a rapid response to soaring food prices in developing countries with an amount of EUR 1 billion.

The FSTP is defined by a Thematic Strategy Paper and Multi Annual Indicative Programme 2007-2010; these set the overall policy orientations and objectives and provide guidelines for implementation. The overall financial allocation for the period 2007-2010 is €925m. The FSTP objective is pursued through the six Strategic Priorities.

At the time of this review the 2007, 2008 and 2009 Annual Action Plans together with their associated Action Fiches have been approved. The 2010 activities are under formulation. The 2007 activities are mostly complete, and the 2008 programme is now being implemented. Contracts for the 2009 activities are being prepared following approval of the programme in April this year.

The controlling EC regulation foresees a review of the Strategy at mid-term. As the Multi Annual Indicative Programme comes to an end on 31st December 2010, there is a need to establish a new Thematic Strategy Paper (TSP) for the implementation of the Thematic Programme covering the period 2011-2013. The current Review is intended to provide an assessment of how the 2007-2010 Strategy has been implemented so far, and to provide guidance for the preparation of the new strategy paper.

The main objectives of the review are:

1. an assessment of the relevance of the objectives of the strategy 2007-2010, and the elaboration of detailed recommendations on the revision/elaboration of the thematic strategy for the period 2011-2013
2. an overall independent assessment of the implementation and prospects for impacts of the activities covered by the MIP 2007-2010 through an analysis of the Annual Action Programmes so far available
3. detailed recommendations for the preparation of the MIP (2011-2013)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

A Food Security instrument to complement geographical programmes

The Food Security Thematic Programme addresses food security at global, continental and regional levels, and complements the geographical programmes where these instruments cannot fully operate, while ensuring the continuity of assistance in the transition from relief to development. The FSTP is defined by a Thematic Strategy Paper and Multi Annual Indicative Programme 2007-2010; these set the overall policy orientations and objectives and provide guidelines for implementation along with budget envelopes by component over the same period of the strategy. The overall financial allocation for the period 2007-2010 is €925m.

Six Strategic Priorities make up the FSTP

1. Supporting the delivery of international public goods contributing to food security: research and technology:
2. Linking information and decision making to improve food security response strategies.
3. Exploiting the potential of continental and regional approaches to improve food security
4. Addressing food security in exceptional situations of transition, and in fragile and failed states:
5. Promoting innovation to combat food insecurity:
6. Fostering advocacy and advancement of the food security agenda, harmonisation and alignment with development partners and donors:

These components are a mixed group of geographical, thematic and methodological components and have been described as a wish-list. However they cover the main aspects of Food Security and the programme has shown itself sufficiently flexible to adapt itself to changing needs and priorities.

An early Mid-Term Review

The current mid-term review looks at the strategy and implementation of Phase I (2007-2010) and makes recommendations for Phase II (2011-2013). It is based on a review of all available EC documentation, discussions with EC staff and implementing partners and responses to questionnaires sent to Brussels and Delegation-based EC staff and implementing partners. No field visits were incorporated into the review methodology except to visit the Rome-based UN organisations. It was accepted as a limitation of the review that for many of the activities the current review is being held rather early in the programme and it is difficult to draw conclusions about the impact of the programme. However the timing is set by the need to start the preparation of Phase II.

On Strategy

Some changes recommended for Phase II

There are widespread concerns within the EC that the FSTP does not address all pillars of food security – in particular that it concentrates on food availability at the expense of food access and nutritional issues. While increased food availability can lead to improved food access (i.e. for subsistence farmers and where the food market is functioning efficiently) concerns about the lack of balance in FSTP are justified. There are also reasons for concern about Strategic Priorities 4 and 5. In the case of SP4, the method of choosing countries is insufficiently objective, while the exclusive focus on LRRD does not seem justified in all cases. In the case of SP5, the ALA countries supported are being phased out of FSTP, despite the fact that in some of them the FS situation is in the ‘alarming’ category of the Global Hunger Index. It is therefore recommended that all of these concerns should be addressed together by: (a) merging SP4 and SP 5 and combining their budgets; (b) renaming this new SP as ‘Improving Food Access and Nutrition for the Poor and Vulnerable in Fragile Situations’; (c) improving food access through social protection programmes; (d) addressing nutritional concerns by forming new partnerships with organisations engaged in micronutrient distribution campaigns; (e) adopting a more objective means of identifying countries for inclusion under this new SP, using indices of food insecurity, vulnerability to disaster, political instability and gender bias.

Overarching Themes - a mixed picture in the activities so far.

While the TS recognises that, despite the fact that women play multiple roles in securing household-level food access, and that they continue to be most vulnerable to food insecurity. This reality is not adequately addressed in the FSTP, particularly in AAP 2007. Compared to gender, there is much greater awareness of vulnerability as an overarching theme. Climate change threatens greatly to increase vulnerability, particularly for the poorest people, who tend to live in the most vulnerable areas. As in the case of gender, coverage of this topic has increased since the 2007 AAP, but it is still not adequately taken into account. OVIs on gender inclusion, vulnerability and (where appropriate) climate change should be incorporated in project log frames.

Stakeholder Consultation is difficult but necessary and rewarding if done well

The best example of stakeholder consultation was the joint workshop on SP1 with RTD. This produced positive results and it is widely believed that this should be replicated in SP5 and elsewhere in the programme. Stakeholder consultation on Phase II programmes should work in tandem with workshops to be organised under the Food Facility.

Emerging Issues – food prices and global recession – is there a role for FSTP?

Three issues are particularly crucial for achievement of the FSTP's central objective: food price volatility, the current deep global recession and climate change. Given new threats to food security of the poorest and most vulnerable, issues of food access and nutrition must move up the FSTP agenda, particularly in the shape of a sharper focus on social protection. Climate change should be treated as an overarching theme, and proposals for funding under FSTP should include an assessment of the threat in the locality in which the proposed intervention will occur. Activities presently covered under the FF should be eligible for inclusion under FSTP, particularly those that improve food access and nutritional adequacy.

On Implementation

Complementarity, Coherence and Continuity can be very difficult across a wide range of programmes, donors and implementing organisations.

Other than for SP4, where complementarity is good, there is fairly widespread dissatisfaction with the measures that have been taken to achieve the 3Cs. It is difficult for a regional programme like FSTP to co-ordinate with national policies when national strategies differ, sometimes quite radically. The current approach of the EC in using different procedures and approaches in parallel has been caused by the fact that CSPs have not engaged in food security the way they had been expected to do after the discontinuation of the previous food security budget line. This has resulted in unrealistic expectations on both humanitarian food assistance and on the FSTP.

Results Oriented Monitoring is in place but it is too early to tell how effective it will be in the FSTP

EC ROM is a well developed and evolving system regarded adequate to cover the FSTP also. No projects have yet been through the ROM process so it is too early to say how the assessment will be. The quality and use of logframes in the FSTP programme has progressively improved between 2007 and to date. In addition, implementing partners are applying their more or less well developed M&E systems. However, it also can be said that FSTP did not exploit its in-built potential for a more pronounced monitoring by using the indicators available in the design documents.

Minimum project size is being increased because of the difficulty of handling many projects – this creates unwelcome distortions in the programme.

AIDCO's resources and those of the individual delegations are stretched by large numbers of projects. This has led to an increase individual project size so as to reduce the administrative burden. There are negative consequences to this in terms of partnerships and it would be better if the AIDCO and the delegations were sufficiently well resourced to deal with a full range of projects.

On the Strategic Priorities

SP1 EC Support for the delivery of international public goods is effective but slow at delivering food security.

The mandate of supporting the delivery of IPGs has been important to the EC for many years. IPGs are shown to have a substantial long term benefit on food security even if impact is slow to accrue and difficult to measure. The policy of widening the support for ARD from the CGIAR to a more diverse research base and particularly encouraging south- south partnership is seen as very positive.

SP2 Linking information and decision making to improve food security response strategies - modest successes so far due to under funding but improved prospects in sight given the new emphasis on policy development and global learning

The core global project with FAO and its satellite continental/ regional projects have been under funded; up scaling is needed to assist more countries with food insecurity indicators. There was good progress regarding the IPC (co-funded by ECHO), what is needed now is more harmonization and co-ordination of the remaining FS information systems and tools and translating this into concrete actions and strategies at sub-regional and country levels.

SP3 Exploiting the potential of continental and regional approaches to improve food security – a good idea but is proving difficult to implement

SP3 is a core component of the FSTP where regional and continental approaches should have a comparative advantage over national approaches, however projects have not been identified on the basis of the pillars of FS or of the logical framework inherent in the MIP, but appear to be assembled in many cases according to the scarce availability of IPs with sufficient capacity at continental/ regional levels.

SP4 Addressing food security in exceptional situations of transition, and in fragile and failed states

At €243 million over the period 2007 to 2010, the LRRD component is the largest in the FSTP. It clearly plays a very valuable role but, despite recent progress in co-ordinating FSTP and ECHO activities, difficulties remain with respect to linking the short-term work of ECHO with the longer programming cycle of the FSTP.

SP5 Promoting innovation to combat food insecurity is a mixture of two very different activities

Innovation is a relevant method for producing positive results but work on this should have been launched much earlier in Phase I .The approach that was actually adopted makes it likely that the number of cutting-edge technologies developed will be fewer than would have been the case if full consultation had occurred at the beginning of the process.

Where continued support under FSTP Phase II to ALA countries can be justified in terms of their needs, they should be eligible for support under the new strategic priority that combines and refocuses the present SP4 and SP5.

SP6 Fostering advocacy and advancement of the food security agenda, harmonisation and alignment with development partners and donors

This programme is tiny by comparison with the others but can fulfil a useful function in providing finance for conferences and publications. It can also be used to give the EC a wider voice in global debates. Very little activity has yet been carried out under this heading.

SYNTHÈSE

Un instrument de la sécurité alimentaire afin de compléter des programmes géographiques

Le FSTP (programme thématique de sécurité alimentaire) s'adresse à la sécurité alimentaire au niveau global, continental et régional et complète les programmes géographiques où ces instruments

ne peuvent pas opérer en totalité, pendant qu'ils assurent la continuité de l'assistance dans la transition entre aide et développement. Le FSTP est défini par un document stratégique thématique et un programme indicatif pluriannuel 2007-2010 ; ces derniers fixent les orientations et les objectifs politiques généraux et constituent des directives pour la réalisation en plus des enveloppes budgétaires en composante pendant la même période de la stratégie. L'allocation financière générale pour la période 2007-2010 est de €925m.

Six priorités stratégiques compensent le FSTP

1. Maintenir la livraison de biens publics internationaux qui contribuent à la sécurité alimentaire : recherche et technologie
2. Relier les informations et les prises de décision afin d'améliorer les stratégies de réponse de la sécurité alimentaire
3. Exploiter le potentiel des approches continentales et régionales afin d'améliorer la sécurité alimentaire
4. Initiation de sécurité alimentaire dans des situations exceptionnelles de transition, et auprès d'États fragiles ou en déliquescence
5. Promouvoir l'innovation dans le combat contre l'insécurité alimentaire
6. Encourager la représentation et les progrès sur l'agenda de sécurité alimentaire, harmonisation et alignement avec les partenaires du développement et les donateurs :

Ces constituants sont un groupe mixte d'éléments géographiques, thématiques et méthodologiques et ont été décrits dans une liste de souhaits. Toutefois, ils couvrent les aspects principaux de la sécurité alimentaire et le programme s'est montré suffisamment flexible afin de pouvoir s'adapter à tous les besoins et priorités changeants.

Une évaluation à mi-parcours avancée

L'évaluation à mi-parcours courante analyse la stratégie et l'implémentation de la phase I (2007-2010) et fait des recommandations pour la phase II (2011-2013). Elle est basée sur l'examen de toute la documentation de la CE (Commission Européenne), les entretiens avec le personnel de la CE et les partenaires d'implémentation et les réponses aux questionnaires envoyés à Bruxelles, au personnel des délégations de la CE et aux partenaires d'implémentation. Aucune visite de site n'a été incorporée dans la méthodologie d'évaluation excepté la visite des organisations de l'UE basées à Rome. Il a été accepté en tant que restriction de l'évaluation que pour beaucoup d'activités l'évaluation est tenue assez tôt dans le programme et il est difficile d'aboutir à des conclusions concernant l'impact du programme. Toutefois, le timing est posé par le besoin de commencer avec les préparatifs de la phase II.

Stratégie – quelques changements recommandés pour la phase II

Il y a des inquiétudes répandues au sein de la CE que le FSTP ne s'adresse pas à tous les piliers de la sécurité alimentaire – en particulier, qu'il se concentre sur la disponibilité alimentaire aux dépens de l'accès à l'alimentation et des questions nutritionnelles. Pendant qu'une disponibilité accrue peut mener à un meilleur accès (càd. pour les agriculteurs de subsistance et là où le marché alimentaire fonctionne de façon efficace), les inquiétudes concernant un manque d'équilibre du FSTP sont justifiées. Il y a également des inquiétudes concernant les SP (priorités stratégiques=PS) 4 et 5. Dans le cas de la PS4, la méthode de choix des pays n'est qu'insuffisamment objective, alors que la concentration exclusive sur les LRRD (liens entre l'aide d'urgence, la réhabilitation et le développement) ne semble pas justifiée dans tous les cas. Dans le cas de PS5, les pays ALA soutenus par le FSTP sont déphasés en dehors du FSTP, malgré le fait que dans quelques-uns entre eux la situation FS est dans la catégorie « alarmante » de l'index Global de la Faim. Pour cette raison, il est recommandé que toutes ces inquiétudes devraient être adressées ensemble par : (a) une fusion entre PS4 et PS5 et une combinaison de leurs budgets ; (b) renommer cette PS en « Amélioration de l'accès alimentaire et la nutrition pour les pauvres et vulnérables en situation périlleuse » ; (c) améliorer l'accès alimentaire à travers des programmes de protection sociaux ; (d) s'adresser aux entreprises de nutrition en formant de nouveaux partenariats avec des organisations engagées dans des campagnes de distribution micro nutritive ; (e) adopter une façon plus objective

pour le choix des pays d'inclusion sous cette nouvelle PS, utilisant des indicateurs d'insécurité alimentaire, de vulnérabilité par rapport à des catastrophes, instabilité politique et des inégalités entre les femmes et les hommes.

Sujets globaux – un aperçu mixte des activités jusqu'ici

Alors que TS reconnaît que, malgré le fait que les femmes jouent plusieurs rôles afin d'assurer l'accès alimentaire du ménage et qu'elles continuent d'être les plus vulnérables par rapport à l'insécurité alimentaire. Cette réalité n'est pas suffisamment adressée dans le FSTP, en particulier dans AAP 2007. Comparé au sexe, il y a une bien plus grande conscience de vulnérabilité en tant que sujet principal. Les changements climatiques menacent d'augmenter la vulnérabilité de façon significative, surtout pour les plus pauvres, qui ont tendance à vivre dans les régions les plus vulnérables. Comme dans le cas du sexe, la couverture de ce sujet s'est améliorée depuis AAP 2007, mais elle n'est de loin pas encore suffisamment prise en compte. OVI sur l'inclusion du sexe, la vulnérabilité et (là où appropriée) les changements climatiques devraient être incorporés dans les journaux de bord dans le cadre de projets.

La consultation des parties intéressées est difficile mais nécessaire et gratifiante si bien menée

Le meilleur exemple de la consultation de parties prenantes était l'atelier de travail commun sur PS1 avec RTD (direction générale de la recherche). Ceci a produit des résultats positifs et il est largement pensé que ceci devrait se reproduire en PS5 et partout dans le programme. La consultation de parties prenantes dans les programmes de la phase II devrait opérer en tandem avec des ateliers de travail qui doivent être organisés sous la facilité alimentaire.

Questions naissantes – les prix alimentaires et la récession globale – y a-t-il un rôle pour le FSTP ?

Les controverses sont particulièrement cruciales pour l'achèvement de l'objectif principal de FSTP : la volatilité du prix alimentaire, la profonde récession globale et le changement climatique. Étant donné les menaces concernant la sécurité alimentaire des plus pauvres et vulnérables, les questions d'accès alimentaire et nutritif doivent monter dans l'agenda de FSTP, surtout sous la forme d'un intérêt accru pour la protection sociale. Le changement climatique doit être traité en tant que sujet global et les propositions pour la constitution de réserves sous FSTP doivent comprendre une évaluation de la menace dans la localité dans laquelle l'intervention proposée aura lieu. Les activités présentement couvertes par FF doivent être éligibles pour inclusion sous FSTP, en particulier celles qui améliorent l'accès alimentaire et le bien-fondé nutritionnel.

Concernant l'implémentation

Complémentarité, cohérence et continuité peuvent être difficiles parmi une vaste gamme de programmes, de donateurs et d'organisations d'implémentation

Autrement que pour PS4, où la complémentarité est bonne, il y a une insatisfaction répandue avec les mesures qui ont été prises afin d'atteindre les 3Cs. Il est difficile, pour un programme régional comme FSTP de coordonner avec des politiques nationales lorsque les stratégies nationales divergent, parfois de façon radicale. L'approche courante de la CE en utilisant différentes procédures et approches parallèlement a été causée par le fait que les CSP ne se sont pas engagés en sécurité alimentaire comme il avait été attendu que ça se fasse après l'abandon de la ligne budgétaire de la sécurité alimentaire précédente. Ceci a résulté dans des attentes irréalistes de la part de la FSTP en même temps que de l'assistance alimentaire humanitaire.

Une surveillance orientée vers les résultats est en place, mais il est trop tôt pour dire combien ce sera efficace pour le FSTP

EC ROM est un système bien développé et évolutif considéré adéquat pour également couvrir le FSTP. Aucun projet n'est encore passé par le processus ROM donc il est encore trop tôt pour dire comment sera l'évaluation. La qualité et l'utilisation de cadres logiques dans le programme FSTP s'est continuellement améliorée entre 2007 et aujourd'hui. En plus, les partenaires d'implémentation sont en train d'appliquer leurs systèmes M&E plus ou moins bien développés. Toutefois, il peut aussi être dit que FSTP n'a pas exploité son potentiel intégré pour une surveillance plus prononcée en utilisant les indicateurs disponibles dans les documents de design.

La taille minimum des projets a été augmentée à cause des difficultés de manager beaucoup de projets – cela crée des distorsions dans le programme

Les ressources d'AIDCO et celles des délégations individuelles sont étirées par un large nombre de projets. Ceci a mené à une taille de projet augmentée afin de réduire les contraintes administratives. Il y a des conséquences négatives à cela en termes de partenariats et il serait mieux si AIDCO et les délégations disposaient de suffisamment de moyens afin de pouvoir s'occuper d'une gamme complète de projets.

Concernant les priorités stratégiques

PS1 Le soutien de la CE pour la livraison de biens publics internationaux est efficace mais lent à la livraison de sécurité alimentaire

Le mandat pour le soutien la livraison de IPG a été important pour la CE pendant de nombreuses années. Les IPG sont connus pour avoir des profits substantiels à long terme en ce qui concerne la sécurité alimentaire même si l'impact est lent à augmenter et difficile à mesurer. La politique d'élargissement de soutien pour ARD de CIGAR pour une base de recherche plus diversifiée et un partenariat nord-sud particulièrement encourageant sont perçus comme très positifs.

PS2 Lier l'information et la prise de décision afin d'améliorer les stratégies de réponse pour la sécurité alimentaire – succès modestes jusqu'ici mais projets améliorés en vue étant donnée la nouvelle insistance en ce qui concerne le développement de politiques et l'apprentissage global

Le projet central global avec FAO et ses projets satellites régionaux/continentaux ont été sous-financés, une augmentation est nécessaire afin d'assister plus de pays avec des indicateurs de sécurité alimentaire. Il y avait de bons progrès en ce qui concerne les IPC (co-fondés par ECHO), ce qui est nécessaire maintenant est plus d'harmonisation et de coordination des systèmes d'information FS et les outils restants et traduire cela en des actions et stratégies concrètes au niveau subrégional et national.

PS3 Exploiter le potentiel d'approches régionales et continentales afin d'améliorer la sécurité alimentaire – une bonne idée mais difficile à implémenter

PS3 est une composante principale de FSTP où les approches régionales et continentales devraient avoir un avantage comparatif par rapport aux approches nationales, toutefois les projets n'ont pas été identifiés sur la base des piliers de FS ou sur les cadres logiques inhérents au MIP, mais semblent être assemblés en plusieurs cas selon la faible disponibilité des IP avec une capacité suffisante à l'échelle continentale/régionale.

PS4 Adresser la sécurité alimentaire dans des situations de transition, et dans des États en faillite et fragiles

A €243 millions pendant la période de 2007 à 2010, le constituant LRRD est le plus important dans le FSTP. Il joue clairement un rôle très précieux mais, malgré des progrès récents dans la coordination

des activités FSTP et ECHO, des difficultés restent en ce qui concerne le lien entre le travail à court terme de ECHO et le cycle de programmation plus long FSTP.

PS5 Promouvoir l'innovation dans le combat contre l'insécurité alimentaire est un mélange de deux actions très différentes

L'innovation est une méthode pertinente pour produire des résultats positifs mais le travail sur ce sujet aurait dû être commencé bien plus tôt pendant la phase I. L'approche qui a actuellement été adoptée favorise le fait que le nombre de technologies à la pointe de la technologie sera moindre que dans le cas où une consultation complète aurait eu lieu au début du processus.

Là où un soutien continu sous FSTP phase II aux pays ALA peut être justifié en termes de leurs besoins, ils devraient être éligibles pour soutien sous la nouvelle priorité stratégique qui combine et recentralise les PS4 et PS5 actuelles.

PS6 Encourager la représentation et les progrès sur l'agenda de sécurité alimentaire, harmonisation et alignement avec les partenaires du développement et les donateurs

Ce programme est petit par rapport aux autres mais peut remplir une fonction utile en amenant des ressources financières pour des conférences et des publications. Il peut aussi être utilisé afin de donner une voix plus large à la CE dans des débats globaux. Très peu d'activité a eu lieu à ce sujet.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 EC STRATEGY AND INTERVENTION

The EC is a leading international donor in Food Security. The EC Food Security policy was established in 1996 under the previous Council Regulation (EC) No 1292/96 which continues to guide the Commission's action in the fight against hunger on the basis of the new Regulation (EC) No 1905/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 establishing a financing instrument for development cooperation (OJ L 378, 27.12.2006, p. 41).

From 1996 to 2006, the Food Security and Food Aid budget line (FSBL) formed the main instrument, which provided € 500m/year (on average – although decreasing over the years) for country programmes (direct aid to Governments), as well as global initiatives, civil society programmes and food aid (indirect aid through International Organizations, NGOs, etc). This comprehensive instrument ceased to exist following the reform of EC external assistance under the Financial Perspectives 2007-2013.

Since 2007, food security interventions have been fragmented over a number of instruments. Country programmes aimed at eradicating chronic poverty and improving food security, which were previously financed by the FSBL, are financed through the geographical instruments, (DCI, ENPI and EDF), while the Humanitarian Instrument provides humanitarian food assistance in crisis and immediate post-crisis situations and delivers food aid where necessary and appropriate. In addition to the geographical instruments the European Parliament and the Council adopted a Regulation in 2008 establishing a Food Facility for rapid response to soaring food prices in developing countries¹ with an amount of € 1 billion in response to the high food prices in 2008.

The Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP), which was created under the Financing Instrument for Development Cooperation (DCI)², addresses food security at global, continental and regional levels, and complements the geographical programmes where these instruments cannot fully operate, while ensuring the continuity of assistance in the transition from relief to development. Thematic Programmes were designed to be subsidiary to, add value to and be coherent with geographic programmes and to provide funding in case no geographical programme exists Commission Communication - "Advancing the Food Security Agenda to achieve the MDGs" (COM (2006) 21) laid the foundations for the FSTP strategy.

The global, continental and regional programmes funded by the FSTP need to be adequately coordinated with national programmes and complement Regional Indicative Programmes whenever the regional dimension is part of a wider geographical context (multi-regional, continental, global levels) and whenever the thematic programme has a comparative advantage over the geographical instrument.

The FSTP is defined by a Thematic Strategy Paper and Multi Annual Indicative Programme 2007-2010 (MIP)³, these set the overall policy orientations and objectives and provide guidelines for implementation along with budget envelopes by component over the same period of the strategy. The overall objective is to advance the food security agenda and contribute to achieving the first MDG on hunger and the specific objective is to improve the impact of the EC Food Security policy, particularly on the most vulnerable, through a consistent set of priorities and actions which complement national programmes and improve their coherence. The overall financial allocation for the period 2007-2010 is €925m. Each year the MIP is further detailed in Annual Action Programmes (AAPs) which define the annual budget allocation in concrete actions. Individual actions are described in Action Fiches (AFs).

The FSTP objective is to be pursued through the following Strategic Priorities (SPs):

¹ Regulation (EC) No 1337/2008 of 16 December 2008.

² DCI: [REGULATION \(EC\) No 1905/2006](#) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 establishing a financing instrument for development cooperation includes in Article 15 a Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP).

³ Commission Decision C/2007/1924 of 4 May 2007

1. Supporting the delivery of international public goods contributing to food security: research and technology: supporting pro-poor and demand-driven agricultural research and technology and improve its outreach and dissemination.
2. Linking information and decision making to improve food security response strategies: strengthening national and regional stakeholders' capacities to produce and analyze food security information, with a view to designing effective response strategies to prevent food crises and reduce chronic food insecurity.
3. Exploiting the potential of continental and regional approaches to improve food security: supporting regional initiatives in Asia and Latin America and continental/regional priorities set in a new AU-EU partnership with Africa (disaster and risk reduction, agricultural policy development and harmonisation, sustainable management of natural resources).
4. Addressing food security in exceptional situations of transition, and in fragile and failed states: linking relief, rehabilitation and development. It will support the most vulnerable in protecting and recovering livelihood assets, while improving self-reliance and crisis prevention.
5. Promoting innovation to combat food insecurity: fostering innovative practices and approaches to food security and their South-South up scaling/dissemination. A special, final allocation is earmarked for countries in Asia, Latin America and Neighbourhood countries phasing out food security assistance.
6. Fostering advocacy and advancement of the food security agenda, harmonisation and alignment with development partners and donors: promoting food security at international level and aid effectiveness, in line with the OECD Paris Declaration.

At the time of this review the 2007, 2008 and 2009 AAPs together with their associated AFs have been approved. The 2010 AAP and AFs are under formulation.

The 2007 activities are mostly complete, and the 2008 programme is now being implemented. Contracts for the 2009 activities are being prepared following approval of the programme in April this year. Annex 6 shows the financial commitment to the first phase of the FSTP.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THIS REVIEW

Art. 19.2 of the DCI regulation, foresees a review of the Strategy at mid-term. As the MIP comes to an end on 31st December 2010, there is a need to establish a new Thematic Strategy Paper (TSP) for the implementation of the Thematic Programme covering the period 2011-2013. The current Review is intended to provide an assessment of how the 2007-2010 Strategy has been implemented so far, and to provide guidance for the preparation of the new strategy paper.

The main objectives of the review are:

- an assessment of the relevance of the objectives of the strategy 2007-2010, and the elaboration of detailed recommendations on the revision/elaboration of the thematic strategy for the period 2011-2013
- an overall independent assessment of the implementation and prospects for impacts of the activities covered by the MIP 2007-2010 through an analysis of the Annual Action Programmes so far available
- detailed recommendations for the preparation of the MIP (2011-2013)

The review will provide an opportunity to take into consideration the evolution in needs and priorities of all actors involved.

2. METHODOLOGY

As requested in the Terms of Reference (Annex 1) and as described in the Inception Report (chapter 2, Annex 2), the Review methodology follows two main areas:

- Review of the Thematic Strategy, and
- Review of the implementation of the MIP.

At both levels, a mix of instruments has been applied, including

- documentation analysis from the EC, implementing partners (IPs) and other major international partners, donors and stakeholders (including FAO, UN, IFAD, WFP, WB)
- personal and telephonic interviews with relevant stakeholders such as EC staff (at headquarters level from the services concerned, RELEX, DEV, AIDCO, ECHO and at Delegation level), implementing partners (including FAO, CFS/ MS, IFAD, UN-HLTF, intergovernmental and non-governmental bodies and organizations)
- review questions carefully elaborated on the basis of an initial list of questions proposed in the ToR , and revised and complemented by specific questions set out in a logical sequence capturing different dimensions (see Annex 5)
- questionnaires at the levels of (a) EC services at headquarters, (b) EC Delegations in selected countries, and (c) designated implementing partners (IPs) of the FSTP.

Complete lists of documents and people consulted are given in annexes 3 and 4 respectively.

The questionnaire was designed so that most questions are “closed”, i.e. one is asked to tick off only one answer, unless otherwise specified. Respondents are also encouraged to substantiate their answers in the space provided.

A limitation of the questionnaires was that questions were not specific to individual FSTP components and sub-components as this would make the questionnaire too long. To mitigate this, respondents were able to provide examples from projects in the comments boxes.

In line with EC and OECD/DAC evaluation guidelines on quality, respondents were offered confidentiality for their responses. For this reason individual questionnaire responses are not appended to this report.

The questionnaires were completed electronically and returned directly to the evaluators. A total of 30 Questionnaire replies were received and analysed by the Review Team; 13 from EC HQ, 8 from Delegations and 9 from IPs.

The qualitative and quantitative elements of the survey are summarised in appendix 7.5.

All responses were collated with the team’s findings from document analysis and personal discussions and are presented in the analysis sections of this review – chapters 3 and 4. The conclusions derive from the analysis and recommendations are based on the conclusions.

Telephone interviewees were selected from key organisations and based on the need to follow up interesting and important information and opinions expressed in the completed surveys.

Previous evaluations, such as the 2004 in depth Thematic Evaluation of Food Aid Policy and Food Aid Management and Special Operations in Support of Food Security commissioned by the EC, have been taken into account⁴. It is to be noted, however that this present mid-term Review was agreed not to be at the level of a formal evaluation according to the EC evaluation methodology given its limited duration and resources available (no country studies and a team of only three consultants with limited time⁵). One main reason for this difference was the fact that few of the activities of the MIP have been

⁴ As well as others (such as Evaluation of CGIAR, evaluation of EC/FAO Food Security Information for Action Programme, 2005-2008) as relevant, and which are referred to in the substantive chapters dealing with the respective work areas (SPs 1 - 6).

⁵ The 2004 EC Thematic Evaluation of the Food Aid and Food Security Operations lasted about one year and comprised a team of 5 international and 10 national consultants from beneficiary countries and included field studies in 10 countries.

completed yet so evaluation of implementation is difficult. However, to the extent possible, the general quality standards and evaluation criteria defined⁶ are applied.

In addition, logical frameworks were used as an analytical tool of the review. For the overall FSTP Strategy and the MIP and its six strategic priorities (SPs), the major elements of the logical frameworks have been reconstructed (see Annex 7). Use was also made of logical frameworks as contained in individual action fiches of the AAPs 2007-2009.

Regarding the Strategy level, emphasis is placed mostly upon the standard evaluation criterion of relevance plus complementarity, coherence and continuity as well as on an analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of the current approach.

Regarding the Implementation level, as relevant, the five key evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability and of complementarity, coherence and continuity are referred to throughout the analysis.

On the basis of findings and conclusions derived from the instruments described above, detailed recommendations are made in respect to a future TS and MIP for the period 2011-13 as requested by the TOR for the Review.

The interrelationships between findings and conclusions drawn from the implementation of the six strategic priorities of the MIP 2007-10 and its three AAPs (2007, 2008 and 2009) and the relevance and consistency and complementarity of the overall FSTP Strategy framework, are presented in a systematic overview. On this basis, the detailed recommendations from the current Strategy and its implementation are derived.

⁶ See DG Relex/ Dev/ Aidco/ Joint Evaluation Unit, Evaluation Methods for the European Union's External Assistance, Methodological Bases for Evaluation, 2006; see also: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/methodology/index_en.htm

3. ANALYSIS OF THE CURRENT STRATEGY AND MULTI ANNUAL INDICATIVE PROGRAMME

3.1 MAIN FINDINGS REGARDING STRATEGY

3.1.1 From Mandate to Strategic Priorities

The mandate of the FSTP is defined by the DCI. The objective is “to improve food security in favour of the poorest and most vulnerable people and contribute to achieving the MDG on poverty and hunger, through a set of actions which ensure overall coherence, complementarity and continuity of Community interventions, including in the area of the transition from relief to development.” This is the core mandate of the FSTP. The regulation outlined five areas of activity.

During the development of the Thematic Strategy these areas evolved into the six strategic priorities - “Linking Information and decision-making” was originally a sub-component of the continental and regional programme). Apart from this minor change it is clear that the Strategic Priorities follow closely the mandate and areas of activities outlined in the DCI. A broader question is whether the areas of activities in the mandate fit with the overall objective: - “to advance the food security agenda and contribute to achieving the first MDG on hunger”, or the specific objective: - “to improve the impact of the EC Food Security policy, particularly on the most vulnerable, through a consistent set of priorities and actions which complement national programmes and improve their coherence”.

The strategic priorities cover a broad range of activities which do cover the above objectives. They also allow for a considerable degree of flexibility which allows for the programme to adapt to changing circumstances. There were questions raised about the linkage between the development of international public goods under SP1 and the “most vulnerable”. While it is difficult to achieve impact in the short-term from the development of IPGs it is clear from the review of the EC contribution to the CGIAR (2002-2005) that there are long term-benefits from research and that it is an efficient way of improving food security in the long-term. One respondent noted that SP1 only addresses the public goods related to research and technology while other important public goods such as water, trade, regional markets, energy and disease controls are not included – although these are also important for food security. This is a relevant observation but these additional areas could be covered under the other SPs if programmes were identified that contributed to the overall objective of the FSTP.

3.1.2 From Strategic Priorities to Programme

The translation of the six Strategic Priorities (SPs) into programmes is made through the established thematic programming cycle of the EC⁷ with RELEX and DEV taking the lead. The main thematic priorities were set by the relevant departments together with internal and external consultations including inter-service consultation with Quality Support Group and with member states. Planned activities were also aligned with CSPs/ and PRSPs including consultations with geographical departments and relevant Commission delegations. It should be noted that (despite the DCI mandate that thematic programmes should only be complementary to geographical instruments), “thematic interventions need to be consistent with the country analysis and respond or relate to the country strategies”⁸. Also, the main objectives of the strategy, grouped by sub-theme and country where applicable, should show the links with the main objectives, activities, and expected results and impacts (normally this is through a logical framework) and should be consistent with the EC policy priorities and CSPs/RSPs.

Against the background of this legal and procedural basis, a Multi-annual Indicative Programme (MIP) consisting of three Annual Action Programmes (AAPs) have been elaborated so far, one each for 2007, 2008 and 2009, and the AAP 2010 is under preparation. Each of the AAPs includes a summary of the Action Programme which includes the identified actions (also called “projects”) under each of the strategic priorities. Each AAP consists also of a set of Action Fiches (AFs) grouped under the respective strategic priority.

⁷ see External Actions through Thematic Programmes under the Future Financial Perspectives 2007-2013, COM/2005/324 final, Annex Process

⁸ COM/2005/324 final, p.11

Of major importance is the question to what extent the activities are relevant to the needs and problems identified in specific regions and consistent with national, regional and global strategies. Varying views were obtained through questionnaires and interviews with EC staff, some being highly self-critical. FSTP activities are often seen as not being clearly linked to national strategies or accepted regional policies, particularly in Africa. For some, even the existence of strategies was seen as a mere assumption. While this might be true for some cases, the emergence of food security as an element of regional / continental and global strategies is becoming more and more a reality. Where no delegation has a regional role to play in regard to FS, it might be difficult to become a partner in the process of strategy and policy development. However, any EC Delegation still has the possibility to become involved in prioritising more clearly the needs and strategies identified in the region where it operates to maximise the potential impact of FS strategies.

The current FSTP, however clearly shows a lack of some highly relevant themes such as access and nutrition. This is a major criticism of the present strategy.

Another important aspect is the degree to which the SPs are covered by the defined activities. Gaps in the coverage of the current FS agendas at global level and of regional bodies (SAARC, ASEAN and in Latin America) have become evident, some of which can be related to a lack of dialogue at regional and global levels and resulting lack of ownership. On the other hand, the fact that SPs overlap and are complementary to each other, is seen as contributing well to the overall FSTP objective. Another factor to be taken into account is the different speed of implementation of the activities under the SPs (for example SP4 and SP5 call for relatively short time frame whereas SP1 and SP2 have a longer-term orientation). There is some concern of the late coverage of Asia and Central Asia – with nothing in the 2007 or 2008 programmes.

The internal consistency between the activities and strategic priorities of the FSTP is well developed, deficiencies relate mostly to weakly defined SPs in terms of coverage of all relevant themes. Criticism refers mostly to a certain ambiguity of SPs allowing for activities to be grouped under various SPs (some activities for nutrition falling under SPs 3, 4 and 5 for example).

Another major area of concern is the difficult “manageability” of the FSTP due to the obvious lack of geographical focus of SPs creating problems of coordination of activities with NIPs, and lack of awareness of recipient governments of additionally funded activities in a given country. In this sense, many activities are seen to be better manageable under geographic budget lines such as EDF or ENPI this is, however, not possible under its present mandate.

Summing up, the main weaknesses of the FSTP as defined relate mostly to:

- incorrect focus on an existing regional level (due to lack of regional integration) with a resulting lack of coherence with country programmes and focus on impact at national/ country level
- lack of demand for FS, including its highly relevant themes of access and social safety nets/ protection
- the lack of coherence between the six SPs which miss an overarching link, such as the pillars of FS, coupled with a relatively well developed internal coherence between activities within their respective SP.

Concerning the coherence of activities and SPs within a logical framework, the MIP, AAPs and Action Fiches (AFs) can be regarded as forming an inherent logical framework albeit not formally elaborated but in descriptive form (containing objectives, results, activities, indicators, sources of verification and assumptions/risks). While the initial AFs (2007) did not include logical frameworks (LFs), from 2008 onwards there is a progressive introduction of LFs (starting with a table of key indicators per subcomponent to be monitored) as an annex to the AF. For the 2009 AAP, LFs were standard and were attached as an annex. In case of an external implementing partner (IP), LFs are elaborated by the IP before the EC awards the contract.

There is room, however for more linkages, knowledge sharing and coordination between some or all of the six SPs (for example, using the results of SP2 for designing policy relevant continental and regional approaches under SP3, feeding the results of SP1 systematically into SP3, creating cross-fertilization and synergies between the various SPs).

Another important dimension is the choice of implementing partners and the mechanism applied for their identification such as through calls for proposals. One major problem in this regard is the widespread lack of capacity of potential partners to be selected, often caused by the lack of dynamic regional integration (such as in Africa). Particularly in the beginning of the FSTP, it is acknowledged that the need to identify implementing partners capable to act on global/ continental levels and of speeding up of contractual procedures was at the basis of project selection such as in the case of UN agencies with which framework agreements existed.

Selecting different potential partners at continental and regional levels, on the other hand would have necessitated assessments of the institutional capacity of IPs before implementing the AAPs. In the meantime, similar studies as the one underway for South Asia (financed by DFID and the WB) could be undertaken in preparation of the next AAP for 2010. In the case of SP4, there is wide agreement that working with NGOs is the main choice available in many cases even if the impact and sustainability of this is unknown.

Reaching affected population groups more effectively, particularly regarding local authorities as partners in the case of SP 4 on LRRD situations would be another prospective course of action for the near future. In the case of SP2 and SP3, co-operation with UN agencies was found to have worked relatively well.

3.1.3 From Programme to Food Security

3.1.3.1 FSTP Objectives and Food Security Needs at the Supra-National Level

An important degree of strategic focus was lost when the FSBL was replaced by a more diverse range of geographical and regional instruments. Continuity between the FSBL and the instruments that replaced it has often been lacking, and considerable effort will be required to restore the degree of complementarity and coherence that previously existed. This issue is further explored in §4.1.1.

One questionnaire respondent noted that Asia receives a disproportionately low share of FSTP resources – around 23 per cent. There is certainly substance in this argument, because there are actually more undernourished people in South Asia alone than there are in the whole of sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) simply because of the much larger population of the former.⁹ Yet the Programme is quite heavily tilted in favour of SSA.

Little progress has so far been made in terms of advancing the regional agenda, partly because global discussions did not gain momentum until after the 2008 food price spike, and partly because it has proved difficult to find partners at the regional level. The questions of finding partners at the regional level is indeed a difficult challenge, since the relevant organisations, particularly in Africa but to an important extent also in Asia, are in their infancy and are beset with resource constraints and, in some cases, internal tensions. The recent food price spike, however, provides the momentum needed to refocus on this important aspect of the Programme.

3.1.3.2 Focus on the Poor and Vulnerable

There is broad agreement at EC HQ level that, with the exception of SP4, the needs of the poor and vulnerable are poorly taking into account by FSTP. Nevertheless, the reconstructed logframe of FSTP shows that for two other SPs (2,3) indicators like “number of vulnerable/ food insecure population” reached had been built into the FSTP design. It should be pointed out that a number of activities under SP5’s Special Final Allocation for ALA also specifically target the poor and vulnerable. An outstanding example is the Food Security for the Ultra Poor (FSUP) project in Bangladesh. The fact that there is no *direct* targeting under the other four SPs reflects the fact that good direct targeting can only be achieved at the national or sub-national levels, and this is correspondingly difficult to achieve in a programme which has an important focus at the supra-national level. It is no coincidence that the two SPs that achieve better targeting are the ones that also have a country-level presence. There is also, however, the important and often-neglected issue of indirect targeting, and this is discussed in §3.1.3.3.

⁹ According to the latest SOFI report (FAO 2008), there are 212 million undernourished people in SSA (30% of population), and 314 million in South Asia (21%).

3.1.3.3 Balance between the 'Pillars' of Food Security

EC Food Security policy notes that food security is multi-disciplinary and has three dimensions: (i) availability (national level), (ii) access (household level) and (iii) food utilisation and nutritional adequacy (individual level). These are widely recognised as the 'three pillars' of food security. Serious reservations have been expressed regarding the balance the FSTP has struck between the three 'pillars' because, while SP1 has a clear focus on food availability, none of the six SPs has a clear focus on food access, food utilisation or nutrition. While there is a great deal of truth in this it is worth pointing out that food availability and food access are not entirely independent of each other. First, when new technologies can be used by subsistence farmers (e.g. staple crops that are drought-, pest- or flood-tolerant); increased food availability translates directly into increased food access. Projects at the CGIAR and other agricultural research centres are tending increasingly to focus on varietal characteristics suited to such challenging environments, where the poorest tend to live. Second, where markets are functioning reasonably well, increased food availability translates into lower food prices, which especially benefits the poor, because they tend to spend a higher proportion of their household budgets on food.

This is not to suggest that improved food access can be achieved simply by increasing food availability, or indeed mainly by such an approach. More direct interventions are required to increase the food access of poor and vulnerable households by increasing their food entitlements. A major intervention aimed at improving food access in recent years has been the development of the social protection approach and social transfers. Where FSTP interventions are targeted at complementing geographical programmes at the national or sub-national level (i.e. under SP4 and SP5) food access issues are in some cases addressed, through e.g. cash transfers, targeted programmes for poor and vulnerable women, and income generating activities (see §4.2.4 and §4.2.5 below). More, however, needs to be done on this front, particularly by FSTP engaging more in social protection. One important such avenue that should be explored is the Safety Nets approach for the chronically food-insecure. Such programmes are, however, expensive, and, particularly in relatively large countries, require a multi-donor approach. In its supra-national interventions, FSTP could best contribute through support and backup measures, for example through advisory services, capacity building for stakeholders, research on issues of poverty, vulnerability, targeting, and gender aspects of food insecurity. The Innovative Approaches SP could make a major contribution here by facilitating the South-South exchange of experience, identification of gaps and discussion of emerging examples of good practice.

In the 2010 Annual Action Plan interventions on nutrition are being programmed for Asia and Africa, but to date the main input on nutrition has again been on the food availability side, particularly through support to agricultural research – to the extent that this focuses on the range of foods required for nutritional balance. In general the CG centres address these concerns in the case of the three macronutrients (carbohydrates, protein and essential fatty acids), through their extensive work on cereals, tubers, pulses and oilseeds. Livestock research can also benefit the poor, although often indirectly, because they are more likely to raise animals in order to sell animal produce and purchase cheaper foodstuffs. The biggest gap is in horticulture, which is a much cheaper source of micronutrients than animal produce, but which is notably missing from the mandated crops of the CG centres. However, it is proposed that horticultural research be funded under the global research component 2009/10.

Access to nutrition is clearly an area in which much needs to be done, because a basic problem of the poor and vulnerable is lack of dietary balance (hidden hunger). The diets of most poor people are deficient in two of the three macronutrients, protein and essential fatty acids, and in most micronutrients. Deficiencies in vitamin A, iron and iodine are particularly marked in developing countries. FSTP needs to explore the possibility of co-operating with a range of new partners, particularly if it is to address the issue of micronutrient deficiency. This is further explored in §5.2.5.2 below.

3.1.4 Overarching Themes

3.1.4.1 Gender

In the TS (§2.2) it is noted that 'gender aspects are particularly relevant since women, who, despite their multiple roles as food producers, household managers, care givers and income generators, continue to be the most vulnerable to food insecurity'. However gender is not mentioned in the section of the TS that elaborates the six SPs (§4.2 'Strategic Priorities'). In Annex 4, gender and ethnic discrimination are noted as issues to be addressed under 'Innovative Approaches', but there is little elaboration. In contrast to this, implementing partners felt that the issue is adequately covered, a view that is largely, but not entirely, echoed by delegation staff in these countries.

A study of the Action Fiches and the proposals produced by the implementing partners in response to the Calls for Proposals indicates that more attention is paid to gender at this level than at the strategic level. Virtually all projects list gender as a cross-cutting issue, but it is sometimes difficult to discern much attention being paid to it otherwise. On the other hand a minority of activities specifically address the gender aspects of food security. An outstanding example is the 2007 Bangladesh project *Food Security of the Ultra Poor* (FSUP) under SP5, whose main objective is 'to contribute to the reduction of extreme poverty and food insecurity of the most vulnerable women and their dependants'. The only other 2007 project that has a reasonably strong gender focus is the *Sector Policy Support Programme (SPSP) Tajikistan 2007-2009* (also SP5).

Projects in the 2008 and 2009 AAPs have tended to be rather more gender-sensitive than those in 2007, although the practice of mentioning gender only as a cross-cutting issue continued. The following projects specifically address the gender dimension of food security:

- *Validating and Initiating the Diffusion of Pro-Poor and Poor-Environment Tsetse Repellent Technology (SP1)*
- *Information Systems to Improve Food Security Decision-Making in the ENP-East Region (SP2)*
- *Putting a Pro-Poor Land Agenda into Practice (SP3)*
- *Livestock for Livelihoods: Strengthening Climate Change Adaptation Strategies through Improved Management at the Livestock-Wildlife-Environment Interface (SP3)*
- *Support for the Implementation of a New National Policy for Food Security in Cuba (SP4)*
- *Innovative Approaches to Food Insecurity (SP5)*
- *Phasing-out Programme of Support for Food Security in Honduras (SP5)*
- *Yemen Food Security Programme 2007 (SP5)*

3.1.4.2 Vulnerability

The overall objective of the FSTP is 'To improve food security in favour of the poorest and the most vulnerable.' There are four basic forms of vulnerability to chronic food insecurity, physiological, economic, social and political.

Most interlocutors identified SP4, with its focus is on LRRD, as the main mechanism for addressing vulnerability. Of the eight delegations which responded to the questionnaire, six were from countries supported under SP4, and all of them supported the proposition that vulnerability concerns are adequately covered. Vulnerability concerns are indeed a clear focus of SP4, since one of its objectives is to 'address vulnerability to shocks and strengthen people's resilience through support for crisis prevention and management'. In pursuit of this, it aims to:

- protect, maintain and recover productive and social assets vital for food security, to allow economic reintegration and longer-term rehabilitation
- address vulnerability to shocks and strengthen people's resilience through support for crisis prevention and management
- improve food security, and nutrition in particular, of particularly disadvantaged and marginalised groups, and
- strengthen/consolidate local institutions and emerging central ones

SP4 is not the only strategic priority under which vulnerability is addressed, because it is also included under the Disaster Risk Reduction component of SP3. In accordance with the focus on Disaster Risk

Reduction at strategic level under this SP, a range of actions is proposed to address the vulnerability issue. In Africa it identifies a number of risks to food security (vulnerability to price instability, natural disasters, diseases, conflicts, and uncertainty of access to resources and markets). The negative consequences for the food security of vulnerable groups ~~is~~ **are** seen as being susceptible to better management through measures such as market-based risk reduction instruments and investment in strategic food reserves. In Asia, SP3 targets vulnerable groups such as children, women, and the disabled and indigenous people in rural and urban areas, focusing on problems of chronic malnutrition that are trans-boundary in nature. In Latin America the focus is similar to that in Asia, with the additional aim of promoting regional integration by developing regional food security and harmonising national and local policies. These issues are explored more thoroughly in §3.2.3 below. The choice of LRRD countries implies that SP4 mainly addresses vulnerability caused by political factors. SP3 on the other hand, addresses the physiological, economic and, to a lesser extent, social aspects of vulnerability.

3.1.4.3 Climate Change

In terms of the Thematic Strategy Paper, climate change (CC) is mentioned only twice, both times as a topic for inclusion under the 'innovations' component of SP5. However, work on this theme has only just been launched in the 2009 AAP under the heading: 'Sustainable management of and access to natural resources (land, water and energy), impact of the degradation of natural resources and of climate change on household and national food security' (Appendix IV), so it is difficult to argue that this cross-cutting theme has been adequately covered to date.

At the implementation level, the responses of the delegations were more positive than those of EC HQ staff. Almost all agreed with the statement that the issue was covered, at least to some extent. Climate change did not figure prominently on the list of projects to be supported in 2007, but interest picked up somewhat in 2008 and 2009, and the topic is mentioned in projects under Strategic Priorities 1, 2, 3 4 and 5. As in the case of gender, in some cases it is mentioned only as a 'cross-cutting issue' but in others it has a more central focus, with objectives that specifically include dealing with its negative impact. In one case, *Livestock for Livelihoods: Strengthening Climate Change Adaptation Strategies through Improved Management at the Livestock-Wildlife-Environment Interface* the project purpose is 'to improve natural resources and livestock management practices in designated sites in response to the increasing risks from vulnerability to climate change'. Under SP1 a new CGIAR Challenge Programme on climate change is being supported. CC is also an overarching issue in the global call for proposals also in SP1. This issue does, therefore, appear to have been attracting increasing attention during the course of FSTP implementation.

3.1.5 Stakeholder Consultation (during formulation and implementation)

State and non-state actors (NGOs, civil society, academia) potentially have a great deal to contribute to the development of FSTP, as they are major sources of both theoretical and practical innovation. They can prioritise the potential actions and propose appropriate activities which will have a real impact on food security. Their involvement also encourages ownership by the beneficiaries, implementing partners and national governments in the programmes developed under the FSTP. The concept of ownership is an important aspect of the Paris Declaration and also leads to a much stronger commitment and more successful projects.

Respondents to the questionnaire felt that non-state actors had little opportunity to participate in the preparation of the strategy and MIP for FSTP Phase I. ECHQ staff, however, reported that a web-based consultation was carried out by DG DEV in 2006/2007. Meetings were also carried out with stakeholders (non state actors) in Rome. As the TS and MIP closely follows the mandate it would have been necessary to involve the stakeholders at the stage of preparing the mandate in order for them to have a significant effect on the direction of the programme.

More consultation occurs at the later stages of planning - i.e. when national programmes including calls for proposals were being formulated. Stakeholder consultation was originally foreseen for the Asia and LA programming phase but this was dropped due to time constraints.

For Phase II it was widely agreed that more should be done to involve state and civil society actors in the programme development stage. This is an integral requirement of the Paris Declaration to ensure ownership and alignment of the FSTP with developing countries' objectives and strategies. It was also

suggested that the FSTP should be redefined first so that a clear framework existed on which to build the activities of Phase II.

It is easier to talk about consultation than to carry it out in practice – there are always time pressures and it is often difficult to identify representative civil society organisations – particularly at the global and regional levels. Further, their capacity to represent the ultimate beneficiaries may be limited. At the stage of developing national programmes it is easier to identify the key stakeholders but in many developing countries the state actors are often weak and it is the CSOs that have greater capacity to engage in the process. At regional and continental levels representation is patchy and it is therefore difficult to organise consultation.

In terms of involvement in implementation of the current programmes most responses from the delegations stated that due to the weakness of state organisations they play little part in the implementation of FSTP activities. Civil society organisations however play a vital role in many of the activities. With regard to SP1 the CGIAR is a global partnership of research centres, donor nations, CSOs and private companies. The research carried out at CGIAR centres and particularly through the challenge programmes involves a wide range of partners - including research organisations from the north and south and governmental and non-governmental partners such as farmers' organisations – to ensure delivery to the final beneficiaries.

Fulfilment of Strategic Priorities 3 and 5 require wide consultation if the full range of innovative approaches to food security for the poor and vulnerable is to be properly explored, and promising new *modi operandi* considered for adoption by the Programme. National and international NGOs have a great deal of experience here that should be tapped into, if possible in the form of a Stakeholders' Workshop organised by FTSP. A workshop of this nature has already been organized around SP 1, so there is a precedent and a model to follow.

In April 2008 forty experts from Africa and Europe including the European Commission met to recommend ARD priority research topics and activities for enhancing Scientific and Technical cooperation between Africa and Europe within the framework of 10 broad priority areas defined under the two EU instruments; FP7-FAB and FSTP. The process was used to define the research themes to be covered by the global component of SP1 – not funded at CGIAR centres. The face to face meeting was preceded by an e-consultation which provided a wealth of information. The main conclusions are included in a summary of the conclusions¹⁰. The organisers and participants of this consultation process felt that it was highly successful and would like to see it repeated in future when research is being reviewed. It might also be used as a model for consultations within the FSTP.

3.1.6 Emerging Issues

Since the FSTP was launched a number of existing issues have emerged as more urgent than previously thought, while two major new ones have emerged. Undoubtedly the most important among the former is the fact that the evidence on CC and its projected impact on food security has become much more compelling, so that this issue has moved rapidly up the development agenda. The most authoritative source of information on this is the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), whose latest report (Climate Change 2007) notes that evidence on warming of the climate system is now unequivocal. Globally, the projected impact on FS includes:

- The likelihood, based on a range of models, that future tropical cyclones (typhoons and hurricanes) will become more intense
- At lower latitudes, especially in seasonally dry tropical regions, crop productivity is projected to decrease for even small local temperature rises (1 to 2°C), thus increasing the risk of hunger
- Drought-affected areas are projected to increase in extent, with the potential for adverse impacts on multiple sectors, including agriculture, water supply and health.
- Large increases in demand for irrigation water in many regions

At the continental level:

¹⁰ Workshop Conclusions - FARA & EFARD Consultation on Agricultural Research Programming for FP7-FAB and FSTP Organised by European Commission in collaboration with CTA, DGDEV , 14 – 16 April 2008

AFRICA

- By 2020 in some countries yields from rainfed agriculture could be reduced by up to 50%
- Agricultural production in many African countries is projected to be severely compromised, further adversely affecting food security
- Towards the end of the 21st century, projected sea level rise will affect low-lying coastal areas with large populations; the cost of adaptation could amount to at least 5 to 10% of GDP
- By 2080, an increase of 5 to 8% of arid and semi-arid land in Africa is projected under a range of climate scenarios

ASIA

- By the 2050s freshwater availability in Central, South, East and South-East Asia, particularly in large river basins, is projected to have decreased substantially
- Coastal areas, especially heavily populated megadelta regions in South, East and South-East Asia, will be at greatest risk due to increased flooding

LATIN AMERICA

- By mid-century, increases in temperature and associated decreases in soil water are projected to lead to gradual replacement of tropical forest by savannah in eastern Amazonia; semiarid vegetation will tend to be replaced by arid-land vegetation
- Productivity of some important crops is projected to decrease and livestock productivity to decline, with adverse consequences for food security; overall, the number of people at risk of hunger is projected to increase
- Changes in precipitation patterns and the disappearance of glaciers are projected significantly to affect water availability for human consumption, agriculture and energy generation

Two critical new issues that have emerged are food price inflation and global recession. The FAO and IMF data bases show that, after decades of decline, the prices of cereals began to increase in 2002, a trend which began to accelerate in 2007 and accelerated dramatically to mid- 2008. While food prices have declined again since then, they remain high and volatile, and according to a joint FAO-OECD medium-term outlook for major agricultural commodities published in May 2008, the period to 2017 is likely to see food prices remain high compared to the 1990s (OECD/FAO 2008). FAO estimates that the number of undernourished people increased globally from 848 million in 1990 to 923 million by the end of 2007, and 963 million a year later ([www.fao.org.news.story/en/item/8836](http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/8836) and SOFI 2008), and is predicted to reach 1020 million in 2009. The trend in the percentage of people who are undernourished has also reversed: after falling from 20% in 1990/92 to 16% in 2003/05, by 2007 it had increased to 17% - and that was before the spike in food prices and the global recession (FAO 2008). In the view of the OECD, recent reversals on this front are equivalent to a seven year setback in progress towards MDG1 (OECD 2009). Moreover, the good news of falling food prices over the past year has been counteracted by the economic crisis, all of which have hit poor countries hard, through factors such as a huge reduction in income from remittances.

In April 2008 the UN Secretary-General established a Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis (HLTF), comprising heads of UN bodies and representatives of the Bretton Woods institutions. In July 2008, this Task Force produced a Comprehensive Framework for Action (CFA) setting out the joint position of its members, and aiming to catalyse action. It proposes a twin-track approach, outlining activities related to meeting the immediate needs, such as investing in food assistance and social safety nets, plus activities related to longer-term structural needs, such as scaling up investment in agriculture within developing countries, focusing on the needs of smallholders and enabling them realize their right to food, sustaining an increase in income and ensuring adequate nutrition. In the same month at their Tokyo summit, G8 Leaders issued a Statement on Food Security emphasising the urgency of short term needs, the need to provide immediate access to fertilisers, particularly for smallholder farmers, and expressing their commitment to reversing the decline in food aid and investment. The G8 leaders called for the establishment of a Global Partnership for Agriculture and Food Security (GPAFS) and established a G8 Working Group on Global Food Security in which the EC and member states have been proactive. The result has been quite solid donor consensus on the need for more and better support for food security, social protection and agricultural development and for a global mechanism to help deliver a comprehensive and co-ordinated international response to hunger. This work was underpinned in January 2009 at the High Level Meeting on Food Security for

All in Madrid, where there was widespread support for the CFA's twin-track approach. Participants agreed on an urgent need to scale up and better coordinate efforts through a broader and deeper engagement of all stakeholders. This meeting it was agreed to launch a formal consultation process for the establishment of a "Global Partnership for Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition" (GPAFSN) which is intended fully to engage all relevant stakeholders. The most recent international policy announcement was Statement on Food Security from the July 2009 G8 Summit, which commits to working in partnership with all development partners to address all three 'pillars' of food security: food availability (improving access to better seeds and fertilizers, promoting sustainable management of water, forests and natural resources, strengthening capacities to provide extension services and risk management instruments), food access (more equitable income generation and distribution, employment creation and improved income prospects) and food utilisation (promoting access to health care and education in rural areas, meant, inter alia, to improve nutrition and food security). See also Annex 11.

As part of this international response to the food crisis, in 2008 the EC established a €1 billion Food Facility (FF) for the period 2009-11, and an additional €50 million was allocated from FSTP for 10 countries. This was meant only as a short to medium term measure to address the immediate problem of the food crisis. Medium-to-long term measures are also needed, because, as the OECD recently observed, the recent food price spike should 'no longer be seen as a "shock" or short term "crisis", but rather as a longer term structural issue' (OECD 2009). This raises both specific and generic issues. The specific issue for the EC is whether or not to continue with the FF in some form or other after 2011, and if so what if any its relationship should be to the FSTP. Most respondents to the questionnaire survey felt that there was no scope for FSTP to take over any of the functions of the FF if the latter is phased out. The reasons given included the differing aims and objectives of the two programmes, technical incompatibility between them, the strong agricultural bias of the FF, conflicts between the short-term nature of the FF and the longer term approach of the FSTP, and the country level focus of the FF vis-à-vis the primarily regional/continental/global approach of the FSTP. In sharp contrast to this, two respondents felt that there is scope for FSTP to take over some of the FF's roles. The reason given was that FSTP and FF already co-finance projects in some countries and that it could be done mainly under SP4.

A more generic question is whether the FSTP should be revised to take account of these emerging issues. Most respondents to the questionnaire survey were in favour of this, many citing the relationship between increased food price volatility and increased food insecurity, and the growing need for social protection in the face of these developments. However it was also noted that both the present phase of FSTP and the next phase are governed by the DCI Regulation and that the Programme's underlying strategy cannot be changed in any way that makes it incompatible with this framework. Any radical change to the FSTP and its Strategic Priorities are ruled out until after Phase II.

The issue of FSTP and the other Millennium Development Goals is covered in annex 9.

3.2 MAIN FINDINGS REGARDING STRATEGY - BY STRATEGIC PRIORITY

3.2.1 Supporting the delivery of international public goods contributing to food security: research and technology

The DCI mandate for SP1 is: "The provision of international public goods, in particular pro-poor demand driven research and technological innovation, as well as capacity development, scientific and technical South-South and South-North co-operation and twinning"

In the Thematic Strategy communication the same description is used but given much more detail in an annex. The main sub-themes are:

- International Public Goods (IPGs)
- Pro-poor and demand-driven research and technological innovation,
- Support for the use and dissemination of satellite imagery and data, for crop monitoring and early warning systems, and food security systems, such as land use and management.
- Capacity development and training, such as distance learning tools
- Networking: Partnerships with EU research initiatives that are relevant for food security and complementary to those funded by existing programmes (such as the 6th and 7th Research

Framework Programmes). North-South and South-South Scientific and technological networking.

SP1 is one of the major elements of the FSTP. The 2007 -2010 budget in the MIP is € 233,100,000 of which € 158,100,000 is for global programmes and the rest for regional programmes.

The FSTP design document links the above themes with the EC-ARD strategy document¹¹ and the EC Communication - “Advancing African Agriculture” .The emphasis of the programme is moved more towards improving food security in Sub-Saharan Africa while retaining the global dimension through research funded at CGIAR and other research centres.

The EC has supported ARD for many years – particularly as members and major sponsors of the CGIAR.

The EC contribution to the CGIAR for the period 2002-2005 was reviewed in 2007. The evaluation was positive, especially in terms of quality of research. It recognised that the work of the CGIAR centres is vital to the development of agriculture in the developing world, and over the long term has had a clear impact on rural poverty, food security and sustainable agriculture.

The evaluation highlighted the weak role of National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS) in many developing countries and recommended the EC should use all means to ensure that national governments in developing countries commit sufficient resources to agricultural research. As a consequence, it recommended that the EC should take opportunities to assist in building national and regional capacity for agricultural research.

The 2007 evaluation also considered the mix of projects that was supported by the EC and found that the same system priorities should be supported in future. Since that evaluation, the number of projects supported has been reduced and more emphasis is now placed on climate change through the new Challenge Programme. Although some of the supported activities will have an impact only in the long term they may be highly valuable in the future and should therefore be retained. The activities supported under SP1, and outlined above, form a coherent package of support for the development of IPGs at the global and regional level.

The CGIAR clearly has major advantages for global ARD – it is recognized for its excellence worldwide, it covers most of the major agricultural issues of developing countries and it is a coherent system funded by a wide range of donors. Despite this, the door should not be closed to other players and it is a sensible development that under the FSTP, EC support has widened to include global ARD based outside the CGIAR. For this reason the regional programmes in Africa, Asia and Latin America and a substantial global programme are all being funded with research organisations outside the CGIAR. So far only the Africa regional programme has been finalised. Within that programme some of the major research organisations and networks in Africa (e.g. FARA, ASARECA, CARBAP and AFAAS).

The ARD work supported by the EC is very diverse in nature. Some of this work may reap benefits within a few years (eg support for technology transfer and extension services) while others maintain and develop a basic resource that can be used for future benefits (eg gene bank maintenance). It has been the view of the EC that long-term work is just as valuable as short-term work but will be much harder to assess. It has been noted during the review that much of the research is production orientated. Although this is true there is also much work on policy and on access to markets. There is however, little work under SP1 on nutrition as this has not been a major research area within the CGIAR.

3.2.2 Linking information and decision making to improve food security response strategies:

The mandate for strategic priority (SP) 2 is contained in DCI Article 15 on “Food Security” under (b) supporting global, continental and regional programmes in support of (i) food security information and early warning. The MIP includes, under paragraph 5.1.2, ”Linking information and decision-making to

¹¹ European Commission Non Paper - Guidelines On Agricultural Research For Development - June 2008

improve food security response strategies” stating that “The objective of the programme is to strengthen national and regional stakeholders’ (public and non-state actors) capacities in the areas of food security analysis, policy/ strategy design, monitoring and evaluation, in order to prevent food crises more effectively and reduce chronic food insecurity” (see also Annex 7, reconstructed logical framework).

The MIP describes the main planned outputs, including *inter alia*, strengthening the link between analysis and effective response strategies; harmonising donors’ and governments’ approaches and better coherence of methodologies and response strategies including PRSPs; long-term EC funding in partnership with FAO as the leading international agency; and better accommodation of the national level through coordinated support for countries. The final outcome of these priorities is supposed to reach a multi-partner approach with UN agencies, NGOs, and specialised institutions and possibly also a multi-donor approach, comprising EU Member States and focused on harmonising and aligning the efforts of all relevant development partners, based on the principles of subsidiarity and comparative advantage. The indicative budget allocated for SP2 over the period 2007-2010 is M€ 65.

In order to assess SP2, it is important to place it in the context of international work on FS information systems (FSIS). With FAO as a leading international agency in food security issues, including FSIS and early warning systems, the 2007 independent external evaluation (IEE) of FAO was a milestone in its ongoing reform process (Immediate Plan of Action “reform with growth” process). In the IEE the global goals of FAO and corresponding guiding principles including FSI were redefined as “progress in the global and regional conditions for development through policy and regulatory coherence and the availability of information to underpin national development”.

The classical approach to FS information for improved policy- and decision-making is the one used also in the current definition of FSTP’s SP2 and comprises mostly food security and nutrition information systems (FSNIS), early warning systems (EWS) and a set of databases and statistics (many of them managed by FAO), such as Global Information and Early Warning System (GIEWS), Key Indicator Data System (KIDS), trade & markets information (EST); Food Insecurity and Vulnerability Information and Mapping System (FIVMS) supported by SP-2; various vital statistics, GeoNetwork (including land, water and ocean resources) and FAO-STAT, including mapping of global food insecurity as a compound index, INFOODS (International Network of Food Data System). WFP also operates a number of relevant instruments (some of which jointly with FAO and ECHO¹²), such as Joint Crop and FS Assessment Missions (CAMs), Comprehensive FS & Vulnerability Analysis & Studies (CFS&AS), and FS monitoring systems (FSMS) in 20 countries, including Vulnerability Assessment Centres (VACs). In addition, other donors have developed their own systems, such as WHO Nutrition databases (on national nutrition, child growth and malnutrition, vitamin and mineral nutrition), UNICEF (on child nutrition), Famine Early Warning System (FEWSNET) by USAID. Integrated Phase Classification (IPC) is a multi-donor joint system for food security and nutrition and emergency needs assessment harmonising core tools (funded predominantly by ECHO).

FS(N)IS are at the heart of any FS strategy and policy as quality information is always the precondition for developing relevant interventions in FS and nutrition. Using the wider approach to FSIS, even SP1 could be seen, as SP2, as a precondition for all other SPs to work effectively as a sound information basis applies also to the area of research and technology development as it forms the basis for informed decision-making in SP3, 4 and 5.

With the major stakeholders engaged in FS using their own FSIS system (also developed historically), there is a strong need to arrive at greater harmonisation and coordination of the parallel efforts in this area. SP2, with its modest budget of M€ 65 over 4 years at global level is one programme trying to achieve improved FS(N)IS and EWS linked to policy development but more efforts are needed. Two of the main players, FAO and WFP, launched in 2008 an independent thematic evaluation of information systems for food security (ISFS) the results of which were not yet available by the time of this MTR. Recognising that in the area of food insecurity measurement and nutrition assessment, there is a lack of harmonisation and synergy and potential duplication of efforts not only between the Rome based “triad” (including FAO, WFP, and IFAD), but also between other major stakeholders in FSIS, such as UNICEF, WHO, IFPRI, the US, Canada, Australia, and the EU and its MS, there is a

¹² See previous SENAC project in FSIS, 2003-07 (supported by EC)

common understanding, however of the main problems existing in this field which globally remains uncoordinated and lacks a common forum. Although there is a community of practice to discuss key technical methodological and institutional issues, in the aftermath of the global economic and food (price) crisis a new effort is underway to overcome duplication of efforts (and sometimes even competition) and to arrive at harmonisation of hitherto agency or country-owned tools and methods (in the context of discussion on global food governance, High level Task Force's Comprehensive Framework of Action (HLTF's CFA) and other fora (Global Donor Platform for Rural Development, Global Platform on Agriculture and Food Security and Nutrition , G8/20).

Another encouraging example of an innovative stakeholder initiative in this direction is the recent IFPRI proposal to EC on "Support for appropriate policy responses at country level" by using information for evidence-based policy actions comprising a state of the art database synthesizing in real time all relevant aspects of FS including responses to the current crisis ("World Food Security Portal") as a support tool for policy makers (see Annex 11).

What is needed is a global coordination and forum on FS information sharing and learning for enhanced policy development response strategies. The CFA of the HLTF on FS Crisis could play this role provided that its membership would be extended to comprise non-UN key players in global FS such as the EU and its MS (maybe also through a joint or liaison committee with a reformed world Committee on Food Security (CFS). Such an extended approach to "FS information linked to decision-making" would comprise a range of activities focused on "managing knowledge and making it available to users" such as:

- advocacy and communication directed to governments, decision-makers, opinion formers, and the public;
- FAO information systems and publications, including international events such as the World Food Summit (WFS) 1996 and its follow up and flagship documents such as SOFA and SOFI;
- the monitoring process through the Committee on World Food Security (CFS);
- the World Agricultural Information Centre (WAICENT) which is renamed to "Global Learning Centre for Food Security (GLC4FS)" and established with the support of FSTP SP-2.

For Phase II of the FSTP, this notion of a wider definition of FSIS certainly would be highly relevant to better reach not only key decision-makers and opinion leaders, but also by using more effectively the media for forming public opinion and to allow wide audiences, particularly also in the South, to participate in the FS debates in their countries including wider use of modern e-learning tools. This work should be coherent with the work of SP6.

3.2.3 Exploiting the potential of continental and regional approaches to improve food security

The mandate for SP3 is defined in DCI article 15 as "supporting global, continental and regional programmes in support of (i) food security information and early warning; (ii) food security in specific fields such as agriculture...; (iii) complementing national food security and poverty reduction strategies...; (iv) networking of policy experts and non-State actors..."

The MIP builds on this definition under the title "Exploiting the potential of the continental and regional approach to improve food security", including the two geographical focus areas of (A) Africa and (B) Asia and Latin America. In regard to (A) Africa, three sub-components of a new partnership framework on agricultural development are identified, comprising (i) disaster and risk reduction; (ii) policy development and harmonisation; and (iii) sustainable management of natural resources (see also reconstructed logical framework Annex 7). In regard to Africa, in 2008 the EC commissioned an identification and formulation consultancy on preparation of PIFs for AAPs 2009 and 2010 and AFs for 2009. Six criteria were used for prioritising projects: (i) balance of three components of policy development (PD), natural resources management (NRM) and disaster and risk management (DRM) to be used as unifying concepts for the design of the AAP 2010¹³; (ii) relevance; (iii) complementarity with other EC funded actions; (iv) preference for continued EC support or project extensions; (v) capacity/ accountability of IPs; and (vi) fair fund distribution amongst partners. This approach is

¹³ The definition applied for „disaster and risk management (DRM)“ is confined to production, price and market based risks leaving out disaster preparedness and EWS as a subject what is questionable.

regarded as highly relevant as it is based on the original logical framework of MIP aiming at systematic coverage of needs.

With regard to Asia and Latin America, in the original design, chronic malnutrition (among the most vulnerable population groups) was regarded as a persistent problem coupled with a lack of sizeable regional organisations apart from the Andean community and Central America. However, in the original MIP section on implementation, there is a separate mention of Asia also with a common strategy proposed for Laos and Cambodia out of which developed later the FAO co-managed project “Support to the EC Programme on Linking Information and Decision Making to Improve Food Security for Selected Greater Mekong Subregional Countries”. The MIP did not make much of a strategic choice, but a gradual approach is underway which will, as far as possible, support regional organizations and processes. This approach was probably justified as existing regional organizations were still weak at time of MIP design. SAARC has recently become more involved in issues of regional food security and nutrition, and issues related to climate change and agriculture and the revitalization of the Regional Food Bank (created in 1988) albeit still much with the assistance of FAO.

The ASEAN Integrated Food Security Framework and Strategic Plan of Action on Food Security in the Region (2009-2013) is an example of a very positive development which falls in line with all SPs of the FSTP and for which additional funding by external partners is sought. Prospective activities in this line aimed at identifying projects for the 2010 AAP and beyond have been started by the EC. A workshop was held in 2008 on the preparation for the FSTP Phase II after this current MTR.¹⁴ Also various new project proposals are on the table, such as for supporting child survival, growth and development interventions in the Asia-Pacific Region (UNICEF, March 2009) for five countries (Bangladesh, Nepal, Philippines, Indonesia and Laos) based on nutritional indicators, and support to safety nets (social protection systems) in cooperation with ASEAN Secretariat (ASEC) following meeting with EC in April 2009.

The indicative budget allocated for SP3 over the period 2007-2010 is M€ 135 (Africa M€ 100, Asia M€ 20, Latin America M€ 15). The degree to which above described strategic potential contained in the SP3 design document was exploited in its actual implementation is assessed in § 4.2.3.

3.2.4 Linking Relief and Rehabilitation to Development (LRRD) in Exceptional Situations of Transition and in Fragile Situations

This is the largest single element in FSTP. The 2007-2010 budget in the MIP is M€ 286, of which M€243 (85%) is under the DCI, while the remainder is split between a special programme in Palestine (8.6%) and regional programmes (6.5%). From the ENPI a contribution of €30 million was made to this SP, an allocation which was earmarked for Palestine, Georgia and Armenia. A further €50 million, which was not programmed, was added as part of the EC response to soaring food prices in 2008.

In 2008 the title of this SP was changed from *Addressing Food Security in Exceptional Situations of Transition, and in Fragile and Failed States*, presumably reflecting a realisation that the original title was somewhat pejorative. However this change can be viewed as more than cosmetic, because there are more than a few countries in fragile situations with respect to food security which could not be described as either ‘fragile’ or ‘failed’ states.

The basic approach is to link relief, rehabilitation and development (LRRD), with the objective of supporting the most vulnerable in protecting and recovering livelihood assets, while improving self-reliance and crisis prevention. It operates at national and sub-national level where EC geographical instruments are not in a position to intervene, or cannot operate fully. This strategic focus is extremely important if stakeholders are to escape from the cycle of perpetually recurring emergencies.

The FSTP design document reflects the widely-held view that the transition from post-emergency relief to rehabilitation to development is a ‘grey area’ where greater co-ordination of instruments is required. As noted in the TS, LRRD is ‘rarely a linear process because of the high vulnerability of the

¹⁴ Mid Term Review of Country Strategy Papers and Food Security Thematic Programme in Asia & Central Asia, Food Security interventions in Asia & Central Asia, various instruments and Mid-Term Reviews of 2009, Regional Food Security Seminar, Dhaka 30th April 2009, Franck Viault AIDCO/D1, Maria Paris-Ketting, RELEX/L3

extremely poor' (p.20). This suggests that a 'twin track' approach will often be required, with more protracted humanitarian assistance for the most vulnerable co-existing with a more developmentally-oriented response for others. The situation is further complicated by the fact that, while the humanitarian response may be led by overseas agencies, the development response must be co-ordinated with governments which, in terms of the countries in which SP4 operates, are often weak and poorly positioned to lead a sustained development response.

While there is clearly a mandate for FSTP to operate at national level in specific circumstances, it is not clear why this SP should be limited to the area of LRRD. While this is a vitally important area, there are other areas of food security which could usefully be addressed in exceptional situations of transition and in fragile situations, particularly in countries which are unusually food-insecure but not particularly susceptible to natural or man-made disasters. Here social protection programmes to increase food access, or programmes to address chronic micronutrient deficiencies could be of higher priority.

Even within the realm of LRRD, there is a problem of non-coherence between SPs. The LRRD approach should address a spectrum of issues, ranging from disaster prevention and preparedness (DPP) through post-disaster rehabilitation to transition to development. However DPP is also covered to an important extent under the Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) activities under SP3, which introduces a danger of duplication and fragmentation.

3.2.5 Promoting Innovation to Combat Food Insecurity

This SP has two sub-components: (i) fostering innovative practices and approaches to food security and (ii) a special, final allocation for countries in Asia, Latin America (ALA) and Neighbourhood countries, for phasing out food security assistance. Financially, SP5 is the third-largest element of FSTP, with a 2007-2010 budget M€ 159, of which 38% is earmarked for Innovative Approaches, 57% for the special allocation to ALA, and 4% for the special allocation for Georgia and Armenia.

3.2.5.1 Promoting Innovation

This is a strategy to improve food security by (a) identifying innovative approaches, (b) piloting them and (c) supporting efforts to upscale them on a South-South axis. It can only be viewed positively. It is also an area in which the case for a regional approach is strong, in terms of both comparative advantage and value added.

3.2.5.2 Special Final Allocation for ALA and EU Neighbourhood Countries

This sub-component of SP5 does not sit comfortably under the overall heading, and was presumably placed here for administrative purposes. The countries it covers fall into two categories: (i) Armenia and Georgia, and (ii) a group of chronically food-insecure ALA countries that, according to the TP 'Still require financing at country level for food security programmes aimed at very poor populations' The TP continues 'Phasing-out is therefore essential to prevent a major disruption of assistance aimed at addressing food insecurity in those countries' (p.27). This strategy of 'phasing out' has to be considered within the context of EC food security assistance as a whole. It may be difficult to justify support to individual countries in a largely regional programme, but it is done for the countries under SP4 on the grounds that special circumstances apply. However with Special Final Allocation countries that are chronically food-insecure, any phasing out of FSTP support should logically be accompanied by phasing in of other forms of support, presumably from the geographical instrument.

A useful way of comparing countries with respect to their level of food insecurity is to use IFPRI's Global Hunger Index (GHI). For a given country this combines three equally-weighted indicators: (i) the proportion of population who are undernourished, (ii) the prevalence of underweight among under-fives, and (iii) the mortality rate of under-fives. The GHI ranges, together with and IFPRI's interpretation of them in terms of food insecurity are as follows:

GHI range	≤ 4.9	5.0 - 9.9	10.0 - 19.9	20.0 - 29.9	≥30.0
Food Insecurity	Low	Moderate	Serious	Alarming	Extremely Alarming

The GHIs for the countries included under SP5 are as follows: Armenia=10.2; Bangladesh=25.2; Bolivia=11.2; Cambodia=23.2; Georgia=9.2; Kyrgyzstan≤4.9; Laos=20.6; Nicaragua=12.8; Tajikistan=25.9; Yemen=29.8; Honduras=11.4. Hence the situation is 'alarming', in five of these countries, 'serious' in four, moderate in one and 'low' in one.

Phasing out FSTP support can be regarded as justifiable in the cases of Georgia and Kyrgyzstan. Armenia's score of 10.2 is so close to the 'moderate' category that it too should cause few concerns. However phasing out FSTP without compensating support is questionable for countries in the 'serious' category, and extremely questionable for those in the 'alarming' category.

This can be illustrated by the case of the most populous country on the list, Bangladesh. Food security is an EC focal sector in that country, and the Commission's food security initiatives there – including the current FSTP-supported FSUP initiative – concentrate on the poorest and most vulnerable sections of society, especially women and their dependents. Yet the total EC allocation for this sector has been falling steadily, from M€112.1 per annum in 2003 to M€67.9 in 2009. The indicative allocation is set to fall further, to M€ 66 during 2011-13. This is because the proposed increase in the geographical allocation from M€ 50 per annum in 2007-2010 to M€ 66 in 2011-2013, is more than offset by the withdrawal of funding from regional/global sources. Hence phasing out has not been balanced by phasing in. Details are given in Figure 1.

Figure 1 Bangladesh: Evolution of Country Allocation, 2003 to 2013 (Geographic & Food Security Budget Lines)

Indicative allocation per year (€ M)	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Indicative allocation per year (€ M)
120												120
110												110
100	FSBL 2003-2005 = €47,7 M											100
90				FSBL 2006 = € 33,7 M								90
80	NIP 2003-2005 = €288.5 M (geographic allocation)											80
70					FSTP 2007 = € 36,5 M							70
60						IFS Cyclone Sidr = €13M						60
50				NIP 2006 = € 67 M		Food Facility 2008-2010= € 50 M			Indicative MIP 2011-2013 = € 198 M			50
40					MIP 2007-2010 = € 205 M						40	
30												30
20												20
10												10
0												0
Per MIP	336.2			100.7	304.5			198			Total	
Per Year	112.1	112.1	112.1	100.7	87.8	84.3	67.9	67.9	66	66	66	Total

(Source: Courtesy Franck Viault Coordination for Asia and Central Asia - AIDCO/D1)

The above situation exemplifies a serious lack of coherence between geographical and regional food security programmes. As noted in the FSTP Strategy Papers, disasters have their most serious impact on the poor and food-insecure, who take longer to recover from livelihood shocks. The food

price spike of 2008 was a disaster for the poor, and it is difficult to see any justification for reducing efforts to promote their food security – particularly at a time when it is most needed.

3.2.6 Fostering advocacy and advancement of the food security agenda, harmonisation and alignment with development partners and donors:

The DCI introduced advocacy under the heading of global, continental and regional programmes as “advocating and advancing the food security agenda” It particularly mentions a) addressing key issues in the international debate, b) policy alignment of development partners and donors and c) promoting the role of CSOs

The TS added five specific issues within the overall strategy, namely: a) The Role of Food Aid, b) Poverty Reduction Strategy, c) Trade, d) Governance and e) The Right to Food.

The MIP reinforced the overall strategy but dropped the specific issues listed in the TS. It also noted the relevance of this programme to promoting the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and to funding the prior international commitments of the EC to international organisations (EIARD and GDPRD). € 8,000,000 was allocated to the strategic priority through the MIP – less than 1% of the total.

Although the SP is very small by comparison with the other components it has an important role to play both in promoting the food security agenda and the international level and in encouraging the participation of non-state actors in the debate. It has potential synergy with the policy development role of SP3 and could be used to fund studies, conferences and publications in all areas of the FS.

4. ANALYSIS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 MAIN FINDINGS REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION

4.1.1 Complementarity, Coherence and Continuity

A review of project documentation indicates that submissions from Implementing Partners are required to address issues of complementarity and donor co-ordination, and these are routinely included in such submissions and reflected in the relevant action fiches. These describe what other EC programmes and the food security programmes of other donors are doing in the relevant field and how the proposed FSTP-supported project will complement them, avoiding duplication and fostering harmonisation and the partnership approach. In some cases, such variables are included as indicators in project log frames. It is thus clear that measures have been taken to foster complementary and coherence. It is, however, difficult in a desk review to establish to what extent initial commitments in this respect are reflected in project activities once approval has been secured. The main source of information at this level at the moment is in the responses to the questionnaire surveys, (see Annex 5, Table 4.1.1.) Again the assessments from the field tend to be more positive than those from EC HQ. While half of the HQ respondents felt efforts to promote complementarity had been adequate, six of the eight delegations reported positively in this respect. This may reflect a situation in which complementarity etc, is better in the field than it is at HQ level. In addition, the six delegations which reported positively were in countries supported under the LRRD approach of SP4. The other two delegations were much less positive about this, so it may be that this is a feature of projects under SP4, which are administered by the delegation.

In the area of LRRD there is a growing level of co-ordination, and therefore complementarity of action, between ECHO staff and those responsible for SP4. This is particularly marked in North Korea, where EC humanitarian activities that had been supported by ECHO during the severe flooding of July 2006 were used by FSTP as a platform on which to build a more development-oriented programme in accordance with the LRRD approach. In many cases the NGOs that had worked with ECHO became partners of the LRRD effort under FSTP, so that there was a good level of continuity. This is not an isolated case. A common framework (*Transition Country Situation Analysis and Main Lines of Action for a Consolidated Response*) has been developed for use in assessing situations on the ground, and this "Is meant to provide support to delegations in looking at the relief-rehabilitation-development 'contiguuum' and ensure that essential co-ordination and dialogue is taking place at all three stages: (i) Understanding of situation; (ii) Needs assessment; and (iii) Analysis and response". (The questionnaire is attached as Annex 8) This joint approach is being piloted in nine countries.

Complementarity with the FF is more difficult to assess, as the latter is so new. The activities funded by the FF are (i) measures to improve access to agricultural inputs; (ii) other small-scale measures aimed at increasing agricultural production, (e.g. microcredit, rural infrastructure, training and support to professional groups in agriculture); and (iii) social transfers to vulnerable population groups, often in the form of labour-intensive public works (roads, irrigation projects etc) in line with the productive safety net model. This suggests that there is a high degree of complementarity, since, like the FSTP, the FF is meant to fund both food availability and food access, but the FF does so through modalities in which the FSTP has not been particularly active. There is already a degree of collaboration between FF and FSTP, as in the case of the two programme's contribution to the UNOPS Trust Fund in Burma/ Myanmar to address the aftermath of Cyclone Nargis.

In the case of the geographical instrument, the situation is very different. Most respondents and interviewees reported that complementarity and continuity are poor, and it was strongly argued by EC HQ staff members who are independent of FSTP that these attributes have been seriously eroded since discontinuation of the Food Security Budget line: the Country Strategy Papers have not played their expected role in boosting food security in the most food-insecure countries, so that unreasonable expectations have been created for the FSTP. The analysis presented in §3.2.4 above supports this view in the crucial area of funding.

Complementarity with national policies and programmes is a requirement under the *Paris Declaration* and the *Accra Agenda for Action on Aid Effectiveness*, and is enforced by the EC Quality Support Group. However, in programmes that are regional, continental or global in nature, such co-ordination is very difficult, because the various countries involved have separate, and sometimes quite sharply

contrasting, policies and programmes. Where FSPT interventions are at national level, project documentation indicates that it is a requirement that this issue be addressed. Again the problem of verifying the extent to which such commitments are translated into action arises, but all of the delegations that responded to the questionnaire indicate that FSTP-supported activities are in line with national policy documents such as the PRSP and national food security policy, where these exist.

Specific procedures to ensure complementarity between FSTP and other donors vary with Strategic Priority and with the level of geographic spread of the activity. At the national level, delegations check with donor coordination groups and with active international organisations. Implementing agents reported good co-ordination of donors to ensure complementarity while one reported that donors and member states each have their own procedures and "follow them strongly". At the global and regional level, normal procedures for the formulation of activities and the preparation of action fiches should ensure that the issue is addressed. Fiches which have not adequately considered the issue of complementarity will not pass the QSG process

Generally speaking donor co-ordination has improved in the wake of the *Paris Declaration* and the *Accra Agenda for Action on Aid Effectiveness*, in such forms as in-country donor thematic groups, budgetary support groups and joint funding of various projects. An example of the latter is the response to Cyclone Nargis in Burma/Myanmar, which comprises a trust fund (Myanmar Livelihood and Food Security Trust Fund – LIFT) to which FSTP is contributing alongside DfID-Burma and AusAID. In the case of SP 1, consultations with member states are held through EIARD – this gives the opportunity to develop complementary or joint actions with member states.

No clear instances of division of labour between FSTP and other donors were identified in the responses to the questionnaire; although delegations responded that there is normally a geographical or sectoral division of labour. Donor coordination groups exist within each country but, food security is rarely discussed at the meetings. It appears from the responses and the available reports that there is "plenty of work for everyone" so duplication is unlikely to be a problem.

Although there is a risk that global initiatives will have a high transaction cost, it is expected that greater complementarity will be achieved through co-ordination of donor actions in global or regional initiatives. One respondent summed up the position as: "transaction costs in multi-country multi-actor global initiatives can be very high, but one should compare these costs with the ownership, relevance, impact and sustainability of these initiatives". This may be true but the frustrations and delays which occur are often more apparent than any progress and positive outcomes. An example of this is the SSA challenge programme under SP1 – this took several years to establish due to the complications of organising collaboration between African countries and NGOs, the CGIAR centres and administration and donors.

It is too early to tell what the results will be for the FSTP activities but it seems clear that the global programmes on linking information with policy making have not yielded results so far.

The current approach to financing global, continental, regional and national programmes is subject to much criticism, particularly regarding the potential impact on food security. In many cases the implementation of continental or regional actions is delayed: often they simply do not work without complementary action at national level. Implementation at global, continental and regional levels is often not clear, and it is regrettable that the current FSTP mandate does not allow for more flexibility to become operational also at country level.

This criticism is largely justified, considering the origin of the FSTP after the abolition of the FSBL with the former's rigid requirement to be only subsidiary to geographic instruments based on the hypothesis that workable value added could be created by such a modality. In many cases, capacity problems at regional level are the main cause of the ineffectiveness of the non-geographic approach. However, the present approach of geographic and thematic acting in parallel can also be seen as useful providing added value in situations of a clear integration of FSTP actions within the framework of RIPs or CSPs or in LRRD situations.

Partner countries and other stakeholders are often confused when the EC adopts different procedures and approaches at the same time which are not necessarily well co-ordinated and complementary to

each other due to the fact that actions at global, continental or regional level do not necessarily translate down and integrate into national country strategies and programmes. On the positive side, it is important to take into account the increased interest by regional organizations to discuss food security with the EU in the policy dialogue. Also, there is a growing trend for continental and regional organizations to include FS and nutrition as themes in their evolving strategies and policies.

Regarding the changing priorities of other donors, the continuity of the challenges posed in the FS/ agriculture sector for cooperation agencies assures a certain stability of the actions of major players in the sector although some donors may have their own agenda. There is also a gradual shift from initial emergency food aid to developmental approach across the international donor community as a common trend. In some instances, there is also the phenomenon of replication by other projects and donors of positive results of some FSTP projects.

FS was a low priority for some donors for some years. More recently, a new emphasis by the international community (following the WDR 2008) on agricultural development including food security has emerged. The recent changes of landscape (soaring food prices, climate change, global economic crisis and resulting increase of food insecurity) have finally moved the issue of FS higher on donors' agendas. Food Security is now being discussed at G8, UN level (HLTF and CFA) and many more countries are showing commitments to improve FS in the world (see for example pledges made at the conference in June 2008, launch of GPAFS). A WB Trust Fund was also started (with a small contribution also by the EC FF) which, however is criticised for its vertical nature.

The 2005 Visibility Guidelines have been replaced by the 2008 Visibility Manual¹⁵. All implementing partners (IPs) under contracts and financing agreements are required to apply them, including IOs. A Joint Visibility Action Plan has been signed between EC and UN in 2006 (based on the 2003 Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement/ FAFA), and Joint Visibility Guidelines for EC-World Bank actions in the field is being finalised. In multi-donor actions, such as Trust Funds, EC contribution is to be included in a broader visibility and communication design. Actions (projects) financed or co-financed by EC need to have an in-built budget for visibility and communication. The visibility comprises *inter alia* reporting (inception, progress and completion reports), stationery, leaflets, brochures, display panels, newsletters, press releases, public events and visits, websites and information campaigns. Use is made of central messages about the shared commitment to communicate the positive results of the partnership also in the interest of transparency in the use of public funds. A basic standard is display of the EU flag and reference to the EU as funder along with a disclaimer. The EU is portrayed also with the following standard key messages: "The world's biggest donor at the service of the Millennium Goals"; "Co-operation that counts"; "The EU delivers"; and "More, better, faster - Europe cares".

4.1.2 Technology Development

During the planning of the global components of SP1 there was a strong participation of RTD staff which enabled the development of the FSTP and FP7 activities to be coordinated. In some cases similar research themes were included in the FSTP and the FP7-FAB programmes and synergies should emerge from these. Complementarity with FP7-FAB will be ensured by emphasizing the global aspect and the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders in the FSTP programme whereas the FP7-FAB programme concentrates more on benefits to European research.

Six Networks for International Cooperation have been set up under the FP7 programme. These are aimed at advancing bi-regional cooperation in the field of science and technology. The networks could prove a useful resource for the FSTP research programme – for the identification of research themes, for assistance in forming partnerships between research organisations and for the dissemination of results. The PAEPARD platform can also be used for this purpose.

During the planning of the research activities to be funded outside the CGIAR centres the possibility of a joint RTD – AIDCO programme was explored but it was decided that this would be impractical due to procedural differences between the two services and due to the different implementation timetables.

¹⁵ See: Communication and Visibility Manual for EU external actions, EuropeAid, April 2008

The total annual funding on research activities has been stable for several years (except for the hiatus in 2006 caused by administrative problems and compensated in 2007). The EC contribution to the CGIAR represents 6-7 % of the overall cost of the CGIAR at current exchange rates. This funding is highly valued by the CGIAR and enables much valuable research to be carried out with long-term benefits to food security. More funding would be welcome and useful but will be difficult to justify in competition with the demands of other SPs.

The global and regional projects funded outside the CGIAR are relatively new and it is difficult to assess their value at this stage. However, the Africa continental projects have been targeted at established institutes and networks and have every prospect of being successful. The global programme has five major themes:

1. "Conservation agriculture" (based on Agroecology) to combat land degradation in dry land areas
2. Innovation systems involving smallholders farmers and traditional knowledge in developing countries
3. Empowering small-holder farmers in the access to markets
4. Risk management in family agriculture in developing countries
5. Agricultural diversification (high value crops, organic agriculture, and underutilized species).

Following the 2007 review of the EC contribution to the CGIAR (2002-2005), all research projects supported by the EC have required that a delivery strategy should be developed at the planning stage. As it is generally impossible for research institutes themselves to ensure delivery, other partners, capable of disseminating the results must be an integral part of the project. There is obviously a limit to the number of these partners and weaknesses in national agricultural research organisations and extension services will affect the efficiency and effectiveness of the dissemination process. An element of capacity building for these organisations is generally included in the project proposals. The project designs are also required to strengthen linkages between ARD organisations in the north and south and with other key stakeholders.

Implementing partners also reported that dissemination is planned at an early stage. They do however recognise the difficulty of achieving effective dissemination to beneficiaries other than those directly involved in the project. A stronger multi-disciplinary approach is called for by one respondent in order to maximise the impact.

These delivery strategies are not limited to the CGIAR-based research projects all regional projects and the global call for proposals are taking dissemination aspects into consideration in their design. Two projects in Africa, those at the African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services and the Platform for African-European Partnership on Agricultural Research II are primarily aimed at knowledge sharing and the regional programme for Asia will be primarily targeted at supporting technology transfer.

4.1.3 Monitoring

Thematic programmes like FSTP (including contribution agreements with IOs) are subject to the Results-Oriented Monitoring (ROM) system of the EC. In addition, EC MTRs and final evaluations are usually built into the contracts (with own budgets). In case of UN agencies, evaluation is sometimes supposed to be carried out by the partner (e.g. FAO), but the EC prefers to have its own external evaluation system applied.

The EC's ROM system was introduced in 2000 and is now in its third phase, 2008-2010. It is mandated for all projects of external assistance in all regions and for centrally managed thematic projects. It is a rapid assessment method measuring onsite once a year (after start of implementation) of all ongoing projects (including *ex post* projects recently) of above M€ 1 EC contribution (a sample of about 40% is covered at the moment) the agreed standard criteria (relevance/ quality of design, efficiency, effectiveness, potential impact and likely sustainability) with a formal 4-point scoring system. AIDCO unit E5 (CRIS database) is the focal point. ROM and evaluations are managed within AIDCO by the respective geographical desks dealing with the FSTP components (plus delegations in some cases) with central (quality) oversight by unit F3. As most of the FSTP actions have not yet started or only started recently, no ROMs or evaluations have been carried out already. The first ROMs are planned for three projects in 2009 for three projects.

The FSTP forms a coherent framework of planning, implementation and M&E in itself. While descriptive elements of logical framework are contained in these design documents, no effort has been made to produce overall or SP specific LFs. The Review Team has reconstructed six LFs (for each of the six SPs) and integrated them into an overall FSTP Logframe. In addition, an assessment of the feasible and less feasible indicators defined has been undertaken (see Annex 7).

Most Objectively Verifiable Indicators are well thought out and are also easy to measure (e.g. number of PRSPs and other policy documents emphasising agriculture and FS, increase in agriculture/ FS activities in centres of excellence/ regional organisations under SP-3;), others are more difficult to measure (e.g. adoption of technologies and policies, degree of farmer participation under SP1).

In general, the existing intervention logic (when framed into LFs) can well be used for monitoring the FSTP and its six SPs and for identifying gaps, both in terms of intervention logic and systematics and in terms of implementation of the AAPs. Monitoring the overall implementation and evolution of the FSTP as well as of its six SPs and the AAPs is not undertaken at the moment. Monitoring of individual AFs is left to the AIDCO geographical and thematic units and EC (regional) delegations on a largely project specific basis. LFs of growing quality and detail as contained in the newer AFs (AAP 2009.) together with the monitoring frameworks used by IPs (performance assessment matrices etc. in the case of UN agencies, IP's own monitoring instruments, such as AWPBs (Annual Work Programmes & Budgets) and LFs in the EC format in some cases), are more and more used. There is room for the systematic monitoring of the overall FSTP and SPs/AAPs by using a unified LFA structure and taking into account useful indicators already contained in the existing documents.

Logical gaps exist in SP5 where agricultural reform, social protection systems and pilot testing is contained under "special allocation" (the latter having been added due to the global food price crisis using FSTP's flexibility mandate). Gaps in implementation appear to exist in the areas of surveillance/ disaster preparedness systems in Asia and disaster risk reduction in Africa (SP3), and in the SP6 implementation in general. Some overlapping occurs between some SPs such as between SP2 and SP5 (donor alignment/ coordination), between SP1 and SP2 (research & development as subcomponent in SP2), between SP2 and SP3 (information dissemination/ awareness rising subcomponent), between SP3 and SP6 (pilot initiative subcomponent).

In many cases parallel monitoring by the partner organisation (IO, IGO, and CSO) is taking place. This stream of information is also used by EC joint management (regional delegations, AIDCO) as valuable monitoring data. Some implementing partners, particularly those from IOs or linked to global governance structures such as CGIAR centres or ILC have their own sophisticated M&E system which will be applied independently of any additional EC ROMs. These systems (FAO) include LFA, Performance Assessment Matrix (prepared during Inception Phase), monitoring at all levels (inputs, outputs, outcomes, impact); also mid-term and final evaluations are foreseen in some EC/FAO cooperation programmes (South East Asia); other systems (ILC) include M&E framework at three levels (performance of work plan and budget, strategy framework outcome, outcome of global network, processing indicators); external evaluation of outputs, outcomes and impact is used in the case of CGIAR centres, besides monitoring of governing bodies at three levels. Another example (Uganda, Bangladesh) is the employment of a PME expert paid by the IP to guide other IPs to properly monitoring activities.

In the case of IOs as FAO, LF application is planned or already applied (sometimes in parallel to own Performance Assessment Matrix); MTR and terminal evaluations will also be used. In other cases, the instrument described in the grant proposal (CGIAR centres) will be used (LF in the case of ILC, embedded in own results based M&E framework). In interviews, reference was made to the indicators contained in the standard documents (LFs) to be used as a routine. Country-specific LFs are foreseen for the inception phase with indicators to be developed with in-country stakeholders (FAO). Other examples comprise: Country Strategy Support Programs to develop their own performance indicators (CGIAR centres); own core and specific indicators were developed by members themselves but too early to assess their usefulness (ILC). Another example is indicators for cross-cutting issues included in the design (gender and environmental sustainability-related (FAO). In many cases, however it is regarded too early in the project cycle to assess any additional indicators to be developed only later during project implementation.

Summing up, it can be said that the EC's experience with ROM in general is very positive, allowing for quality measuring (quantitative and qualitative analysis) during implementation (and *ex post*) and of results by ODA sector. The EC ROM system is being reviewed annually. In 2007, 1,630 operations in 148 countries were monitored. It is constantly improved and currently being extended to sector policy support programmes. This instrument is regarded also useful for thematic programmes.

Regarding potential impact, in the absence of evaluations on comparative impact of geographic instruments over thematic programmes, it is difficult to assess any sizeable difference in the impact of national versus regional measures. In general, however it is widely agreed that country programmes (in the context of NIPs/CSPs) by nature have a much greater impact on the population concerned (who reside primarily in a given country and not a region or continent!) than thematic programmes at an abstract "global/ continental/ regional" level. Although, a trickling down effect of regional programmes to national country levels is foreseen in most SP-AFs, in reality it has not been proved to what extent and it is not to be expected as great as through a direct intervention at country level by nature. On the other hand, influencing and shaping regional FS policies in favour of food insecure national populations could lead to improved national policies which in turn lead to more effective, pro-poor policies ultimately benefiting the poor. Therefore, the indicators contained in the FSTP/TS-MIP and AAPs (as well as in some AFs) on the "coverage of food insecure, vulnerable target populations" and on "malnutrition/ under nutrition rates" would be very relevant if applied in monitoring both by EC and by IPs.

In conclusion, it can be said that FSTP did not exploit its in-built potential for a more pronounced monitoring by using the indicators available in the design documents. No Logframes were drafted nor applied for systematic monitoring. The EC ROM system as it is used for programmes funded under external action programmes is the right instrument also to be applied to the AAPs of the FSTP. Also, evaluations could be carried out in the near future.

4.1.4 Administration

Timing for commitments and payments appears to have been generally respected but there have been delays in the approval and contracting phase. This is particularly problematic when funding from a previous source has stopped and a hiatus occurs before EC funding commences. There are few delays in payment after the contracts are signed. Delays in signature of the contract can cause significant knock-on problems to project implementation – in particular in coordination of different programmes

The question of balance between project size and administrative cost was discussed extensively during meetings in Brussels. Many of the projects are managed wholly or partly by Brussels HQ. These include "centrally managed", "jointly managed" (with International Organisations) and centralised "calls for proposals". There are also a few "budget support" activities within the FSTP. Where activities are located within a single country the management of the contract or call for proposals is generally handled by the delegation.

The process of managing a project includes identification, formulation, quality control and approval. This is followed by contract negotiation, management of the activity and monitoring and evaluation. In the case of a call for proposals the documents must be prepared and queries answered during the call period. The proposals must be evaluated and again contracts negotiated. Some of these tasks may be delegated to consultants through framework contracts but many cannot. Inter-service consultation is necessary at many stages of the process and this adds to the workloads of other departments also.

Larger projects are a more efficient way of disbursing the FSTP funds for AIDCO. The largest centrally managed action during the period 2007-2009 is the 2008 SP1 support for the CGIAR at € 67.5 million. The smallest is the 2007 SP6 support to WFP (€ 200,000). While larger programmes clearly involve more work than smaller ones it is much easier to manage one project of € 67,000,000 than more than 300 projects of € 200,000 with the same total value.

Resources at AIDCO are limited. At present there is a major difficulty handling the existing projects and this burden will increase as more of the 2009 and 2010 projects come on-stream. AIDCO

simultaneously has to manage the Food Facility via the FF Task Force – and coordinate the activities of the two funds.

A wide range of activities is suitable for funding from the very large to the very small, as seen above. Although some small projects were funded in 2007 this is not now the case. For example, a minimum project size of € 3-4,000,000 was set for the African Regional and Continental subcomponent of SP4 (less than € 10,000,000 was considered “small”) despite the fact that much smaller projects were identified and considered worthwhile in the initial screening process. This restriction meant that many smaller organisations (including some of the Regional Economic Communities and other African organisations) could not participate in the FSTP as they do not have the capacity to handle large programmes. This reduces African ownership and undermines the intent of the Paris Declaration, the EU Africa Strategy¹⁶, the Communication 'Advancing African Agriculture'¹⁷ and the Joint EU-Africa Strategy¹⁸. This project size restriction is leading to more projects being funded through International Organisations. Besides the ownership issue mentioned above this also risks losing visibility as the funding is seen as coming from the international organisation not the EC.

Projects managed by delegations – including those devolved from centrally managed calls for proposals are often smaller but the problem of resources still exists at the delegations as they do not have staff dedicated to working on FSTP projects. Delegations noted that “small is often better” as communities and local organisations often do not have the capacity to handle large projects – but this does require more resources overall for project management.

4.2 MAIN FINDINGS REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION - BY STRATEGIC PRIORITY

4.2.1 Supporting the delivery of international public goods contributing to food security: research and technology

Support for the CGIAR has been central to the EC's ARD policy for many years. In 2007 the EC contributed € 45,000,000 to the CGIAR – half of this amount covered an unintended gap in funding in 2006.

In 2008 a three-year programme was set up to cover the remaining years of the MIP. The annual funding has remained constant at around € 22,500,000. This change in funding from single to multi-year reduces the overhead costs of the project and increases the stability of funding for the CGIAR centres. On the other hand it also reduces flexibility in funding to some extent. In line with the MIP and the AAPs the emphasis on Africa has increased (now 50% of the total). Since 2007 the funding has flowed through IFAD – replacing the earlier WB Trust fund mechanism. The new system with IFAD appears to be working well and opens up possibilities for improved donor coordination with IFAD.

The CGIAR funding has also moved more towards partnerships with other research organisations – particularly in Southern countries through increased funding to Challenge Programme. Support for climate change research has been specifically targeted through a new challenge programme. The number of projects supported at the CGIAR has been deliberately reduced from 50 in 2007 to 22 in 2010 in order to simplify the programme and reduce management costs within AIDCO.

The CGIAR was set up nearly 40 years ago and in that time has developed into a complex network of centres and governing bodies. It has been accepted for some years that reform was necessary. The EC has become an important agent for reform in the CGIAR system. The process is ongoing and has gained a strong acceptance from its members and research centres. It is expected that this process will lead to greater participation of southern organisations and increase the emphasis on technology transfer as well as applied research.

Also at the global level a call for proposals is being introduced for ARD outside the CGIAR. The 2009 allocation is € 5,000,000 but this is expected to be amalgamated with the 2010 programme which will bring the indicative combined budget to € 23,000,000. The overall objective of the call is “agricultural innovation for smallholder farmers in developing countries for food security, in the context of impact

¹⁶ COM(2005)489

¹⁷ COM (2007)440

¹⁸ Adopted in Lisbon, December 2007

and adaptation to climate change and in favour of economic development". Within this, six themes were chosen for support following a workshop held in April 2008: - "FARA & EFARD Consultation on agricultural research programming for FP7 and FSTP". Of these, five were chosen for the call for proposals.

Regional programmes for Africa are included in the 2008 and 2009 AAPs. These will support continental and sub-continental research programmes – specifically through Africa- based organisations and institutes FARA, ASARECA, ICIPE and CARBAP. The programme will also support the coordination of African research and extension and links with European research through its support for FARA, ASARECA, AFAAS and PAEPARD II. Regional programme for Asia and LA are being developed for 2010. The Asia programme will concentrate on technology transfer for food security in South and South East Asia.

A diverse range of funding, spread over CGAR centres and regional centres of excellence has the best chance of improving food security globally. It also maintains linkages with a wide range of southern research organisations, improving the visibility of the EC and offering opportunities for further collaboration with European Research Institutions. The available funds should not be spread too thinly, however, as the transaction cost of implementing and managing many small projects is high.

Support for the development and delivery of international public goods is a long-term process and impact is unlikely to be seen within the lifetime of the FSTP. However studies of agricultural research have repeatedly shown substantial benefits over the long-term. A delivery strategy is now required as part of every proposal submitted in this component. Partnerships with southern research centres and other stakeholders are also strongly encouraged.

CGIAR projects are monitored by ECART/NATURA¹⁹ using the ROM system. The use of ECART/NATURA experts enables the projects to be analysed from a scientific and management perspective. Joint monitoring of projects with other EU MS donors is being considered and would save time and cost for both the donors and research institutions.

4.2.2 Linking information and decision making to improve food security response strategies

As outlined in the strategy section, SP2 concentrates working with one major partner, the FAO (based on the mandate of MIP §4.2.2 and 5.1.2 that the TS should build on „long-term EC funding in partnership...with FAO as the leading international agency”, and that the complexity of SP2 „...requires...multi-stakeholder collaboration and partnerships with UN (FAO and WFP in particular)...“ This focus on cooperation with FAO is regarded as adequate, but weaknesses in the approach and budget allocation are discussed in the following.

As this component is phase III of EC-FAO cooperation in this field, it has seen mixed results in the last phase.²⁰ Regarding the current SP2 FAO global project, generally, while so-called multi-donor cooperation with international agencies (FAO, IFAD, WFP), has well developed so-called multi-stakeholder collaboration with other key players, notably EU MS has not been achieved. The goal of providing technical assistance to national administrations through the regional level to improve national information systems could not be reached during the previous phase and is also not evident in current planning due to limited budget for needs based country work. In one field, the development of the Integrated Phase Classification (IPC)²¹ system, good progress could be made.

¹⁹ NATURA (Network of European Agricultural Universities Related with Agricultural Development) and ECART (European Consortium for Agricultural Research in the Tropics)

²⁰ See: EC-FAO Joint Evaluation: Food Security Information for Action Programme, GCP/GLO/162/EC, Vol. I: Final Independent Evaluation Report, April 2009

²¹ The IPC programme is an analytical framework to classify the severity of food insecurity, being jointly developed and promoted by 8 international partners. The IPC has been piloted or is being progressively adopted in several countries in the Greater Horn of Africa, Western and Southern Africa and Asia with the support coming currently essentially from Humanitarian Donors (notably ECHO). The EC/FAO Global Programme is also contributing, though with a limited budget, to the technical development of the IPC.

Assessment of the AAPs 2007-10 shows the following. No project was contained in the 2007 AAP where SP2 is not even listed. The 2008 AAP contains the main project, the “EC Programme on linking information and decision making to improve food security”, the so-called “global project”, implemented with FAO (budget of M€ 6)²² with a monitoring sub-project for the South-East Asia region (budget M€ 2), and a sub-project in Central America with UNDP (budget M€ 3). The current global project is grouped under eight broad themes relating to major problems to be addressed.²³ These themes comprise also new issues having emerged in recent FS debates and which were missing in the original FSTP design, such as on resilience and vulnerability, integration of nutrition, climate change, markets and price volatility, household budget surveys, communication (albeit “social safety nets” or social protection are missing, only reference is made under some of the communication and knowledge sharing activities of theme 8). Also, the theme 7 on “food security and nutrition analysis and decision-making processes” shows weaknesses as no clear linkage between the need to use quality information for programme planning and policy-making is developed, an area which was already found to have been neglected under previous phases of the programme. The programme also addresses the global communication and advocacy concern (work with FAO’s new Global Learning Centre for Food Security/GLC4FS, TOT approach for FS trainers’ network in Africa, etc.). Implementation partners comprise known and new partners such as JRC, CTA, CILLS, ReSAKSS, MAFAP (Gates Foundation).

The global project can be regarded as having inadequate resources to undertake needs-based country work with some regions affected by serious food insecurity (e.g. East and Central Africa and Central Asia) not receiving any support through the component. Other gaps identified concern lack of regional partners for Central Asia and Greater Horn of Africa (although IGAD exists there); lack of cooperation with COMESA so far (no focal point foreseen). Theme 6 priorities for year 1 described in the main document relate only to IPC with no reference made to the issue of harmonizing IPC with other tools and approaches.

The result indicators proposed are fully in line with those contained in the FSTP-TS/ MIP. The programme commits itself to preparing annual workplans and allows for EC external monitoring missions. The independent evaluation of the predecessor project recommended to introduce outcome indicators “... to include policy changes that result from decisions that are based on better information provided by the FSIS; allocation of budget resources to geographical areas on the basis of vulnerability status; or line item government resources used to pay for the implementation of introduced tools and maintenance of trained staff. To achieve country level impact, it is also recommended to “tie the global programme into a complementary in-country project or programme”, such as “an existing FSIS that is already functioning, such as those in Malawi, Mozambique or Kenya”. Further details of the assessment are to be found in Annex 9.

The South East Asia (SEA) sub-component (with a budget of M€ 2) focuses on selected Greater Mekong sub-regional countries (Lao PDR, Cambodia and Myanmar) and is embedded in the ASEAN FS Information System (AFSIS) implemented by the Thailand Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives

²² The predecessor project was called “EC/FAO Food Security Information for Action Programme (2005-2008)” (FSIA project) and was phase II of the EC/FAO joint project on strengthening food security and nutrition information systems (FSNIS). The FSIA project was quite successful in improving the availability and quality of FS information, its main accomplishment being the development, consolidation and fine-tuning of a number of instruments and tools, including: Crop Monitoring (CM) Box; CountryStat; Food Security Statistics Module (FSM); GIEWS Workstation (GIEWS WS); Integrated Phase Classification (IPC); Nutrition assessment tools: Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS) and Household Food Insecurity and Access Scale (HFIAS), and Training package for improved reporting on food security and nutrition. It was assessed as less successful in its second main objective of linking FS information to evidence-based decision-making in the 17 countries where it was applied. This weakness is related to a number of factors, including the number of countries across which it was spread and which should be decreased, so that more resources would be available per country. As the budget of the new global programme is already overstretched, it was recommended that the EC Consultancy Fund needs to be used more strategically in supporting the new programme (from: EC-FAO Joint Evaluation of FSIAP, April 2009).

²³ See: EC/FAO Programme on linking information and decision making to improve food security 2009-2011, Inception Report, 5 June 2009

(MOAC) as part of the ASEAN Integrated FS (AIFS) Framework and Strategic Plan of Action on FS (SPA-FS).

The sub-component on Central America (Nicaragua, Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras) was planned on information systems in Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) with a budget of M€ 3 (to be topped up by M€ 2 for 2010) as „Regional Programme of Information Systems in Food Security and Nutrition in Central America“(PRESISAN) to be started in 2009. It is relevant and complementary to other ongoing EC funded actions both under FSTP and geographic instruments. Efficiency/ effectiveness, impact and sustainability prospects appear good given joint management modality with UNDP and professional approach and high commitment by partner countries.

The AAP 2009 contains three projects (combined budget of M€ 18):

- “Linking information and decision-making to improve food security response strategies in CILSS and CEDEAO [ECOWAS] countries” (M€10 over four years) focused on 17 eligible countries in the West Africa region managed by the EC Delegation Burkina Faso.

The project is highly relevant to improving reliable data bases and coordinated response strategies and HRD on FS in West Africa. Efficiency/ effectiveness and impact prospects are good with the involvement of other donors in the Steering Committee (USAID, France, and FAO). Ownership by ECOWAS remains to be seen. Coherence/ complementarity/ value added are high as parallel FSTP projects are being implemented in the same region.

- “Technical and scientific support for food security information for decision-making in Sub-Saharan Africa” (M€ 5) relates to the Horn of Africa region with JRC as implementing partner

The project is highly relevant focusing on remote sensing technologies to be applied for FS, building on the long involvement (including IPC methodology) of the EC in this chronically food insecure region. Efficiency/effectiveness prospects are good given the involvement of strong institutions like JRC. Also, impact prospects are high given the application of state of the arte technologies to be applied and the groundwork laid already.

- Information systems “Information systems to improve food security decision making in the ENP-East Region” (M€ 3, see above) in Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia and Moldova. This project will be implemented (in joint management) with FAO.

The relevance of this project is very high as the area of primary data collection for agriculture sector has been very much neglected by the international development community in the last two decades. However, the funding is inadequate (M€ 3 for four countries) to assure that agricultural censuses or sufficient data can be collected, so impact prospects are uncertain at the moment. But the EC “seed money” provided is strategic. Efficiency/ effectiveness prospects are high given FAO joint management. Coherence/ complementarity/ value added: By substance, great, by geographic embededness with other regional programmes somewhat isolated.

For the entire component, of the M€ 65 to be spent over 2007-2010, M€ 41 has been programmed so far (M€ 11 in 2008, M€ 21 in 2009 and M€ 9 for 2010), M€ 24 are technically still available for 2010, but part of this possibly has already been pre-programmed for newly identified projects for 2010 (UNICEF proposal on child malnutrition in Asia, ASEC proposal for FSIS and social safety nets in Asia, IFPRI proposal for Africa).

Component	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total	Planned
Information and decision-making	0	11,000,000	21,000,000	9,000,000	41,000,000	65

4.2.3 Exploiting the potential of continental and regional approaches to improve food security

The 2007 AAP contains only one SP 3 project, “*Better Training for Safer Food in Africa*”, implemented by DG SANCO with a budget of M€ 10. Its objective is to enhance the safety of agricultural produce

for improved nutritional value and tradeability through training and capacity building across six regions in Africa. A subcomponent concerns the OIE World Animal Health & Welfare Fund with a budget of M€ 1.89. With the design phase underway from 2007 to 05/2009, this project had a very slow start.²⁴ In the absence of a ready design document it is too early to assess the expected impact and sustainability.

The 2008 AAP contains two projects under SP-3 (budget M€ 10): *“Support to Farmers’ Organisations in Africa Project (SFOAP)”* implemented jointly with IFAD (EC contribution M€ 5) working with four regional farmers’ platforms composed of farmers’ organisations (FOs), ROPPA (14 members), PROPAC (10 members), SACAU (14 members) and East African Farmers’ Federation (EAFF (8 members) plus the pan African Farmer Platform. Its focus is on FO capacity-building for lobbying (influencing agricultural policies and research agendas²⁵). Started in 01/2009, it reached inception stage²⁶. Project design involved the four RFOs in a needs based way. A LF and detailed cost tables exist with M&E arrangements at different levels. With nearly half of National FO members women, gender activities play a great part.

“Strengthening CAADP Institutions and Processes” implemented through a World Bank Trust Fund (EC contribution M€ 5). CAADP is coordinated by AUC/ NEPAD and RECs. Its objectives are higher levels of agricultural production and growth (Maputo goal of 10% national budget share for agriculture sector) organised around four pillars; (i) sustainable land and water management (lead institution: CILLS/ Univ. Zambia); (ii) market access and infrastructure (lead: CMA/ AOC); (iii) food security (lead: CILLS/ Univ. KwaZuluNatal); (iv) agricultural research and innovation (lead: FARA, plus ASARECA, WECARD, SADC/FANR). The program document of the multi-donor Trust Fund (MDTF) of November 2008²⁷ describes the Results Framework and Chain (proposed budget of US\$ 55 million 2009-13).

The 2009 AAP contains five projects under SP-3 (budget of M€ 29.0945, M€ 37 in recent programming table): *“Putting a pro-poor agenda into practice - support for the International Land Coalition”* in joint management with IFAD (EC contribution M€ 2.950). It builds on a predecessor project with EC 2007-09 in Africa, Asia, LA (for about 15 M€)²⁸. The project is focused on Africa (Benin, Niger; DRC, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Madagascar) with the objective to ensure that natural resources/ land are accessed and used equitably and managed sustainably reducing vulnerable households’ food insecurity through pro-poor land policy reform and influencing policy dialogue based on broad membership comprising IGOs and global, continental, regional and national and local level CSOs.

“Regional Cassava Initiative in support of vulnerable smallholders in Central and Eastern Africa” in joint management with FAO (budget M€ 4.761). The project relates to the seven countries most affected by new strains of viruses threatening the entire cassava production mostly of subsistence smallholders on marginal lands and thus their food security status (Tanzania, Burundi, Rwanda, Uganda, DRC, CAR, and Gabon). It is the continuation of previous ECHO assistance 2006-09 (M€ 2). Its main components (results) relate to improved (a) variety distribution, (b) surveillance and (c) cassava commissions in countries (following the positive example of Burundi). Main partners are MOAs, NARS and CBOs and global and regional institutions like IITA, ASARECA.

“Livestock for Livelihoods: Strengthening Climate Change Adaptation Strategies through Improved Management at the Livestock-Wildlife-Environment Interface” in joint management with AU-IBAR (budget M€ 4.883) coordinated by DEC Nairobi. The project is still in an early stage. It is a follow-up to a previous similar project funded by UNEP/GEF in Kenya and Burkina Faso. It will cover four transboundary “hotspots” being natural parks and/or transhumance related fragile ecosystems of the ASAL type (involving 12 countries). It aims at strengthening livestock-based livelihoods and improving

²⁴ EC/ SANCO, Mid term Evaluation of the „Better training for safer food in Africa“ activities, FWC/ Lot 3, Inception Report version 1.0, FCEC, 31.03.2009

²⁵ Unfortunately no more mentioned in LF

²⁶ Support to Farmers Organisations in Africa Programme, Continental Programme of Work, June 2009

²⁷ The CAADP Trust Fund Program Document, A Multi-Donor Trust Fund to Support the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP), November 05, 2008

²⁸ See: Final Action Implementation Completion Report on the ILC’s Action „Land and Sustainable Development: Linking Secure access to the Implementation of Environmental Agreements, ILC 2009

food and environment security in ASALs in response to increasing risks from and vulnerability to climate change.

“Supporting the Platform for rural development and food security in Western and Central Africa” in joint management with UNOPS (EC contribution M€ 3.5). It is based on a predecessor project with the same title (IFAD-EU-UNIFEM-France), called the “rural Hub” (evaluated in 2007). The project is designed as Phase II coordinated by DEC Dakar and with the objective to improve coherence and effectiveness of policies and programmes of the Region (Western and Central Africa) through dialogue and coordination of regional and national stakeholders around relevant themes in RD and FS. Despite its role as an expertise network (64% of funds foreseen for TA), ownership appears to be weak, and problems exist reportedly with the implementing agency foreseen (UNOPS, financial problem with the Hub in Senegal).

“Regional Programme of Food Security and Nutrition in Central America II –PRESANCA II” in joint management with UNDP (EC contribution M€ 13) and as a successor to PRESANCA I ending in September 2009 covering the four countries of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua coordinated by DEC Managua. Its objective is to reduce food and nutritional insecurity among the most vulnerable populations by strengthening consistency between regional and national (sector) policies and linking up with sub-national level through a local development fund (FONSAN). It focuses on human resources development at regional level, and a bi-national or tri-national (border area) approach for effecting decision-making at country level through local associations of municipalities.

Overall analytical assessment: The three AAPs under implementation comprise a set of diverse projects with a strong focus on Africa (food safety, Farmers organisations to influence policies, land access for poor smallholders, crop diseases/ nutrition for smallholders, agro-pastoral livelihoods and climate change, dialogue platform) and with just one major project in another region, Central America. Except for two projects which show weaknesses (food safety with a very slow design phase ranging from 2007-2009, and “Platform for Rural Development” with an array of planned activities without a clear focus), the projects are all highly relevant and with strategic and innovative focus.

It is evident that the project selection based on the mandate as defined did not allow for assembling projects which would aim in the same direction such as would have been possible when aligning them under a common theme such as the “pillars” of food security. On the other hand, when looking at the re-constructed Logframe of the SP3 (see Annex 7), there were three results planned for Africa, (a) disaster and risk reduction, (b) policy development and harmonisation, and (c) sustainable management of natural resources. The programmes implemented appear to have not much in common with this planning as only two out of seven show a clear linkage to the planned results (see following table):

SP3 - Africa, AAPs 2007 - 2009: Linkage of Projects to three Results Planned				
	(a) Disaster & Risk Reduction	(b) Policy Development & Harmonisation	(c) Sustainable Management of Natural Resources	Comment
2007 AAP				
• food safety				no linkage
2008 AAP				
• SFOA				no linkage
• CAADP		X		clear linkage
2009 AAP				
• ILC				no linkage
• Cassava				no linkage
• Livestock			X	clear linkage
• Platform		X		some linkage

There are clear weaknesses in the overall selection of themes and their geographical distribution in this SP. Only one out of eight projects is outside Africa, with Asia completely missing until today. Neither the pillars of FS nor the systematics foreseen in the design document (see re-constructed LF,

Annex 7) were followed (for Asia for example, focusing on improved nutritional status of vulnerable groups focusing on chronic malnutrition). New and emerging issues such as on social safety nets/ social protection for building resilience to shocks are not reflected in the choice of projects. SP3 would be the right place to launch regional platforms on social transfers/safety nets including issues of poverty targeting and vulnerability on a continental basis (South-South networking among countries, exchange of lessons learned and best practices etc.).

The overall component of SP3 with its four AAPs over the period 2007-2010 has been allocated an indicative budget of M€ 135 (Africa M€ 100, Asia M€ 20, Latin America M€ 15). According to original planning, for Africa M€ 6 are not yet committed, for Latin America M€ 2 (see table in annex 6).

However, in real spending this plan was not fully reached:

- for 2007, the 10 M€ for Africa were committed, albeit with one project which did not yet materialize until mid 2009 still being in the design phase
- for 2008, the 10 M€ planned for Africa again were committed as planned, with two very innovative and strategic projects
- for 2009, for Africa four projects were committed (three of which highly relevant and prospective) with a volume of M€ 16 instead of M€ 24 planned according to schedule (balance of M€ 8)
- for 2009, one major project was committed for Latin America for M€ 13 as planned
- over 2007-09, for Africa and Latin America, M€ 49 were committed instead of M€ 57, leaving a balance of M€ 8
- for 2010, commitments are planned: for Africa M€ 50 and for Asia and Latin America M€ 20, leaving an additional balance of M€ 8 from the M€ 135 to be spent through the four AAPs 2007-10.

The overall budget volume and structure can be regarded as being appropriate also for the FSTP II follow-up phase in principle as it represents a reasonable distribution of funds across the priority continents of Africa with a planned share of 74%, followed by Asia with 15% and Latin America 11%.

4.2.4 Addressing Food Security in Exceptional Situations of Transition and in Fragile Situations

The countries covered under this SP are: Afghanistan, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo Brazzaville, Cuba, DRC, East Timor, Guinea Conakry, Haiti, Liberia, Myanmar, North Korea, Palestine, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan and Zimbabwe. It is not entirely clear why these particular countries were selected. At one point DG-Dev developed draft ToRs for the Inter Service Food Security LRRD Group, which contained a set of criteria for selecting countries where food security remains a concern after relief is phased out. However a number of different DGs were involved in discussions on the approach, and agreement could not be reached on the criteria. In the end the above list of countries was proposed and adopted without any apparently systematic approach to selection. Certainly the above list reflects the original title of SP4, which was 'Linking Relief and Rehabilitation to Development in Exceptional Situations of Transition and in Fragile and Failed States', for clearly many of the countries in the list fall into the latter category. However, a more systematic approach is required – not least because the food crisis has propelled several countries that had previously been viewed as stable towards the 'fragile state' or 'fragile situation' end of the spectrum. The original intention was to develop a strategy paper for each LRRD country, but this would have taken nine or ten months, and there was insufficient time to do this before SP4 was launched, so it was launched through the 'Calls for Proposals' route, with a series of 'LRRD fiches'.

After the countries were selected, AIDCO developed an FSTP framework 'LRRD Country Situation Analysis and Main Lines of Action' (see Appendix 7.8), with ECHO input, in order to facilitate analysis of the situation on the ground and inform decisions on the most appropriate types of response. These were then sent to the respective delegations for completion, after which the programme was decided. This part of the Programme is implemented by the delegations.

The activities supported in LRRD countries were selected by the delegations after the Calls for Proposals and were sanctioned by both DG-DEV and the AIDCO geographical desks based on their

perceived relevance to political and humanitarian considerations. The projects that were selected may usefully be grouped as follows:²⁹

- Restoring and supporting livelihood systems in post-conflict situations (Burundi, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Sudan)
- Rehabilitating agriculture and addressing nutritional issues in the very acute post-crisis phase where malnutrition rates have worsened (Burundi, Central African Republic, Congo Brazzaville and DRC)
- Rehabilitation of infrastructure to prevent natural disaster (North Korea)
- Addressing the prevention and treatment of malnutrition while supporting livelihoods in volatile and fragile situations (Somalia, Sudan)
- Increasing food production and other income-generating activities (Afghanistan, Central African Republic, North Korea, Somalia, Sudan)
- Improving agricultural productivity, securing tenure and preventing disruption of assets within the context of recession of political, economic and social conditions (Guinea Conakry, DRC, Palestine, Zimbabwe)
- Improving living conditions of long-term refugees (Chad, Palestine, Sudan)
- Creating the conditions for integration of refugees from RCA (Chad)
- Improving conditions for returning refugees (Afghanistan, Sudan)
- Improving access to basic services, including water supply, sanitation, health and education (Afghanistan, Chad, Palestine)
- Improving access to markets (East Timor, Palestine, Somalia, Zimbabwe)
- Cash transfers (Palestine, Somalia)
- Support for agricultural recovery in areas hit by natural calamity (Haiti, Myanmar, North Korea)
- Supporting donor co-ordination (Afghanistan, Burundi, DRC, Guinea Conakry, Haiti, North Korea, Palestine, Sudan, Somalia)

This list of activities indicates that SP4 is supporting all three 'pillars' of food security: availability (by support to agriculture), access (through social transfers, cash transfers and livelihoods support) and food utilisation/nutrition (through improved sanitation, drinking water supply and basic health). In terms of overarching themes, it is by definition attuned to addressing vulnerability, but there is no very clear or systematic connection to gender aspects of vulnerability and food insecurity.

The LRRD transition process has four stages, although as noted earlier (§3.2.4) these are not necessarily linear. The stages are: (i) disaster prevention and preparedness, (ii) humanitarian relief; (iii) post-disaster rehabilitation and (iv) transition to development. FSTP has not as yet done a great deal in terms of disaster preparedness, apart from the programme in North Korea, which aims to rehabilitate coastal flood protection infrastructure. Measures such as construction of cyclone/hurricane shelters, the creation of flood defences and plinth building to protect homesteads and other assets in flood-prone areas, do not figure on the agenda. In terms of the second phase, emergency response is ECHO's responsibility, so that the emphasis has to be on co-ordination and continuity (see below). Much of the work under SP4 seems to concentrate on rehabilitation, in such forms as restoring livelihood systems, rehabilitating agriculture, and programmes to assist longer-term refugees.

Although there has been progress towards co-ordinating ECHO and FSTP actions on LRRD, more needs to be done. This, however, entails overcoming some important challenges. One is that, while ECHO can mobilise funding and respond to a humanitarian crisis rapidly, the programming and implementation cycles of FSTP are rather lengthy, involving several DGs, then the delegations, then (in many instances) the Calls for Proposals process. The SP4 focus on 'failed states' in itself imposes further delays, for obvious reasons. Hence, for example, the budget for Zimbabwe programmed for 2008 has not yet been implemented. The problem this creates for LRRD is that ECHO is limited to short term interventions (maximum 12-18 months), so that it may have completed its operations and withdrawn before FSTP can mobilise resources to link the relief and rehabilitation phases to the

²⁹

In addition to this, in 2008 SP4 provided € 50 million as part of the EC response to soaring food prices. This, however, cannot be classified as an LRRD approach, and appears to have been placed under this SP for administrative reasons.

development phase, so that gaps emerge, momentum is lost, and LRRD as a process is compromised.

ECHO is presently developing a 'European Commission Humanitarian Food Assistance Policy', which deals, *inter alia*, with the issue of LRRD. If and when adopted, this policy will provide a stronger basis for collaboration between ECHO and FSTP. This should be helped by the fact that the Commission is also preparing an action plan to work in fragile states.

One project under SP4 which does not fit in with the LRRD theme is the 2008 initiative *EC Response to Soaring Food Prices: Cash Transfers to Most Vulnerable People and Market-Based Production Support Measures to Support Smallholder Farmers*, costed at M€50. The target beneficiaries are vulnerable poor consumers and smallholder poor farmers. The 'Risks and Assumptions' section of the AF notes the danger that market signals may not be well transmitted to farmers, so that they may not be able to benefit from increased urban food prices, and the paradoxical situation of a localised price collapse may ensue. This is a very real danger (as was amply demonstrated in the early days of the 'green revolution'). Unfortunately, it is in the least developed countries and in the most marginalised areas of all developing countries that markets function least effectively. Similarly with the other intended beneficiaries, vulnerable poor (urban?) consumers: if the initiative does not elicit a supply response, they will not benefit, except for any increase in purchasing power that results from the cash transfer element. Even this may be problematic, because in the absence of a supply response, cash injections could fuel further food price inflation.

4.2.5 Promoting Innovation to Combat Food Insecurity

4.2.5.1 Promoting Innovation

As noted in the relevant Action Fiche, 'This component is meant to stimulate and capture innovative and locally owned, sustainable solutions to current and future food security challenges. It provides an opportunity not only for civil society and other non-state groups, but also for different public and private institutions to develop, test and disseminate best practices and innovations, which may eventually be scaled up or replicated in other areas'. This part of the Programme, however, was not launched until the 2009 AAP. Progress to date comprises developing and deploying a mechanism for identifying innovative new approaches, and issuing Calls for Proposals in a number of countries.

The process of identification began by contacting delegations to seek their views, and the responses played a key role in shaping the programme. Such an approach is unlikely to produce too many cutting edge ideas, as the staff of donor agencies are not themselves project implementers, and are thus unlikely to possess the necessary detailed first-hand knowledge. Moreover, most of the reasonably detailed information they do possess is likely to be rooted in the activities of the EC's implementing partners, and therefore tied to approaches these agencies have tried. Such a process may capture some cutting-edge ideas, but it is also likely to miss a good many more.

The Action Fiche lists the themes to be addressed as:

- a. Pro-poor growth-orientated agriculture, fisheries/aquaculture and forestry with the emphasis on low-cost, locally owned, sustainable solutions
- b. Alternative production methods (e.g. organic agriculture) providing new market opportunities
- c. Food security and rural/local development (decentralisation, rural-urban linkages, local development and area-based management are priority areas in the new EU policy statement)
- d. Sustainable management of and access to natural resources (land, water and energy), impact of the degradation of natural resources and of climate change on household and national food security
- e. Urban and peri-urban food security, landless food-insecure people and income diversification through non-agricultural activities and agricultural non-food activities
- f. Nutrition and the neglected issue of "hidden hunger" (micronutrient deficiencies have an enormous impact on the lives of mothers and children in particular)
- g. Demographics, labour issues and migration
- h. Relations between key social issues and food security (social protection and safety nets, HIV-AIDS pandemic, sanitation, the role of education in fostering food security, etc.)
- i. Gender equity, minorities and ethnic groups usually targeted, such as the extremely poor and food-vulnerable

- j. Prevention and preparedness strategies to avert food crises or mitigate their effects
- k. Innovative approaches in Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development, in particular in complex and protracted crises.

It is noted that ‘this list is non-exhaustive and should be adapted to local conditions and assessed needs’.

Despite earlier-stated reservations about its provenance, this list is actually comprehensive in terms of covering the various aspects of food security, as is shown in the table below. Two of the themes (c and g) do not have any very obvious link to the pillars or cross-cutting issues, but some may emerge in the course of implementation.

Food Security Aspect	Food Security ‘Pillar’				Overarching Theme		
	Availability	Access	Utilisation/Nutrition		Gender	Vulnerability	Climate Change
			Utilisation	Nutrition			
Theme	a, d, e	a, b, d, i	f, h	a, f	i	j, k	d

The project will be implemented in Africa (Chad, Eritrea, Mauritania, Niger, Sudan and Zambia), Asia (Afghanistan, Cambodia, and Mongolia) and Latin America (Peru). Each item on the list will be implemented in specific countries, as pilot projects. However, given the lengthy timetable required to design, pilot, evaluate, conduct an ex-post evaluation, distil lessons and share experiences in South-South fora for possible future up-scaling, etc., it is disappointing that this project was not launched at the outset of FSTP in order to maximise the time horizon.

Although the identification process resulted in comprehensive coverage in terms of themes, a parallel approach which could have generated more cutting edge ideas would have been to organise a workshop with mainly non-EC staff who are implementing food security projects in the field, and who would be invited to share their experiences of innovative and promising approaches. NGOs and other civil society actors are obvious invitees, but others, such as private sector firms, academics and the staff of not-for-profit foundations could also usefully contribute ideas and share experiences. The foundations might play a particularly useful role, since many of them have a policy of funding innovative, high-risk (but also high potential) approaches of a type public sector donors tend to avoid. There is a precedent for this type of workshop under FSTP, as one was held under SP1 (see §4.2.1).

4.2.5.2 Special Final Allocation for ALA and EU Neighbourhood Countries

Given the serious concerns that were raised about this topic at the strategic level (§3.2.5), implementation issues seem of relatively minor significance – particularly as this element is being phased out. The interventions are of two basic types.

- a. Project and project-like activities
 - “Food Security for the Ultra Poor” (Bangladesh) [contribute to the reduction of extreme poverty and food insecurity of the most vulnerable women and their dependents].
 - “Yemen Food Security Programme” [foster economic development and job creation in agriculture, processing and exports; fulfil basic needs of those under the poverty line; contribute to food availability and access]
 - “Food Security Programme for Cambodia [support food security – in all its dimensions – of the most vulnerable groups in urban and rural areas]
 - “Food Security Programme for Lao PDR” [increase food security and incomes, particularly in rural areas, so that communities are better prepared, capable and resilient to cope with recurring ‘lean seasons’ as well as external shocks]
 - “Project in Support of the food-crop seed production for food security in Nicaragua” [reinforce technical support services, extension and entrepreneurship; improve seed quality]

The idea behind these projects was to continue to provide support to food security in the absence of funding through geographical instruments. However, since the geographical instruments do not appear to have ‘taken up the slack’, there is a danger that initiatives of this type will not so much ‘phase out’ as simply come to an end.

b. Support to Policy Reform

- “Sector Policy Programme Support Programme Kyrgyzstan” [creation of a more efficient social assistance system targeted at poor families and the establishment of institutions to better address the condition of deprived children]
- “Sector Policy Programme Support Programme Tajikistan” [assist the government in improving the design, management delivery and effectiveness of national policies in the social protection sector]
- “Georgia Food Security Programme” [maintain the momentum for reform in key areas of agriculture and the social sector during the transition towards the ENP through budgetary support]
- Armenia Food Security Programme” [similar to the above for Georgia]
- “Project in Support of the food-crop seed production for food security in Nicaragua” [contribute to the achievement of the general objectives of the Poverty Reduction Strategy, in the framework of the MDGs, with special reference to rural poverty and reduction of child malnutrition]

The policy process has four main phases: (i) policy formulation by political leaders, (ii) policy analysis and design of policy instruments by technical staff, (iii) policy enactment by parliament through new or amended legislation and/or regulations, and (iv) policy implementation by state actors through directives or by non-state actors through incentives/disincentives. Donor assistance is usually most effective in supporting (ii) and in building capacity for this. Phasing out will be facilitated only if this and the other three components come together effectively.

4.2.6 Fostering advocacy and advancement of the food security agenda, harmonisation and alignment with development partners and donors:

This component is by far the smallest of the six – with a budget of less than 1 percent of the total. The budget for the period 2007-2010 has been split into five actions over 2007 and 2008 AAPs.

The two activities in the 2007 AAP have been successfully completed:

1. A conference entitled “Taking Action for the World’s Poor and Hungry People” was jointly organised by IFPRI, and LGOPAD. The conference was held in Beijing in October 2007. The EC contributed € 500,000 - 28% of the total. No final report or *ex post* monitoring is yet available for this event.
2. Together with the Government of Canada the EC supported the development by the WFP of nutritional indicators for the International Food Aid Information System (INTERFAIS). The EU contribution to the project was € 200,000. The results can be seen on the WFP web site (<http://www.wfp.org/fais/>).

The three activities supported in 2008 are:

1. Support for EIARD (€ 1,300,000)
2. Support for GDPRD (€ 1,500,000)
3. A call for proposals “Strengthening Civil Society Networking in International Policy Dialogue for an Increased Food Security” (€ 4,500,000)

The purpose of EIARD - the European Initiative on International Agricultural Research for Development – is to “enhance the appropriateness and effectiveness of European investments in ARD at national, regional and international levels both in Europe and developing countries.”

GDPRD is the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development whose mission statement is “achieving increased development assistance impact and more effective investment in rural development and agriculture”

A call for proposals will use the remaining € 4,500,000 from the component to support the development of “Food Security Networks”. It aims to increase the capacity of the networks, as well as strengthen their contribution and participation to the international debate on food security.

All the activities in the 2007 and 2008 AAPs fit into the strategy outlined in the DCI, the Communication and the TS&MIP through increasing the international debate, harmonising partner and donor actions and strengthening CSOs and contribute to the Paris Declaration.

Several of the issues included in the Thematic Strategy are not well covered – eg the role of food aid, trade, governance and the right to food. Trade and Governance are covered to some extent in the regional and continental component SP3.

The EC has not so far financed studies into food security issues through this SP. Studies are an important means of providing information for policy makers and should be included in Phase II.

During discussions the capacity of organisations to participate in calls for proposals was discussed. Global and regional calls for proposals have been set up under SP1 and SP6 and more local calls have been used by delegations for the other SPs. Many organisations in developing countries need assistance in developing their proposals in such a way that they stand a realistic chance of success. It was suggested that a help desk or other mechanism be set up in association with these calls to ensure that good ideas are not lost for want of experience in proposal preparation.

It is particularly important for this component to be able to continue to fund relatively small interventions to make best use of the available budget.

5. STRATEGY - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PHASE II

5.1 STRATEGY OVERALL

5.1.1 From Mandate to Strategic Priorities

5.1.1.1 Conclusions

The mandate for Phase II is fixed by the DCI. This mandate is seen as covering the major aspects of FS and is sufficiently flexible to be able to respond to changes in priorities. It should not be changed at this stage of the FSTP.

The Strategic Priorities and the balance of input between them can and should be reviewed at this stage. From the analysis it has been found that all the SPs have the potential to make a contribution to food security and none should be dropped. SPs 1, 2, 3 and 6 have distinct goals and modes of action. SP4 and the geographical component of SP5 have substantial overlap and it may be appropriate to merge the LRRD and special allocation to ALA and Neighbourhood countries. This subject is covered in more detail in §5.2.5.2. The work on innovative approaches is the original part of SP5 and its contribution should not be lost in a merged SP4/5.

Regarding the budget allocation for Phase II the review team does not recommend any substantial change in the balance of the programme. SP2 and SP6 are relatively small and changing their allocation would not materially affect the other SPs. SP1 does good work and research funding needs stability. Both SP3 and the new SP4/5 could usefully use substantially more funds to maximise their potential but there is no source within the FSTP from which to take it.

5.1.1.2 Recommendations

No change is possible or desirable for the DCI at this stage, as sufficient flexibility exists within the current regulation.

Strategic Priorities 4 and 5 should be merged in Phase II.

No major changes in the allocation of funds are recommended for Phase II with the current funding of SP5 being taken with it to the combined SP4/5.

5.1.2 From Strategic Priorities to Programme

5.1.2.1 Conclusions

While it is not recommended to change the existing SP structure for the remainder period of the current FSTP (2010 AAP), however, a more systematic approach in programming future interventions (including remaining projects for the 2010 AAP as possible) would be considered very useful, such as could be seen in the AAP 2010 Africa subcomponent which was reoriented towards the original results proposed in the Logframe structure and validated by a formulation consultancy.

For Phase II of FSTP (2011-13), different strategic priorities could be defined reflecting recent changes in global FS policy and possibly grouped in the framework of the HLTF-CFA including the "pillars" of FS. The option is only whether this redefinition would occur within the present DCI mandate or a revised DCI to be sought from the EU policy-making levels (MS, EP, Council, and Commission) (See also annex 11)

5.1.2.2 Recommendations

For Phase II of the FSTP, new strategic priorities should be designed with a stronger internal cohesion. It should take into account more closely the current international debate of the day, including the pillars of FS, and the themes of nutrition and social protection, and should build coherent programmes around these by applying the logical framework approach (LFA) of PCM. Also, geographical coverage needs to be complemented by including from the onset relevant other regions than Africa, particularly hitherto relatively neglected regions like South and Southeast Asia.

5.1.3 From Programme to Food Security

5.1.3.1 Conclusions

The needs of the poor and vulnerable are directly addressed under FSTP only under the nationally-oriented projects of SP4 and SP5, although there is a significant element of indirect relevance to this constituency under SP1. This leaves an important problem of imbalance between the way that the FSTP addresses the 'pillars' of food security, with significantly more emphasis on availability than on access and utilisation/nutrition. In Phase II, therefore, there should be increased emphasis on food access and nutrition.

The recent food price spike and the fact that this is expected to herald an end to the era of falling real food prices provides an opportunity to give fresh impetus to the search for an effective regional agenda.

Asia, despite having many more undernourished people than SSA, and despite the fact that FSTP is meant to address gaps in geographical coverage, receives a disproportionately low share of the overall FSTP budget.

5.1.3.2 Recommendations

The food access and nutritional needs of the poor and vulnerable are best served at the national level and hence in the areas presently covered by SPs 4 and 5. However, the focus of these SPs needs to be changed so as to address these issues more purposefully and comprehensively. This argument is elaborated in §5.2.5 below.

Elements of the previously neglected 'pillars' can also be addressed at the supra-national level, particularly through the indirect linkage that exists between food availability and food access when the market is functioning reasonably well – as in most urban areas. Hence, measures to increase availability of micronutrient-rich foods by increasing supplies of horticultural produce reaching the market will be of special benefit to the urban poor. This requires more efficient production of horticultural produce through better varieties, which will reduce the cost of production. Present rather vague plans for horticultural research should therefore be translated into firm commitments. FSTP should consider supporting regional advisory services, capacity building for stakeholders, research on issues of poverty, vulnerability, targeting, and gender aspects of food insecurity.

Allocation of funding between continents should become a project selection criterion, so as to take into account both need and availability of alternative sources of EC funding, particularly the EDF.

5.1.4 Overarching Themes

5.1.4.1 Conclusions

The fact that women play multiple roles in securing household-level food access and that they continue to be most vulnerable to food insecurity is acknowledged in the TS, but it is not adequately addressed in the FSTP strategy. Nor is the fact that women play a key role in nutrition, because of their traditional responsibilities in storing, processing and cooking food and in the nurture and education of young children. Proposals in response to CFPs do tend to note gender as a cross-cutting theme, but most proposed activities do not sufficiently reflect gender concerns. There is, however, a general tendency for these concerns to receive more attention in later AAPs than previously, but this is still far from the level merited by the importance of the subject.

Compared to gender, there is much greater awareness of vulnerability as an overarching theme, particularly in terms of SP3 and SP4. The choice of LRRD countries implies that SP4 mainly addresses vulnerability caused by political factors. SP3, on the other hand, addresses the physiological, economic and, to a lesser extent, the social aspects of vulnerability.

Climate change threatens greatly to increase vulnerability, particularly for the poorest people, who tend to live in the most vulnerable areas. As in the case of gender, coverage of this topic has increased since the 2007 AAP, but it is still not adequately taken into account.

5.1.4.2 Recommendations

Each project and other activity should contain an analysis of gender and vulnerability concerns and state specifically how these concerns will be addressed. The vulnerability analysis should contain a section on any threats posed by climate change, and where these are significant there should be a strategy for addressing them. It should be a requirement that project logframes include gender- and vulnerability-related objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs), and monitoring should examine progress towards meeting these.

5.1.5 Stakeholder Consultation

5.1.5.1 Conclusions

The process from development of the DCI to implementation of individual activities is a long and slow one. Stakeholders cannot be included at all stages so it is necessary to determine at which stages the involvement is practical and when it can be most useful.

At the stage of development of the DCI and the MIP, the programme is so large that there is almost no limit to the number of stakeholders – these might include all governments and NGOs in developing countries, EU Member States, International Organisations, other donors and, of course representatives of many potential beneficiaries. At this early stage the consultation was principally through the overall development of EC policy on development – this policy must include the EC commitment to the MDGs, alignment with African priorities (through CAADP and the Advancing African Agriculture policy), the EC Guidelines on Agricultural Research for Development and the Paris Declaration. A web-based consultation exercise and discussions with the Rome-based organisations also contributed to the strategy. The review team received little feedback about the quality of this process but believe that it was sufficient. It is clear that consultation is beneficial and required as part of the Phase II TS development. At the same time it is recognised that this process can be slow and difficult so there must be a pragmatic approach to the level of consultation that can be achieved.

At the stage of programming, stakeholders should be involved much more closely. The workshop on Research for Africa was seen as highly valuable and resulted in well targeted themes being put forward into the global research programme planned for research institutes outside the CGIAR and the research programmes of RTD. It should be possible to develop workshops for the components on Regional and Continental programmes, Information, Innovation and possibly Advocacy. These may be arranged through the context of regional and global fora on development. For the innovation component it is seen as essential to involve southern partners in the design process. During discussions at the EC it was suggested that workshops could be combined with those being planned for the Food Facility. This seems to be a promising idea.

For the LRRD component there are three stages – choice of country, prioritization of resources between countries and development of programmes within countries. For stages one and two it is difficult to envisage stakeholder participation, but for the third stage the existing mechanisms for consultation seem to operate satisfactorily, particularly with national and international NGOs. However, the lack of capacity of weak governments to participate sometimes limits the value of their participation. (Choice of country is further discussed in 5.2.5. below.)

It is easier to talk about consultation than to carry it out in practice: there are always time pressures and it is often difficult to identify representative civil society organisations – particularly at the global and regional levels. Further, the capacity of CSOs to represent the ultimate beneficiaries may be limited. These difficulties should not, however, be allowed to deter the EC in fully engaging in the process.

Participation by southern organisations is often difficult because of lack of funds. Funds from SP6 could legitimately be allocated to allow greater participation in the consultation process.

5.1.5.2 Recommendations

The formulation of the Phase II TS should include as broad a consultation as time permits. This could include meetings with major stakeholders (eg MSs, IOs, EIARD) web based consultation and also placed in the context of recent EC policy agreements with external organisations (G8, AU etc).

Consideration should also be given to arranging consultation for individual components or sub-components at the beginning of Phase II.

Stakeholder consultation on Phase II programmes should work in tandem with workshops to be organised under the Food Facility.

Funding to allow southern organisations to participate in workshops should be made available as necessary from the SP6 component.

5.1.6 Emerging Issues

5.1.6.1 Conclusions

Since the FSTP was designed, some existing problems have intensified, and new issues have emerged. Three of these are particularly crucial for achievement of the FSTP's central objective. Recent food price volatility and the current deep global recession have reversed years of progress towards meeting MDG1. While the recession will inevitably end at some point, real food prices are likely to remain above 1990s levels at least in the medium term, so that the food price spike that culminated in mid-2008 has to be viewed as symptomatic of a longer term structural issue. Meanwhile, climate change threatens to intensify these negative trends throughout the developing world. The main EC response to this crisis has been through the Food Facility, supplemented by further resources from FSTP, and FF activities are complementary to those of the FSTP.

5.1.6.2 Recommendations

Given new threats to food security of the poorest and most vulnerable, issues of food access and nutrition must move up the FSTP agenda, particularly in the shape of a sharper focus on social protection (discussed in detail in §5.2.5 below). Climate change should be treated as an overarching theme, and proposals for funding under FSTP should include an assessment of the threat in the locality in which the proposed intervention will occur. Where this is significant, measures should be proposed to eliminate or mitigate its impact. Where appropriate, and subject to availability of funding, activities presently covered under the FF should be eligible for inclusion under FSTP, particularly those that improve food access and nutritional adequacy. It is not possible to say at present what lessons have been learned from experience of implementing the FF, because this programme is relatively new and has not yet been monitored or reviewed. It would therefore be premature to try at present to design instruments for FSTP Phase II intervention to correct any future food price hikes. However once lessons have been drawn from the FF experience, these should be used to determine the most appropriate way for FSTP to respond.

5.2 STRATEGY - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PHASE II – BY THEME

5.2.1 SP1: Supporting the Delivery of International Public Goods Contributing to Food Security

5.2.1.1 Conclusions

The mandate of supporting the delivery of IPGs has been important to the EC for many years. IPGs are shown to have a substantial long term benefit on food security even if impact is slow to accrue and difficult to measure. The policy of widening the support for ARD from the CGIAR to a more diverse research base (both through Challenge Programmes and the sub-component funding research outside the CGIAR system) and particularly encouraging south-south partnership is seen as very positive. Direct support to regional research groups through the regional and continental sub-component maintains EC contact and visibility with these groups and should continue.

Projects supported by the EC are very diverse in nature. Some may reap benefits within a few years (eg support for technology transfer and extension services) while others maintain and develop a basic resource that can be used for future benefits (eg gene bank maintenance). Both approaches are valid and both have a place within the food security mandate and the FSTP strategy.

Until now there has been little support for work on nutrition although nutrition is an important component of food security.

5.2.1.2 Recommendations

The programme of support to ARD through global programmes, including both CGIAR and other research institutes, and regional programmes should continue.

The mixture of support for projects with the potential for long and short term impact should be maintained and that the EC support for IPGs should not focus too heavily on technology transfer.

Research on nutrition for food security should be included in Phase II.

5.2.2 SP2: Linking information and decision making to improve food security response strategies

5.2.2.1 Conclusions

Given the well established links of FAO to regional and country level stakeholders and its recognized technical leadership, the decision to work (in fact continue to work based on two predecessor projects) predominantly with FAO as a leading international organisation in FSIS through a global project but with regional subcomponents (Latin America, ENP-East Region, Africa, South-East Asia) was justified. As the re-constructed logical framework of SP2 shows, also, "national administrations were to receive technical assistance and support through the regional level to improve national information systems, analysis and policy/strategy development capacities".

These objectives could only partly be tackled so far, particularly the strengthening of capacities at national level, such as through the ENP-East project, the ECOWAS project for 17 countries and the SEA project component (with AFSIS) of the FAO global project. However, this deficiency in implementation, as pointed out above, can largely be attributed to the inadequate resources committed with M€ 6 for a global project of this scale and relevance being largely inadequate and not allowing to necessary needs-based work at country level.

Regarding the main "global project with FAO under SP2, it is assessed as highly relevant to improve food security responses through: i) improved and harmonised food security analysis methods; ii) enhanced global consensus on the severity and determinants of food insecurity; iii) support to evidence based policy making; iv) improved coordination between global, regional and national stakeholders (e.g. in Africa the relationships between NEPAD, RECs and National Governments in CAADP implementation); and v) capacity building. A number of technical areas (e.g. climate change, vulnerability and resilience analysis, markets analysis, improving household and agricultural survey methods) in which FAO has a comparative advantage as knowledge based organisation have been identified and form the core of the Programme technical work. However, the design and the implementation process of the programmes funded under component 2 of FSTP have two main problems: i) they have been designed as a set of separate programmes without any in built coordination mechanism, making it difficult for FAO to play its coordination role and thus limiting the possibility of promoting a more harmonised set of food security analyses; ii) some regions affected by serious food insecurity (e.g. East and Central Africa and Central Asia) are not receiving any support through the component 2 of FSTP.

There is also the extended approach to "FS information linked to decision-making" which comprises a range of activities focused on "managing knowledge and making it available to users" such as advocacy and communication directed to governments, decision-makers, opinion formers, and the public; FAO information systems and publications, including international events such as the World Food Summit (WFS) 1996 and its follow up and flagship documents such as SOFA and SOFI; the monitoring process through the Committee on World Food Security (CFS); the World Agricultural Information Centre (WAICENT) which is renamed to "Global Learning Centre for Food Security (GLC4FS)" and established with the support of FSTP SP-2. For a renewed FSTP (Phase II), this notion of a wider definition of FSIS certainly would be highly relevant to better reach not only key decision-makers and opinion leaders, but also by using more effectively the media for forming public opinion and to allow wide audiences, particularly also in the South, to participate in the FS debates in their countries including wider use of modern e-learning tools.

5.2.2.3 Recommendations

SP2 major global project with FAO including regional “satellite” subcomponents being largely under funded, remaining balance of M € 24 is to be programmed for future interventions (including if possible remaining projects to be identified for AAP 2010) to increase funding for urgently needed work at country level and to extend the programme to additional countries in need in Africa and Asia. This includes the ENP-East component (with only M € 3 for 4 countries) which does not allow for agricultural censuses and related activities to be undertaken. This relates also to a new priority programme on “knowledge management and learning on FS” which should be targeting as a starting point the recently created “Global Learning Centre for Food Security (GLC4FS)” hosted by FAO.

FSIS development aimed at harmonisation of definitions, methods, tools and approaches should be implemented by using a common forum and framework for action, aimed at integrating FS information with effective policy development (PD) and programming and including all major stakeholders. The future architecture of FSIS needs to comprise the major policy strategies relevant in food security and nutrition (FSN), such as world Committee on Food Security (CFS), World Food Summit Plan of Action, High-level Task Force on Global Food Security Food Crisis (HLTF) Comprehensive Framework for Action (CFA), PRSP process and MDG Monitoring. This should be done in an interlinked and integrated manner and the leadership for international alignment and harmonisation could lie with a HLTF comprising also the CFS and EU/MS under the technical leadership of FAO.

5.2.3 SP3: Exploiting the potential of continental and regional approaches to improve food security

5.2.3.1 Conclusions

The mandate of SP3 is oriented towards complementing national FS policies including PRSPs and agricultural development policy (together with disaster and risk reduction, policy development, harmonisation and national resources management in the case of Africa) but this approach was not followed systematically in the selection of programmes. Strengthening the capacity of IPs has been neglected as a precondition in many cases, and special measures – including assessment of IP’s institutional capacity at project start and focused TA for institutional strengthening were missing. Themes selected are scattered across sectors and approaches with important themes such as platforms on social transfers/ safety nets missing. AAPs have focused on Africa, with Central America and Asia playing minor roles. Recently, during AAP 2010, new partnerships have been sought with Asia (ASEC, UNICEF) to improve coverage of this Region.

For FSTP Phase II, the pillars of food security and the CFA of the HLTF would need to be taken into account in a revised structure of the SPs combined in an overall logical framework.

5.2.3.2 Recommendations

For Phase II, the aspect of complementing national FS policies, including PRSPs, needs to be given much more emphasis. Policy development in agriculture, food security and environmental management, which directly result from improved information systems (SP2), should be the focus. The current three dimensions of PD, NRM and disaster and risk management (DRM) in the case of Africa could be maintained, but with DRM also comprising EWS and not just market elements as under current 2010 planning. The focus on Africa can be maintained while also working with a number of strategic partners in Asia and Latin America. In general, the component should be re-designed on the basis of the pillars of FS and the CFA of the HLTF using a consistent LF approach.

5.2.4 SP4: Addressing Food Security in Exceptional Situations of Transition and in Fragile Situations

5.2.4.1 Conclusions

There is clear justification for implementing projects in individual countries where ‘geographical instruments are not in a position to intervene, or cannot operate fully’. The fact that LRRD operates in the ‘grey area’ between relief, rehabilitation and development means that it needs to co-ordinate closely with humanitarian efforts, particularly those under ECHO. While there is increasing evidence that this is happening, more needs to be done in order to achieve a smoother transition across the spectrum. However, important differences in the approval processes, budgetary cycles and timing of

activities under ECHO compared with other DGs involved in development, and this make this a very difficult challenge.

Not all highly food-insecure countries are particularly susceptible to natural or man-made disasters. Where this is the case, social protection programmes to increase food access, and/or programmes to address chronic micronutrient deficiencies could be of higher priority.

5.2.4.2 Recommendation

This strategic priority should be merged with SP5 to create a new SP and reduce the total number from six to five, while simultaneously increasing the attention that is paid to food access and nutrition. The discussion and rationale for this are presented under §5.2.5.2 below.

5.2.5 SP5: Promoting innovation to Combat Food Insecurity

5.2.5.1 Conclusions

The first component of this SP (promoting innovation) needs no justification or further comment at strategic level. The second component, the Special Final Allocation for ALA and EU Neighbourhood Countries, is meant as a 'phase-out' activity, which implies that loose ends will be tied up so that support may be withdrawn relatively smoothly and without need for further intervention. This may be true for the neighbourhood countries, but it is certainly not the case for most of the ALA countries on the list. Here phasing out of support under FTSP should logically be accompanied by phasing in of support under geographical instruments, but this is not happening, and this in turn indicates both a serious lack of coherence between FTSP and the geographical instruments and a lack of continuity of support compared with the FSBL.

Taking a more strategic view, four key observations can be made. First, it is clear that FSTP does not adequately cover questions of food access and nutritional balance, nor, generally speaking, does it target the poorest and most vulnerable. Second, where FSTP interventions do address these neglected areas of food security, and where they do target the poorest and most vulnerable, this happens basically under SPs 4 and 5. Third, interventions in these neglected areas and for these neglected people are best conducted at the national or sub-national levels, which are the levels at which SPs 4 and 5 presently operate. Fourth, in most, if not all, of the ALA countries presently supported under SP5, one of the conditions used to justify SP4 – namely that 'geographical instruments are not in a position to intervene, or cannot operate fully' – also applies. Hence it makes sense to amalgamate SP4 and SP5 and focus their activities more closely on food access and nutrition and on the most vulnerable population segments.

5.2.5.2 Recommendations

Strategic Priorities 4 and 5 should be amalgamated under a new title: 'Improving Food Access and Nutrition for the Poor and Vulnerable in Fragile Situations', and the focus of these two SPs should be adjusted accordingly. The budgets for these two SPs should also be amalgamated, and, if possible augmented. This amalgamation should not in any way compromise the work presently being done in LRRD, but should instead place it within a wider framework of stability of the three 'pillars' over time (sometimes described as a fourth 'pillar'). This is particularly necessary in areas prone to natural or man-made disaster, where there are repeated episodes of acute hunger and undernutrition. However in some countries the problem is less one of instability over time, as one of chronic hunger and undernutrition. Hence some of the countries presently supported under SP4 could switch from LRRD to social protection to improve food access and nutrition, while some ALA countries presently under SP5 could perhaps usefully be moved to an LRRD mode. Once the countries have been decided upon, a series of country-level situation analyses should be conducted to determine which mode is most appropriate.

The countries to be supported under this new SP must be more objectively selected, by developing clear and agreed criteria for inclusion. These would include indices of food insecurity (e.g. GHI), vulnerability to natural and man-made disaster, political instability and – crucially – an index of gender bias, such as UNDP's Gender Related Development Index.

In order to improve food access, social protection should be an important focus of this newly-formulated SP. Some work is presently under way on this under SP5 (see §4.2.5.1 above), and

review of these projects should be prioritised in order that lessons can be learned that will guide future activities. However, large-scale social protection is an expensive undertaking. If the EC decides to institutionalise the social transfer interventions presently supported under the FF, this newly-formulated SP would be the most appropriate vehicle for this, and resources should be channelled accordingly. Otherwise this component would be best served by FSTP engaging as a member of a multi-donor consortium in countries where this exists.

Nutritional interventions should not be limited to agricultural projects. They should also include initiatives such as mass distribution campaigns for micronutrients, particularly in the form of vitamin A capsules, iron tablets and salt iodisation – backed up by de-worming campaigns for children (which can inexpensively be combined with vitamin A distribution). For this purpose, new partnerships should be sought with agencies with a proven track record in the field of micronutrient interventions, particularly for women and children. Such agencies include Helen Keller International, the Micronutrient Initiative and UNICEF.

New ways of improving food availability were very usefully addressed in the workshop convened for this purpose under SP1, but large knowledge gaps remain concerning the best way to improve food access and nutrition for those most in need. There are also gaps in the 'grey area' of LRRD that attempts to link rehabilitation with development. The 'Innovative Approaches' component of the present SP 5 should therefore be retained under the combined SP, but its primary focus should be on areas where there are important knowledge gaps. This should primarily be an exercise in learning lessons and identifying best practice through wide consultation, rather than a matter of piloting a range of interventions, as has been done in Phase I. The former is likely to be a much more cost-effective exercise, and the funds saved can be used instead on other activities under this new SP.

Improving food utilisation has not been included here, partly because it is multi-sectoral, involving health, education, water and sanitation, and partly because many of the delegations already have these as focal sectors. FSTP management should not be unduly concerned about not covering all aspects of all three 'pillars' of food security, but should instead concentrate where the Programme has comparative advantage and can add value to the work done by geographical instruments. It is sufficiently challenging to engage seriously with the area of food access and nutrition.

5.2.6 SP6: Fostering advocacy and advancement of the food security agenda, harmonisation and alignment with development partners and donors

5.2.6.1 Conclusions

This component is a small but potentially valuable part of the programme. It is strongly supportive of the Paris Declaration. A greater use of the SP6 to support studies into food security issues would be beneficial. As discussed in §5.1.5 funds from SP6 could usefully be used to increase the participation of southern organisations in the other SPs.

This component should be used to allow the EC and other stakeholders to become more involved in discussions on global food security issues. These are already taking place in several different fora (e.g. UN HLTF, GPAFS(N), CFS and G8/20). EC support for, and participation at, regional fora such as ASEAN would also be a worthwhile use of the funds from SP6.

5.2.6.2 Recommendations

The SP should be continued in Phase II and should contribute to studies on food security and the participation of southern organisations in the other SPs. SP6 should be used to engage more strongly in global and regional debates on food security.

6. IMPLEMENTATION - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PHASE II

6.1 OVERALL

6.1.1 Complementarity, Coherence and Continuity

6.1.1.1 Conclusions

Probably the strongest measures to achieve complementarity in EC in-country food security programmes are to be found under SP4. Here the delegations have been closely involved in the identification of activities, issue the Calls for Proposals and manage them once they are approved. Complementarity between FSTP work in LRRD and DG ECHO's work in humanitarian response is growing, although it has not yet become fully systematised. Outside of this SP, however, there is fairly widespread dissatisfaction with the measures that have been taken to achieve the 3Cs. Problems include staff working in isolation, lack of continuity between FSBL and FSTP causing funding shortfalls at national level, loss of complementarity resulting from use of budget support and lack of a sound global strategy to make the FSTP complementary to NIPs and CSPs.

It is difficult for the regional components of FSTP to co-ordinate with national policies when national strategies differ, sometimes quite radically. There is, however, potential for co-ordination under SP4 and SP5, where the Programme operates at the national and sub-national levels. Here there is general satisfaction among interlocutors regarding the degree of complementarity

The complementarity of FP7 and FSTP was found to be good. This should be continued in Phase II. The overall objectives of the two programmes are quite different so it would be unwise to force the two programmes to use exactly the same approaches.

Regarding specific procedures to ensure complementarity with other donors it is clear that the Paris Declaration and follow up actions have improved the situation. There will always be room for improvement, however, and the subject needs to be addressed when considering each new activity.

6.1.1.2 Recommendations

Efforts to further integrate the efforts of ECHO and FSTP in LRRD projects should continue. Concrete measures should be taken to promote the routine involvement of in-country ECHO staff in designing and evaluating Calls for Proposals in projects that adopt the LRRD approach.

When projects operate at the national level under the new merged SP4 and SP5 they must be fully coherent with national strategies where these exist. A review of relevant national policies and strategies should be a requirement in Calls for Proposals under this new SP. Given poor complementarity with geographical programmes and the lack of integration of food security into the geographical programme in most countries, there is a need for increased support to country allocations.

Given staff constraints at all levels, and given the precedent of the FF having in-country staff, FSTP should be permitted to place staff at delegations which have regional responsibilities.

On complementarity with other donors the EC must maintain a close dialogue with other donors and continue its role in sponsoring workshops and other fora to ensure complementarity in the future.

6.1.2 Monitoring (ROM) and Evaluation

6.1.2.1 Conclusions

EC ROM is a well developed and evolving system, and its use for monitoring FSTP actions will start in the current year. In parallel, many IPs use their own M&E systems, and this contributes to comprehensive monitoring at all levels. Log Frames are used more and more, and indicators are developed by some IPs in consultation with in-country stakeholders. LFs of AFs show increasing quality over time with good quality LFs found in many AFs over 2008-2009. Although not undertaken at present, it would be feasible to monitor the complete FSTP in its current phase through a comprehensive set of LFs at all levels. This would involve the use of interlocking/cascading LFs, while correcting some overlapping of SPs and redefining some indicators for systematic monitoring

purposes. Examples of basic, very relevant predefined indicators are “coverage of food insecure, vulnerable target populations” and “malnutrition/under nutrition rates” in a given Region (see LFs of FSTP re-constructed by Consultant, Annex 7).

6.1.2.2 Recommendations

A comprehensive Logical Framework should be developed at all levels (for 2010 AAP already and) for Phase II of the FSTP to be used as basis of a comprehensive M&E plan, involving joint development of indicators with IPs and other stakeholders. Such a comprehensive LF would prove very useful also for systematically avoiding gaps, reducing inconsistencies and overlaps between subcomponents, and for monitoring relevant indicators, such as many already contained in the current MIP, like for example “coverage of food insecure, vulnerable target populations” and “malnutrition/ under nutrition rates”.

6.1.3 Project Size and Administrative Costs

6.1.3.1 Conclusions

It is clear that AIDCO’s resources and those of the individual delegations are stretched. This has led to a natural tendency to increase individual project size so as to reduce the administrative burden of handling a large portfolio of projects. This practice, which is already evident, even though it is not official policy, will undoubtedly place less strain on AIDCO and the delegations, but has some negative consequences. Large grants can only be handled by large organisations or well-organised consortia. This means that many potential partners for EC grants are unable to act as recipients of EC funding. These include regional economic organisations in Africa and many regional or global NGOs with relatively low capacity for managing large grants.

There is a severe risk that if this trend continues in Phase II of the FSTP most of the funds will be disbursed to international organisations and north-based consortia. This clearly discourages ownership by southern organisations, goes against the Paris Declaration and risks losing visibility to the intermediary organisation.

In addition to this movement toward international organisations, the policy reduces the flexibility and range of EC actions: “small” but otherwise appropriate projects have been identified during FSTP formulation missions but rejected on size grounds alone, thus distorting the Strategy and MIP intentions. One further effect will be the isolation of EC staff from many stakeholders. Unless there are direct relations with partners in developing countries the EC risks losing touch with the grass roots.

It should be noted that the money that is needed for project management within the EC is already being spent on management fees at the international organisations.

6.1.3.2 Recommendations

AIDCO and the delegations should be adequately resourced (both in personnel and finance) to be able to handle a full range of project sizes as appropriate to the needs of FSTP and not determined by administrative expediency.

It is not the position of the Review Team to determine the mechanism of this additional finance but, if necessary, funds should be diverted from the FSTP itself to enable the internal management of projects. As this will save management costs at international organisations there may be little net reduction in funds to beneficiaries.

6.2 IMPLEMENTATION - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PHASE II – BY THEME

6.2.1 SP1: Supporting the Delivery of International Public Goods Contributing to Food Security

6.2.1.1 Conclusions

The new three-year funding structure for the CGIAR support is a positive move – giving better continuity to funding of programmes and therefore improved stability. Funding through IFAD does not

seem to have conferred intrinsic benefits and it would be preferable if support could be provided more directly to the CGIAR or its centres in the future.

The workshop to determine research priorities for global research outside the CGIAR system and RTD's FP7-FAFB programme is regarded as a considerable success and should be repeated in future for other regions and other components.

Due to a lack of capacity and experience it is believed that many southern research organisations and, in particular, national NGOs and consulting firms do not put forward concept notes in response to global calls for proposals. The EC could assist potential applicants through a 'help desk' system. This process would enable smaller organisations to participate in calls more effectively and may also help them find potential partner organisations through a web-based bulletin board. It would also increase the involvement of southern organisations in future international activities. The assistance could be extended to the preparation of proposals during the identification and formulation phase where the call for proposals mechanism is not used.

The regional programmes are rather slow to be established – Africa is running, Asia is planned for 2010 but so far no action is planned for Latin America.

The recent emphasis on delivery strategies is seen as essential to improving the impact of these programmes. Capacity building at partner organisations should be encouraged together with linkages between southern research organisations.

6.2.2.2 Recommendations

It is hoped that a Latin American programme will be implemented in Phase II.

When issuing global or regional calls for proposals the EC should consider assisting potential applicants both to find partners and to develop successful proposals. This could be carried out using funds such from SP6 Other examples exist within the EC and should be studied.

In order to maximise the benefit of the IPGs all programmes should continue to include strong and targeted delivery strategy with sufficient funding for and commitment from partner organisations to ensure that the delivery strategy is effective.

6.2.2 SP2: Linking information and decision making to improve food security response strategies

6.2.2.1 Conclusions

The main project, the "global project" with FAO, focused on information systems could achieve some positive results towards greater harmonisation of FS analytical tools and methods at cross-country level (notably the IPC). IPC was funded largely by ECHO so far and no plan exists yet for AIDCO to take over. Another positive example of SP2 achievement are (lead by FAO-WFP-IFAD) "FS theme groups" developed at country level (so far in Ethiopia, Mozambique, DRC, Liberia, and Bhutan). Yet another positive example is the recent IFPRI project proposal to EC of a "Support for appropriate policy responses at country level" project comprising innovative e-based data analysis and policy-making modules.

In its second objective to create linkages to response strategies it was less successful. Due to its under funding, while a network of regional projects emerged, no full coverage and systematic linkages between all subcomponents could be reached yet. Also, partly due to difficulty in reaching down to working directly with Governments, no effective linkage of ISFS with resulting policy development (PD) could be achieved yet. The linkage to resulting FS policy development and to PRSPs still poses a challenge. Also, strengthening of national information systems through country TA could only be implemented at limited scale. The project resources (€ 6 million) are inadequate to undertake urgently required needs-based country work. The two subcomponents in South East Asia and ENP-East Region (€ 2 and 3 million respectively) are equally under funded. Multi-donor collaboration with UN agencies has been well developed, multi- stakeholder cooperation with EC MS and other global players hardly materialised.

Given the clear needs to undertake needs based country work and to cover some regions affected by serious food insecurity (e.g. East and Central Africa and Central Asia) which are currently not receiving any support through the component 2 of FSTP, the unprogrammed balance of M€ 24 could clearly be used for addressing these needs.

6.2.2.2 Recommendations

Country work in FSIS is needed urgently to foster evidence-based policy development on FSN at country levels. The balance of M€ 24 under the current FSTP for SP2 is to be programmed for an AAP 2010 to cover these urgent needs (stepped up support through FAO global project for country level activities from the present ceiling of only 0.5 M€ per country). The level of budget allocation per country is to be increased (possible reduction in number of countries supported if overall budget equal or same as now as one option) or the number of countries covered could be increased by the same time on basis of food insecurity indicators (entailing an increase of overall budget available for next phase as option 2). Also, funding of the global, inter-regional coordination work through FAO for the various regional subcomponents in Africa, Asia, Latin America, ENPI, ENP-East, and Central Asia needs to be increased. The projects in 4 countries of ENP-East Region (under funded with only M€ 3 for 4 countries) are to be stepped up in any case to allow for conducting urgently needed agricultural censuses and related work.

For MIP 2011-2013, the following activities are recommended:

- Continuing cooperation with FAO as international lead agency in the area of FSIS
- Paying greater attention to the PD and programming side of FSN strategies as a result of quality information
- Extend IPC and integrate it with other major FSIS. AIDCO should take over funding from ECHO which is pulling out by end 2009.
- Focusing on harmonisation of FSIS approaches, definitions, tools, methods beyond IPC as one useful instrument
- Including work on agricultural statistics and censuses
- Defining a comprehensive framework for FAO's involvement in the implementation of FSIS linked to evidence-based decision-making at various geographical levels, including the wider definition of "information systems" (communication, learning, advocacy)
- Linking FSIS clearly with national country level work (CSPs/NIPs and RIPs) to enhance impact
- Fund the up-scaling of IFPRI project "Support for appropriate policy responses at country level"

6.2.3 SP3: Exploiting the potential of continental and regional approaches to improve food security

6.2.3.1 Conclusions

The initial preference for FSTP to work with international organisations, particularly UN agencies has made it possible to quickly generate projects ready for implementation, because of the modality of existing direct agreements. The three AAPs 2007-2009 comprised a diversity of topics with a strong focus on Africa and with just one major project in another region, Central America. Except for two projects which show weaknesses the projects are all highly relevant and with strategic and innovative focus. For 2010, projects are planned for the first time for Asia.

The existing DCI mandate did not allow project selection to become aligned under a common theme such as the "pillars" of food security. According to re-constructed Logframe of SP3 (see Annex 7), there were three results planned for Africa, (a) disaster and risk reduction, (b) policy development and harmonisation, and (c) sustainable management of natural resources. But only two out of seven projects clearly followed the planned results.

The FSTP SP3 (but this is true also for the other SPs) could have a much more focused approach and likely impact, not to speak of coherence, if the logical framework structure which was inherently available in the design documents, would have been used as basis for the project cycle management.

The overall component of SP3 with its four AAPs over the period 2007-2010 has been allocated an indicative budget of M€ 135 (Africa M€ 100, Asia M€ 20, Latin America M€ 15). According to original planning, for Africa M€ 6 are not yet committed, for Latin America M€ 2. The overall budget volume and structure can be regarded as being more or less appropriate in principle as it represents a reasonable distribution of funds across the priority continents of Africa with a planned share of 74%, followed by Asia with 15% and Latin America 11%.

6.2.3.2 Recommendations

During the remainder period of the current FSTP (AAP 2010), the present cooperation modalities should be continued. For a Phase II of FSTP, Joint management of FSTP actions through UN agencies and other international organisations should continue, primarily where there is a comparative advantage, such as in technical leadership like with FAO, for MDTFs, for complex projects of a regional nature, etc.). Otherwise, project preparation should be undertaken as possible through EC's standard modality, working with its governmental and non-governmental partners at regional, and increasingly also national, level.

Project selection should not be based primarily on availability of IPs at continental/ regional levels, but on systematically covering gaps in the various fields of FS policies and programmes (three pillars, FNS, building resilience, etc.) using a systematic framework (like HLTF-CFA, CAADP, MDG monitoring, PRSP process, and country strategy papers and NIPs) at the various levels, global continental, regional, national. Phase II of the MIP should contain more SP3 activities in regions and continents outside Africa, particularly Asia.

The remaining balance of up to M€ 16 unprogrammed yet for AAP 2010, should be used, if possible, to filling gaps in the systematic coverage of priority results to be achieved based on the original (reconstructed) logical framework of the SP3: For example, no project exists for "disaster & risk reduction", only one in "natural resource management" and two in "policy development & harmonization", only two out of seven projects address defined results to be achieved.

The overall funding for the component appears to be slightly under funded (14.5% of total) compared to SP4 which consumes the lion's share of FSTP although it is more geared towards emergency operations and post-crisis assistance/ LRRD. SP3 is the core component of the FSTP where regular country level interventions funded through regional initiatives are the main focus. In a next FSTP, SP3 or its follow-up equivalent, should receive at least 30% of overall funding.

The regional distribution of funds should also be slightly adjusted under a FSTP 2: Africa 70%, Asia 20%, and Latin America 10%.

6.2.4 SP4: Addressing Food Security in Exceptional Situations of Transition, and in Fragile Situations

6.2.4.1 Conclusions

The lack of a country-level strategy paper for LRRD has caused problems, particularly the fact that activities in the development phase are not always clearly attuned to the type of disaster that is being addressed (e.g. natural or man-made). Many people are vulnerable to food insecurity because they live in places which are vulnerable to natural calamity. In the case of flood-prone areas, unless infrastructure projects are undertaken to reduce and manage disaster risk, it is questionable whether providing roads and market infrastructure, agricultural land improvements, irrigation and other livelihood assets is effective or efficient, because without physical protection, these new assets would be exposed to destruction in the next flood. In other situations, however, the same type of activities can be highly productive. For example, conflicts frequently have their roots in poverty, and successfully tackling this issue in a post-conflict situation could help prevent conflict from re-emerging. The transition to development phase is highly context-dependent.

6.2.4.2 Recommendations

The major recommendations for implementation are implicit in the strategic recommendations contained in §5.2.5.2 above, i.e. merging SP4 and 5 and focusing on improving food access and nutrition. In addition, the original idea of developing a country-level strategy paper should be

resurrected for LRRD and food access/nutritional interventions under the proposed new format for SP4+5.

6.2.5 SP5: Promoting Innovation to Combat Food Insecurity

6.2.5.1 Conclusions

Although the method for choosing activities to fund under the 'innovations' component was not conducive to producing a balanced portfolio of interventions, in fact the list that emerged actually covers all three 'pillars' of food insecurity plus nutrition and the overarching themes of gender, vulnerability and climate change. However the fact that this part of the SP was not launched until 2009 means that the time horizon has been too short for what is a quite lengthy process.

6.2.5.2 Recommendation

Again the major recommendations for implementation are implicit in the strategic recommendations made in §5.2.5.2. In terms of innovative approaches, it is recommended that a workshop be convened along the lines of the one earlier conducted under SP1, to bring together actors from civil society, private foundations (and the private sector as appropriate) to share experiences of innovative approaches and cutting-edge ideas. These ideas should then be used to inform innovative ways of addressing food security issues. Meanwhile no further pilot projects should be launched, but the ones that have already been launched should be closely monitored in order to learn as many lessons as possible for future innovative interventions.

6.2.6 SP6: Fostering advocacy and advancement of the food security agenda, harmonisation and alignment with development partners and donors

6.2.6.1 Conclusions

This component is very small and relatively few funds have been disbursed so far on projects. It will be interesting to see the range of projects supported under the current call for proposals. It should be possible to release relatively small-scale funding from this component should be available at relatively short notice for the support of conferences and other advocacy issues.

The component has not so far been used to support studies into food security issues – these could be a valuable contribution to the FSTP output and have a high visibility.

6.2.6.2 Recommendations

A simple procedure should be found to allow funding from this subcomponent should be available for support of conferences and other advocacy issues at relatively short notice

Studies into food security issues should be supported in Phase II

ANNEX 1

MISSION TERMS OF REFERENCE

Annex 1 Mission Terms of Reference

Terms of reference for the Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP) MID TERM REVIEW (2007-2009)

Table of contents

- I. Mandate
- II Background
- III. Issues to be studied
- IV. Methodology, Management and Reporting
- V. Expertise required
- VI. Timing and Budget
- Annex 1: The key review questions
- Annex 2: Key documentation for the review (initial reading list)

I. MANDATE

- DCI: [REGULATION \(EC\) No 1905/2006](#) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 establishing a financing instrument for development cooperation includes in Article 15 a Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP). The objective of the thematic programme is to improve food security in favour of the poorest and the most vulnerable and contribute to achieving the first MDG on hunger, through a set of actions which ensure overall coherence, complementarity and continuity of Community interventions, including in the area of transition from relief to development. It also includes in Art 20.1 a requirement that strategy papers shall be reviewed at mid-term, or *ad hoc* if necessary.
- The Commission Communication COM(2006)21 "Advancing the Food Security Agenda to achieve the MDGs" laid the foundations for the FSTP strategy and provides further details for actions in accordance with Art 15 of the DCI.
- COMMISSION DECISION C/2007/1924 of 4 May 2007 lays down the Thematic Strategy for the FSTP for 2007-2010.

The Thematic Strategy stipulates that in accordance with the DCI, a Multiannual Indicative Programme (MIP) will cover the first four years of implementation of the FSTP, providing guidance for the formulation of Annual Action Programmes (AAPs) which will ensure that complementarities with geographical, humanitarian and other thematic instruments is maximised. Activities undertaken under the MIP will be monitored on a regular basis and at different levels. The Results-Oriented Monitoring System, currently in use for geographical programmes, also applies to FSTP projects.

The object of the present mission is to review **the MIP (2007-2010) altogether with the AAPs implementing the strategy over the period 2007-2009 so as to provide inputs and recommendations for the preparation of a second phase of the thematic strategy for 2011-2013.**

II. BACKGROUND

EC Food Security policies - overview

The EC is a leading international donor in Food Security. The EC Food Security policy was established in 1996 under the previous Council Regulation (EC) No 1292/96 which continues to guide the Commission's action in the fight against hunger on the basis of the new Regulation (EC) No 1905/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 establishing a

From 1996 to 2006, the Food Security and Food Aid budget line (FSBL) formed the main instrument, which provided €500m/year (on average – although decreasing over the years) for country programmes (direct aid to Governments), as well as global initiatives, civil society programmes and food aid (indirect aid through International Organizations, Non Governmental Organizations, etc). This comprehensive instrument ceased to exist following the reform of EC external assistance under the Financial Perspectives 2007-2013.

From 2007 onwards, food security interventions are fragmented over a number of instruments. Country programmes aimed at eradicating chronic poverty and improving food security, which were previously financed by the FSBL, are to be financed through the geographical instruments, (DCI, ENPI and EDF), while the Humanitarian Instrument is providing humanitarian food assistance in crisis and immediate post-crisis situations and delivers food aid where necessary and appropriate.

The Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP) addresses food security at global, continental and regional levels, and complements the geographical programmes where these instruments cannot fully operate while ensuring the continuity of assistance in the transition from relief to development.

In reaction to the soaring food prices in 2008, the European Parliament and the Council adopted a Regulation establishing a facility for rapid response to soaring food prices in developing countries³⁰ with an amount of € 1 billion. This facility effort came in addition to a series of initiatives undertaken by the Commission to assist developing countries in addressing the impact of soaring and volatile world food prices, including an increase in its budget for food aid, a reallocation of funds from the existing food security programme in support of the most fragile states (€50 million) and €200 million set aside from the reserve for unforeseen needs of the 10th EDF to respond to the social and budgetary consequences of the crisis.

The proper combination of instruments is essential to ensure the Linking of Relief with Rehabilitation and Development. Indeed, the global, continental and regional programmes funded by the thematic instrument need to be adequately coordinated with national programmes and vice versa. The FSTP also complements Regional Indicative Programmes whenever the regional dimension is part of a wider geographical context (multi-regional, continental, global levels) and whenever the thematic programme has a comparative advantage over the geographical instrument.

The Food Security Thematic Programme

The FSTP is defined by a strategy for the period 2007- 2010, which sets the overall policy orientations and objectives. This strategy is accompanied by a Multi Annual Indicative Programme (MIP), which provides guidelines for implementation along with budget envelopes by component over the same period of the strategy. The overall financial allocation for the period 2007-2010 is €925m, of which €30.6m have been foreseen to finance activities that benefit ENPI countries.

Each year the MIP is further detailed in Annual Action Programmes which define the annual budget allocation in concrete actions.

The FSTP objective is to be pursued through the following strategic priorities:

1. Supporting the delivery of international public goods contributing to food security: research and technology: this component aims to support pro-poor and demand-driven agricultural research and technology and improve its outreach and dissemination.
2. Linking information and decision making to improve food security response strategies: this component aims to strengthen national and regional stakeholders' capacities to produce and analyze food security information, with a view to designing effective response strategies to prevent food crises and reduce chronic food insecurity.
3. Exploiting the potential of continental and regional approaches to improve food security: this component aims to support regional initiatives in Asia and Latin America and

³⁰ Regulation (EC) No 1337/2008 of 16 December 2008.

continental/regional priorities set in a new AU-EU partnership with Africa (disaster and risk reduction, agricultural policy development and harmonisation, sustainable management of natural resources).

4. Addressing food security in exceptional situations of transition, and in fragile and failed states: this component aims to link relief, rehabilitation and development. It will support the most vulnerable in protecting and recovering livelihood assets, while improving self-reliance and crisis prevention.
5. Promoting innovation to combat food insecurity: this component aims to foster innovative practices and approaches to food security and their South-South up scaling/dissemination. A special, final allocation is earmarked for countries in Asia, Latin America and Neighborhood countries phasing out food security assistance.
6. Fostering advocacy and advancement of the food security agenda, harmonisation and alignment with development partners and donors: this component aims to promote food security at international level and aid effectiveness, in line with the OECD Paris Declaration.

The main implementing partners are global players in the field of food security, such as the UN agencies specialized in food and nutrition security, research institutions active in agricultural research for development and networks like the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, donor and civil society organizations and platforms, continental organizations of states such as the African Union and the NEPAD, regional economic communities and regional organizations and institutions, including non state actors, civil society/NGOs and, in specific situations, national governments.

The end beneficiaries of any actions implemented by the thematic programme are the rural poor in all food insecure countries: small-holder women and men working in the agriculture, family owned farms, farmers' organizations, indigenous groups and most vulnerable people.

The review of the FSTP

Art. 19.2 of the DCI regulation, foresees a review of the Strategy at mid-term. As the MIP comes to an end on 31st December 2010, there is a need to establish a new Thematic Strategy Paper (TSP) for the implementation of the Thematic Programme covering the period 2011-2013. The current Review is intended to provide an assessment of how the 2007-2010 Strategy has been implemented so far, and to provide guidance for the preparation of the new strategy paper.

The review is an opportunity to take into consideration the evolution in needs and priorities of all actors involved.

The present mid-term review mission will assist the Commission in providing an overall qualitative appreciation of the thematic strategy for food security, an assessment of the MIP's implementation over the period 2007-2009, and will offer guidelines and recommendations for the preparation of the new MIP (2011-2013).

III. ISSUES TO BE STUDIED

The main objectives of the consultants' assignment will be to provide the relevant external co-operation services of the European Commission with:

- an assessment of the relevance of the objectives of the strategy 2007-2010, and the elaboration of detailed recommendations on the revision/elaboration of the thematic strategy for the period 2011-2013
- an overall independent assessment of the implementation and prospects for impacts of the activities covered by the MIP 2007-2010 through an analysis of the Annual Action Programmes so far available
- detailed recommendations for the preparation of the MIP (2011-2013)

Scope of the review

Review of the strategy

In the assessment of the Thematic Strategy, the consultants should address whether the approach followed in the strategy remains relevant in its conception and design, in particular in view of the recent global changes (food price volatility, financial and economic crisis, energy crisis, demographic pressure and, overall, an increase of in poverty and hunger in large parts of the world).

The consultants should also assess the advantages and disadvantages of the current approach to finance on the one hand mainly global, continental, and regional programmes under the FSTP, and on the other hand national programmes under the geographic instruments.

An assessment of the 6 strategic priorities as able to comprehensively cover all the different aspects and challenges of food security as a multi-dimensional sector should be carried out.

Detailed recommendations for the revision of the Strategy should be developed.

Assessment of the implementation of the MIP (2007-2010)

The assessment will cover the Commission's actions and interventions at global, regional and national level in the framework of the annual action programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009 (under adoption) as from start in the implementation of the AAP 2007 (end 2007) up to now.

The activities will be assessed to the maximum extent possible (depending on the current implementation status) on the following criteria: relevance, (expected) impact, sustainability, effectiveness and efficiency.

The mid-term review should also (a) assess the degree to which implementation of the Thematic Strategy has contributed to the achievement of its objectives (b) identify key lessons from the Commission's activities, and (c) assess the extent to which complementarities and synergies with geographical programmes as well as the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7) have been ensured.(see art 11.1 and 11.2 of the DCI).

Recommendations for the MIP 2011-2013

On the basis of the above, detailed recommendations for the elaboration of the MIP 2011-2013 should be developed.

Review questions

The review of the Thematic Strategy will be based on a set of questions. These questions are intended to give a more precise and accessible form to the review criteria and to articulate the key issues of concern to stakeholders, thus optimising the focus of the review. The questions in annex provide guidance for the elements of the review. They are not exclusive and constitute a minimum baseline on which the consultant can build.

IV. METHODOLOGY, MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING

Management

The review manager and first contact point will be Daniel Contel (DG DEV/B/2). The management and supervision of the review will rest with the programming DGs (DG DEV and DG RELEX). In addition, a **Steering Group** consisting of members of DG DEV, DG RELEX, AIDCO, ECHO, DG Research and possibly other Commission services will guide the study and approve all outputs.

Methodology and reporting

The review team will hold four meetings with the relevant Commission Services. The largest part of the work will be dedicated to the analysis of all relevant key documentation, including data on the pertinent policy and programming documents and instruments, and also taking account of any key documentation produced by other international donors and agencies. Existing ROM (Results Oriented Monitoring) info regarding FSTP projects as well as evaluations should be taken into consideration.

Part of the work will be carried through interviews (which can partly be done by phone), and summaries of these interviews will be presented to the Steering Committee.

1. Inception Phase:

Following a first meeting in Brussels with the Steering Group, the consultants will prepare an inception report within 10 days of the beginning of the assignment. It will include (i) a preliminary overview of issues, (ii) a methodological approach for the review including a full list of questions, and (iii) a provisional time schedule (iv) a template for the final report.

Following the presentation of the inception report by the consultants in Brussels, the Steering Committee will discuss and approve the Inception Report.

2. Desk Phase

On confirmation of formal approval of the inception report, the team of consultants will proceed with the second stage (Desk Phase) of the review.

At the conclusion of this work, the review team will present in Brussels to the Steering Committee a Draft Final Report in English no later than 30th July 2009. The link between analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be made explicit. The draft Final Report should cover all the objectives of the assignments:

- an assessment of the relevance of the objectives of the strategy 2007-2010, and the elaboration of detailed recommendations on the revision/elaboration of the thematic strategy for the period 2011-2013
- an overall independent assessment of the implementation and prospects for impacts of the activities covered by the MIP 2007-2010
- detailed recommendations for the preparation of the MIP (2011-2013)

The draft Final Report will be submitted to the Steering Committee at least 8 days before the scheduled meeting. The Steering Committee will discuss and comment on the draft Final Report.

On the basis of comments received from the Steering Group, the review team will make the appropriate final amendments and submit their Final Report within 10 working days of the last meeting. A translation of the summary of the final report in French should also be provided.

3. Presentation of the study:

The review team (or selected members) will, on the basis of the Final Report, participate in a Seminar in Brussels during which they will make a presentation to the Commission services and other relevant stakeholders (including civil society organisations) on the review's findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

V. EXPERTISE REQUIRED

This review is to be carried out by a team of three consultants: one Team Leader (category I) and two experts (category II).

As a whole, the team must be able to demonstrate solid experience in all of the following fields: (1) development co-operation policy, (2) EU food security policies, and (3) food security related issues such as agricultural research, information systems, agricultural and rural development policies and projects, nutrition (4) safety nets projects, (5) LRRD approaches.

Each member of the Team should have solid experience in at least one of the above fields.

Prior experience in similar review exercises would be an asset.

The team should be able to demonstrate experience in both the ACP region, and in other developing regions of the world (Asia, Latin America, European Neighbourhood countries).

The team have an excellent command of English with a good working knowledge of French, and possess excellent drafting skills.

VI. TIMING AND BUDGET

In order for a new version of the Thematic Strategy Paper to be ready by March 2010, so as to allow time for programming the 2011 AAP following the revised Thematic Strategy's adoption, the review needs to start immediately, when considering the time needed for inter-service consultation, DCI Committee opinion and European Parliament scrutiny.

Indicatively, the assignment will start in May 2009 and end in October 2009.

The maximum duration for the inception and desk study phases is of three months. The draft Final Report must be submitted no later than 30th July 2009.

The maximum budget available for this contract is € 190,000 all-inclusive (lump sum)

The number of working days per week will be 5.

Indicative Calendar

Starting date	25 th May (one day mission in Brussels)
Inception Report	9 rd June (one day mission in Brussels)
Draft Final Report	30 th July (one day mission in Brussels)
Submission of Final Report	21 st August
Seminar/presentation of Final Report	September (one day mission in Brussels)

Annex 1: The Review Questions

Review of the strategy

- Is there a focus on hunger reduction and malnutrition throughout the actions foreseen in the TS? Are these actions relevant for the achievement of MDG 1 objective? Could such focus be reinforced by revising the TS?
- Are the objectives, priorities and sub-themes in balance with the global needs?
- Has the Strategy given rise to programmes designed in a manner relevant to the needs and problems identified in specific regions and consistent with national or regional or global strategies?
- Has the Strategy given rise to food security programs/actions addressing the needs of non-governmental stakeholders?
- Beside recent EC responses to the food price crises are there other areas in food security that are not or not adequately covered by the FSTP? (for example with regard to the Comprehensive Framework for Action elaborated by the UN High level task force on food crisis, or on nutrition issues....)
- Should the TS be revised for better contributing to an EC answer to the global food crisis and its effects in developing countries (now combined with the financial and economic global crisis' effects)?
- In there a need for a re-thinking or a new design of the TS because of the recent international changes and challenges (high volatility of food prices, financial crisis and economic crisis)?
- Should not the TS offer a more comprehensive package of measures to tackle all dimensions of food security through a more strategic approach?
- Have other donors' actions on the issues addressed by the thematic programme substantially changed in terms of presence, resources, and priorities? What is their impact in terms of Division of Labour and donor coordination?
- Should the Commission maintain the current approach to finance on the one hand mainly global, continental, and regional food security programmes under the FSTP, and on the other hand national programmes with an impact on food security under the geographic instruments?
- Is the involvement of non state actors in the preparation of the strategy and in the implementation of MIP satisfactory and sufficient?

Assessment of the implementation of the MIP

- Have the results of and/or the progress in the implementation of the MIP been satisfactory in general? What are the results up to now regarding the indicators defined in the TS? Are the performance indicators helpful in defining progress or does the results monitoring system have to be improved? Are the indicators sufficiently clear and tangible? How could necessary improvements be achieved?
- To what extent has timing for commitments and payments been respected? Have there been any particular delays, setbacks, obstacles, and were any measures taken?
- Is the general direction of co-operation laid out in the TS still relevant given the progress and results in the implementation?
- Are FSTP actions sufficiently complementary to other EC horizontal programmes and actions by other donors, in particular those of Member States, and subsidiary to EC geographical programmes? What measures have been developed in order to get such complementarities? In particular, are FSTP funded actions and projects at country level (namely through the component 4: LRRD in exceptional situations and fragile states as well as component 5 special allocation ALA and Georgia and Armenia) complementary to national strategies and EC programmes?
- Were the interventions in LRRD countries and fragile states based on existing national LRRD strategies?
- What are the results of implementation through global initiatives or regional partners? Has on-the-ground delivery (in the case of actions and projects whose implementation started) been satisfactory in terms of quality and pace? Has EC visibility been sufficiently ensured? At national level, is there sufficient alignment with country priorities (e.g. integration within broad PRSP frameworks)?
- Is there a sizeable difference in the impact of national versus regional measures?
- With regard to the important share of agricultural research in the FSTP programming, do synergies between FSTP and FP7 in the area of agricultural research for development have been put in place?
- As research is such an important part of the programme, are the conditions for the dissemination of results to get impacts on Food Security have been put in place?
- To what extent do targeted actions represent a logical and coherent package? Were the implementing partners for targeted actions the most appropriate to achieve objectives?
- Are the results of the Calls for Proposals satisfactory and will they lead to achieving the objectives of the FSTP?
- What are the experiences from the ROM exercise with respect to the FSTP. Has this monitoring instrument been adequate? Should it be supplemented and/or modified?

Annex 2: Initial key documentation

- Commission Communication COM(2006)21
- Food Security Thematic Programme / Thematic Strategy paper and Multiannual Indicative Programme - May 2007
- Annual Action Plan 2007
- Annual Action Plan 2008
- Annual Action Plan 2009

ANNEX 2

INCEPTION REPORT

Annex 2 Inception Report

ANNEX 3

LIST OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

Annex 3 List of Documents Consulted

Background/ overall policies (UN, FAO, etc.)

- FAO, CFS/2008/2, COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY, Thirty-fourth Session, Rome, 14-17 October 2008, Agenda Item II, ASSESSMENT OF THE WORLD FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION SITUATION
- FAO, The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2008, High food prices and food security – threats and opportunities
- FAO, Responding to the food crisis: synthesis of medium-term measures proposed in inter-agency assessments, 2009
- UN, High-Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis, Outcomes and Actions for Global Food Security, *Excerpts from “Comprehensive Framework for Action”, July 2008*
- UN, High Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis Programme of Work for 2009
- UN, Comprehensive Framework for Action, July 2008, High-Level Task Force on the Global Food security Crisis
- UN, The Millenium Development Goals Report 2008

New and emerging issues

- FAO, Linking Social Protection and Support to Small Farmer Development Report of a workshop held at FAO, Rome, on 17-18 January, 2008
- EC/AIDCO, Enhancing EC’s contribution to address Maternal and Child undernutrition and its causes
- EC/AIDCO, Social transfers: an effective approach to fight food insecurity and extreme poverty

EC policies

- EC/EP, Communication From The Commission To The European Parliament, The Council, The European Economic And Social Committee And The Committee Of The Regions, The EU - a global partner for development, Speeding up progress towards the Millennium Development Goals, COM(2008) 177
- EC/DEV, DEV/10/2004_EN, Common framework and procedure for the programming of thematic and horizontal budget lines
- EC/EP, Joint statement by the Council and the representatives of the governments of the Member States meeting within the Council, the European Parliament and the Commission on European Union Development Policy: ‘The European Consensus’, (2006/C 46/01)
- EC, Common Framework And Procedure For Strategy Papers For The Thematic Programmes, 2007 - 2013, 30 May 2006
- EC, Communication From The Commission To The Council And The European Parliament, Advancing African Agriculture, Proposal for continental and regional level cooperation on agricultural development in Africa, COM(2007) 440
- EC/Dev, European Commission, Dg Development, Development Policy and Sectoral Issues, Environment and Rural Development, DEV/5459/05-EN, Brussels, B4*3 (04)D/5659, Food Aid/Food Security Budget Lines, 21 02 01 - 21 02 02 - 21010401, Programming Document 2005-2006

Food Price Crisis+EC Food Facility

- EP/EC, Regulation (Ec) No 1337/2008 Of The European Parliament And Of The Council, of 16 December 2008, establishing a facility for rapid response to soaring food prices in developing countries
- EP/EC, Regulation (Ec) No 1905/2006 Of The European Parliament And Of The Council, of 18 December 2006, establishing a financing instrument for development cooperation
- EP/EC, Draft COMMISSION DECISION of [...] for implementing the facility for rapid response to soaring food prices in developing countries to be financed under Article 21 02 03 of the general budget of the European Communities in 2009
- EP/EC et als, Communication From The Commission To The European Parliament, The Council, The European Economic And Social Committee And The Committee Of The

Regions, Tackling the challenge of rising food prices, Directions for EU action, COM(2008) 321

FSTP Legal mandates

- EC, Communication From The Commission To The Council And The European Parliament A Thematic Strategy For Food Security - Advancing the food security agenda to achieve the MDGs, 2006
- EP/EC, Regulation (Ec) No 1905/2006 Of The European Parliament And Of The Council of 18 December 2006 establishing a financing instrument for development cooperation
- EP/EC, Communication from the Commission to the Council and the EP, External Actions through Thematic Programmes under the Future Financial Perspectives 2007-2013, COM(2005) 324

The FSTP Strategy

- EC, FSTP Thematic Strategy and MIP 2007-2010, 2007
- EC/AIDCO/RELEX, Programming table (budget overview, 2pp) for FSTP

The six priority strategies:

1 - research & technology

- Monitoring reports on CGIAR Institutes – CIP, CIAT, CIMMYT and IFPRI
- EC/AIDCO, EC NON PAPER Guidelines on Agricultural Research for Development, June 2009
- EC, EIARD STRATEGY 2009-2013, Nov. 2008
- IFPRI, Monitoring Of Cgiar Projects Co-Funded By The European Commission In 2005 In Africa, Asia, Latin America And The Mediterranean Regions, International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Project GRP 1, *Draft, Policies For Biotechnology And Genetic Resource Management*, March 2007
- EC, ECART/ EEIG, Monitoring of the EC Support to Strategic Agricultural Research through the CGIAR Centres for Food Insecure Countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, Latin America, and West Asia/North Africa Regions, Contract N° 2006/128-368, FINAL REPORT , *Review of the IFPRI Project GRP 1, POLICIES FOR BIOTECHNOLOGY AND GENETIC RESOURCE MANAGEMENT*, *Bohumil Havrland and Niels Louwaars*, March 2007
- EC 2007 contribution to CGIAR description of the action
- EC 2008-10 contribution to CGIAR consultant's report
- EC 2009 Non-CGIAR Global Research – consultant's report
- ToR for Identification Mission of a Regional Agricultural Research Programme for Andean Region financed out of the Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP)
- ToR for "Technology transfer for food security in South and south-east Asia – identification mission" financed out of the Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP)
- PAEPARD 1 Final report
- EIARD Strategy 2009 – 2013 (2008)

2- information & decision making

- FAO Statistical Development Series 11, A system of integrated agricultural censuses and surveys, Vol. 1, World Programme for the Census of Agriculture 2010, FAO 2005
- FAO, Support to the EC Programme on Linking Information and Decision Making to Improve Food Security for Selected Greater Mekong Subregional Countries, Project Proposal, n.d.
- Joint FAO and WFP Thematic Evaluation of Information Systems for Food Security (ISFS), Terms of Reference, 2009
- WFP Evaluation of Strengthening Emergency Needs Assessment Implementation Plan (SENAIP), 2007
- EU-FAO Memorandum of Understanding, Concerning the establishment of a Strategic Partnership...in the field of development and humanitarian affairs, Brussels 13 September 2004
- EC/FAO Joint Evaluation: Food Security Information for Action Programme, GCP/GLO/162/EC, Volume I: Final Independent Evaluation Report, April 2009
- EC/FAO Programme on linking information and decision making to improve food security 2009-2011, Inception Report, 5 June 2009

- EC et als, Integrated Phase Classification (IPC), Manual and Handbook

3 - continental/ regional approaches

- EC/ SANCO, Mid term Evaluation of the „Better training for safer food in Africa“ activities, FWC/ Lot 3, Inception Report version 1.0, FCEC, 31.03.2009
- Support to Farmers Organisations in Africa Programme, Continental Programme of Work, EAFF/PROPAC/ROPPA/SACAU/EU/IFAD, June 2009
- The CAADP Trust Fund Program Document, A Multi-Donor Trust Fund to Support the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP), November 05, 2008 CAADP World Bank Status Report March 2009
- Final Action Implementation Completion Report on the ILC's Action „Land and Sustainable Development: Linking Secure access to the Implementation of Environmental Agreements, ILC 2009
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, EuropeAid Co-operation Office, Thematic operations, Central management of thematic budget lines PA DEV Food security, *IDENTIFICATION AND FORMULATION MISSION FOR THE CONTINENTAL AND REGIONAL COMPONENT 'AFRICA'*, FOOD SECURITY THEMATIC PROGRAMME (FSTP), Final Report, March 2009
- REGIONAL STRATEGIES AND PROGRAMME FOR FOOD SECURITY IN THE SAARC MEMBER STATES, Final Report, Prepared by Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO) In collaboration with South Asian Association for Regional Co-operation (SAARC), August 2008
- UEMOA, APPUI A LA MISE EN OEUUVRE DE LA POLITIQUE AGRICOLE DE L'UNION EN MATIERE DE SECURITE ALIMENTAIRE PROGRAMME REGIONAL DE SECURITE ALIMENTAIRE, 2003-2007, FAO

4 - fragile states/ LRRD

5- innovation & special allocation countries

6 - advocacy & harmonisation

- A NUTRITIONAL MEASURE OF FOOD AID FLOWS - International Food Aid Information System - INTERFAIS – description of the action
- EC support to EIARD 2008 contract and other documentation
- EC support to GDPRD 2008 contract and other documentation
- Strengthening Civil Society Networking in the International Policy Dialogue for an Increased Food Security - Call for proposals Guidance.

Regional: ACP/Africa

- EC Communication – Advancing African Agriculture
- EC, Mid term Evaluation of the Better training for safer food in Africa” activities
- The World Animal Health and Welfare Fund (OIE) “Better Training for Safer Food” in Africa – Inception report
- Mozambique Programme Aid Partners (PAPS) Performance Review 2008 (and other linked documents)
- Monitoring reports for LRRD projects in Democratic Republic of Congo

Regional: ALA

Regional: ENP

- EC, Armenia ECO3 Evaluation report 1997-2006
- EC, Georgia ECO3 Evaluation report 1997-2006
- EC, West Bank And Gaza Strip – PS – Food Security Programme Support for small & medium sized agricultural enterprises in West Bank & Gaza Strip. Ex-Post Monitoring Report

MIP/ AAPs

- EC, AAP summary and Action fiches – 2007, 2008 and 2009

M&E, ROM and methodology

- DG Relex/ Dev/ Aidco/ Joint Evaluation Unit, Evaluation Methods for the European Union's External Assistance, Methodological Bases for Evaluation, 2006
- EC, Monitoring reports on CGIAR Institutes – CIP, CIAT, CiMMYT and IFPRI
- EC, Thematic Evaluation Of Food-Aid Policy And Food-Aid Management And Special Operations (Fa-Fs) In Support Of Food Security July 2004
- EC, Monitoring reports for LRRD projects in Democratic Republic of Congo
- EC, West Bank And Gaza Strip – PS – Food Security Programme Support for small & medium sized agricultural enterprises in West Bank & Gaza Strip. Ex-Post Monitoring Report
- FAO, Approach to Major Evaluations in FAO of Strategies, Themes, Institutional Performance and Programmes, FAO Evaluation Service, Sept. 2004

Humanitarian aid(ECHO etc.)

Complementarity, Visibility

- Communication and Visibility Manual for EU external actions, EuropeAid, April 2008

ANNEX 4

LIST OF PEOPLE AND ORGANISATIONS CONSULTED AND MEETING NOTES

Annex 4 List of People and Organisations Consulted (through questionnaire and directly) and Meeting Notes

Including telephone interviews

Organisation/ Unit	Name/ Title	Coordinates (email, telephone)
EC Brussels		
AIDCO/QMSM	Fernando Cerutti Gill, Quality Management Officer	fernando.cerutti-gil@ec.europa.eu
DG Dev	Willem Olthof, Policy Advisor, Sustainable	willem.olthof@ec.europa.eu
DG ECHO	Mathias Lange, Food Assistance Adviser	mathias.lange@ec.europa.eu
RELEX/L3	Ria Ketting, Principal Administrator, Strategy, Co- ordination and Analysis	maria.paris-ketting@ec.europa.eu
DG Dev	Daniel Contel, Food Security Policy officer	daniel.contel@ec.europa.eu
DG ECHO	Stephane Delpiera	stephane.delpiera@ec.europa.eu
DG ECHO	Isabelle Combes, Operational Support Policies	isabel.combes@ec.europa.eu
AIDCO/F3	Simona Mari Head of Section – FSTP	simona.mari@ec.europa.eu
	Bart Messinne	bart.messinne@ec.europa.eu
AIDCO/E6	Dominique Blariaux Quality Support Food Security Unit	dominique.blariaux@ec.europa.eu
AIDCO/D1	Andre Chalmin Desk Officer, Thailande, Laos, Cambodia, Myanmar	andre.chalmin@ec.europa.eu
AIDCO/D1	Franck Viault, Principal Administrator, Coordination & Supervision for Asia and Central Asia	franck.viault@ec.europa.eu
DG ECHO	Hermann Spitz, Deputy Head of Unit, ECHO-A.5	herman.spitz@ec.europa.eu
AIDCO/QMSM	Isabel Faria De Almeida, Quality Management Officer	
EuropeAid/D2	Muriel Baum, Programme Manager DPR of Korea,	muriel.baum@ec.europa.eu
AIDCO /E6	Philippe Bertrand , Quality Support Officer	philippe.bertrand@ec.europa.eu
AIDCO C/4	Manuel Ancillotti - Programme Manager Comp 3	Manuel.ANCILLOTTI@ec.europa.eu
AIDCO C/4	Alejandra Suarez Aller - Programme Manager Comp 1 and 2;	Alejandra.SUAREZ-ALLER@ec.europa.eu
DEC Rome		
	Mr. Renaud-Francois Moulinier, 1st Counsellor	renaud-francois.moulinier@ec.europa.eu tel. +39-06-679-7823/ 678-2672
UN-HLTF		
	Marianne Muller, Senior Policy Adviser and Chief of Staff	c/o IFAD, m.muller@ifad.org

Organisation/ Unit	Name/ Title	Coordinates (email, telephone)
FAO		
CFS	Maria Carmen Del Squeff, Chairperson	www.fao.org/UNFAO/Bodies/cfs/cfs34/index_en.htm ; faoprarg1@interfree.it , tel. +3906-3488554271; mcsqueff@yahoo.com ;
	Mr. Kostas Stamoulis, Secretary of CFS, Off. C-314,	kostas.stamoulis@fao.org
CoC	Professor Noori Naeini, Chairman	c/o Ali Mekouar, ali.mekouar@fao.org ,
TCA	Mr. Jose Maria S. Viñas, Assistant Director General for Technical Cooperation	josemaria.sumpsi@fao.org
ES/ESA	Kostas Stamoulis, OIC , Economic and Social Development Department (ES)/ Director , Agricultural Development Economics Division (ESA)	www.fao.org/economic/es-home/en/ ; kostas.stamoulis@fao.org
	Mark Smulders, Senior Economist/FIVIMS Coordinator	mark.smulders@fao.org , Tel: +39-06-5705-3272, www.fivims.net
	Luca Russo, economist FS policy & institutions	
	Alberto Zezza, economist	
PARMD	Chimba David Phiri, Chief, Policy Co-ordinating and Agricultural Policy Support Service	david.phiri@fao.org
TCD	Pietro Chiappini Carpena, Programme Officer, Field Programme Development Service	pietro.ChiappiniCarpana@fao.org
EORD	Jeffrey B. Tschirley, Chief, Rehabilitation and Humanitarian Policies Unit	jeff.tschirley@fao.org
TCD	Abdul Q. Kobakiwal, Chief, Special Programmes in Food Security	abdul.kobakiwal@fao.org
EORD	Cristina Amaral, Chief, Emergency Operations Service	cristina.amaral@fao.org
EORD	Angela Hinrichs, Liaison and Operations Officer	angela.hinrichs@fao.org
EST	Henri Josserand, Chief GIEWS	www.fao.org/giews/english/index.htm
ESS	Ricardo Sibrian, Senior Statistician	
AGN	Marie Claude Dop, Nutrition Assessment	
NRC	René Gommès, Senior Agrometeorologist	
	John Latham, Senior Officer, Geospatial Info	
KCE	Stephen Rudgard, Chief, Knowledge Exchange	

Organisation/ Unit	Name/ Title	Coordinates (email, telephone)
TCE	Suzanne Raswant, Mr. Scaglia, Ms. Buffagni	
PBEE	Daniel Shallon, Evaluation Officer	Daniel.shallon@fao.org
IFAD		
Office of the Secretary	Vincenzo Galastro, Head of Country Management Office Unit	v.galastro@ifad.org
External Affairs Department	Gelsomina Vigliotti	g.vigliotti@ifad.org
Technical Advisory Division	Shantanu Mathur, Grants Coordinator	s.mathur@ifad.org ,
	Amine Belhamissi, Technical Advisor	a.belhamissi@ifad.org
Policy Division	Roberto Longo, Policy Coordinator	r.longo@ifad.org
ILC	Sabine Pallas, Programme Manager Resources Mobilization/ Women's Access	c/o IFAD: s.pallas@landcoalition.org
	Michael Taylor, Prog. Mgr Africa & Global Policy	m.taylor@landcoalition.org
	Lucia Angelucci, administrative matters	l.angelucci@landcoalition.org ; tel. +3906-5459-2206
Programme Mgmt Dept	Brian Baldwin, Senior Operations Mgmt. Advisor	brian.baldwin@ifad.org
External Affairs Department	Laura Leena Jalasjoki, Associate Policy Co- ordinator	l.jalasjoki@ifad.org
WFP		
Donor relations	Delphine Dechaux	delphine.dechaux@wfp.org
OMXF	Arif Husain	arif.husain@wfp.org
Office of Evaluation	Anne-Claire Luzot	anneclaire.luzot@wfp.org
OMEF	Amy Horton, Deputy Chief	
PDS	Al Kehler, Chief	al.kehler@wfp.org
PDSD	Guillaume Foliot	guillaume.foliot@wfp.org
OMEF	Carlos Veloso	carlos.veloso@wfp.org
LRRD/Transition	Nicholas Crawford	nicholas.crawford@wfp.org
OED	Mary Ellen McGroarty	mary-ellen.mcgroarty@wfp.org
Early Warning Unit	Geoffrey Pinnock	geoffrey.pinnock@wfp.org
OED	Ugo Gentilini	ugo.gentilini@wfp.org

Meeting Notes Rome Summary (30 Jun-1 Jul 2009)

Gerry Gill

1. FAO

- Food crisis of late 2007/2008 not new – underlying causes there for a long time; the new thing was the price explosion creating an 'emergency' situation and worsening chronic food insecurity, conceptually not an emergency, as in weather events, conflict
- Huge Balance of Payments problem for food-deficit low income countries; problem also for WFP because of high international food prices

- The HLTF produced no consensus in some areas such as the role of biofuels, speculation in the financial and commodity markets, but full agreement on one thing, that this is not a short-term crisis only; the world is entering a new phase of higher food prices, so need a mix of short-term, medium-term and long-term measures
- EC-FF covers only short term problems, so important to link it to MT and LT; FF more important in modalities, so e.g. infrastructure is not eligible for support under it (CFFA has chapter on short-term)
- Need now to update the country assessments looking now at MT and LT issues
- The food crisis, high plus recession highlight the vulnerability of 1-1.2 billion people; but before the crisis there was a hard core of 850 m undernourished; estimated to have increased to over 900 m as a result of food price hikes and to more than 1 billion after the recession hit in 2008
- The numbers undernourished have been increasing since the mid-1990s, but now the percentage is increasing as well, so performance is worsening on both counts
- The global architecture on food security has not addressed the fundamentals and has not softened the effects of the 2008 crisis. Dealing with food insecurity is now a huge challenge because of years of underinvestment in agriculture and now climate change and the rise of biofuels.
- There are very few ideas at present on what to do about the fundamental problems that have to be addressed at both national and regional levels
- At regional level FAO has comparative advantage because it can co-ordinate efforts of government, NGOs; NGOs are not as good as UN agencies in regional work
- FSTP's 5 year budget cycle makes it possible to scale up, which is not possible within ECHO's short time frame
- One of the mechanisms that could be used to address the transition phase is a cluster approach, i.e. to cluster a group of UN agencies, donors, NGOs etc round a single key issue. At global level there is a water and sanitation cluster, and a health cluster, but none in agriculture and food security
- In the FSTP budget line there is a big gap in the emergency to development transition process; it has been very difficult to do this in the past, but there is a window of opportunity now
- FAO has the capacity to work at regional level with FSTP and can bring its experience from emergency programmes to LRRD; need a common well-tested platform
- Trans-boundary issues: one area in which FAO has been working is growing cassava around refugee camps housing Burundi refugees, so they will have cuttings to take home with them and kick-start agricultural production
- The African Fertiliser Initiative is a good example of a regional approach: building regional procurement hubs to achieve scale economies and counteract the fact that fertiliser demand is small in many African countries and many have poor fertiliser storage facilities
- Pastoralism is another area in which a regional policy and regional approach is justified, but it is very difficult to achieve this in practice

2. WFP

- At EC there is a perception that WFP = food aid; however WFP has a new strategic plan, which emphasises food assistance over food aid
- On LRRD there is an assumption that this is a linear sequence, but this does not exist in most disasters; in many cases people don't want to go back to the status quo ante, because that was unsustainable; for example refugees from Rwanda don't want to go back because they know their land will have been taken by someone else and they won't get it back

3. IFAD

Shantanu Mathur, Senior Technical Adviser, Economic and Financial Analysis, Technical Advisory Division (In charge of handling FSTP funds to CGIAR)

Q1. How is the system working - are there delays in receiving funds from EC or at IFAD in disbursing to centres?

A. Initially it was a rush job. IFAD had very serious misgivings about the process, but time was such a pressing constraint that they essentially continued in World Bank mode in 2007. The 2007 funds didn't arrive at IFAD until November of that year, but they did manage to get all of the money disbursed in 2007. This was all retroactive funding of work the centres had covered from their reserves. Other than that no significant delays, and 2009 funds actually arrived in advance, while they are already preparing disbursement for 2010 based on the proposed programme of work. Remy Noe's role in this at EC has been key, as has Simona Mari's. It is possible that the current reorganisation of the CG system may throw all of this back into the melting pot.

Q2. Is there any synergy/complementarity for the EC working with IFAD or are they just a convenient mailbox through which to send the money?

A. Since 2007 the process of channelling the money is definitely smoother than it was under World Bank management, when there was very little due diligence, almost no reporting. Belmisi manages an IFAD group comprising some of their lawyers and people from the financial controller's officers who handle about 20 grant agreements at 15 CG centres to fund their thematic programmes. In addition the CG has 3 Challenge Programmes, such as the Challenge Prof led by Oxford University which focuses on the adaptation side.

IFAD now monitors progress of the grants. In 2007 all of the monitoring was necessarily ex-post, so there was no scope for on-course revision in that year. Since then more on-hands monitoring in partnership with EC.

IFAD has its own grants programmes with CG centres, but this has a quite different focus from the EC money.

Q3. How would they like to do things differently for 2011-2013? This may open up a whole story about the CGIAR reform process (change management they call it) and core funding as opposed to restricted (project) funding (as is practiced now). In principle the EC wants to move to core funding but needs the new CG system for dealing with this to be in place first.

A. IFAD definitely don't want to serve as a mail box. Right from the start the IFAD president told the EC that he wanted substantive involvement in the programme. IFAD would like this to grow into a strategic partnership with the EC in which IFAD would add value in the conceptualisation, formulation and programmatic phases. They want a proactive role, although this has not yet happened. IFAD involvement is mostly on the admin side at the moment, but they would like to become more proactive in the management of funds and would like more say in how funds are allocated. For example the system could use IFAD's competitive grant's programme with the CG centres

Q4. What are IFAD doing to ensure EC visibility?

A. It is worth contrasting IFAD support to CG with the mode chosen by EC. The former attach funding to specific activities, so that it will be possible to trace the IFAD contribution through to impact, meaning that IFAD should be able to claim credit for specific achievements. EC support, on the other hand, is to core funding, so it will be impossible to say what the impact of EC funding per se has been on intended beneficiaries. The only visibility that can be achieved will be the EC logo on vehicles, signboards, etc. There is a clear trade-off here.

Summary of Rome Meetings --- Hans Von Zedlitz

Appendix A: Implications of recent strategic policy on „world food crisis“ for re-designed FSTP 2010 and beyond (2011-13)

Appendix B: IFPRI Proposal „Preventing World Food Crisis: Support for Appropriate Policy Responses at Country Level“

	FAO
30/06/09	ADG/ TCA, Mr. J. M. Sumpsi
	The EU being the number one in Africa, this corresponds to FAO's thematic area no. 4 on agriculture and FS (chaired by AU/FAO); The follow-up to the FSTP (with its very strict mandate) is in the context of the new

	FAO
	<p>soaring food price crisis which is due to market failure (and not failure of national policies or ecological disasters). With the (food price) crisis persisting, cooperation with the EU is to be placed in the context of the HLTF CFA (which was also consulted with the EU) providing as lesson learned the continued use of this new modality of joint discussions, creation of Task Forces (EU and UN) and joint programming on a multi-agency basis (overcoming the old project-specific approach).</p> <p>The Food Facility is an example of this new approach of cooperation and needs to be continued reaching at 60 countries to be covered by rapid national food assessments (by FAO-IFAD-WFP and WB) which has covered 30 countries so far. FAO now is to reach 25 countries where the challenge is the implementation phase with a different set of agencies operating in each country.</p>
30/06/09	Committee of the Council (CoC), Chair Professor Noori
	<p>In the overall context of FAO reform, IEE/IPA, and RBM, 11 global strategies have been defined which are related to SPs no. 3, 4 and 5 of FSTP, for example no. 2 on capacity-building, no. 3 on decentralisation and nos 4 and 5 on „partnerships“.</p> <p>Based on FAO's CoC and CFS experience, and the HLTF CFA as unifying framework, the current „food crisis“ which is more a food price (and therefore access) crisis, is to be seen as a chance to create synergies between the major players, including the EU, France (high level experts group), FAO, CFS, the G8 etc. Despite much talking about food crisis, much less was done concretely so far, actions being left with UN-SG, WB, WFP etc. but with the countries themselves not involved. EU MS would need „to speak with one voice“ on this issue. However, the previous political cleavage between OECD and the G77 (more than 120 countries) reportedly could be closed recently.</p>
30/06/09	Group Meeting: Kostas Stamoulis, Director ES and key staff; Maria Carmen del Squeff, Chair CFS;
	<p>Against the background of the continuing „food price“ and „access crisis“ with growing number and proportion of hungry people, a change of international FS architecture is required to tackle the fundamentals of the crisis taking into account the challenges of climate change, biofuels and underinvestment in agriculture (cf. High-level conference October 2009 on „Feeding the world in 2050“).</p> <p>Regarding the CFS work, a „0 Draft“ outlining the reform needs is expected by end July, to be followed by a „draft 1“ to resolve the outstanding issues in time for the October 13-17 CFS session (see DEC Rome background paper by Swedish Presidency, Appendix A below). CFS's role to assemble country positions is clear, but a number of outstanding issues require urgent reform of CFS (governance structure, including creation of an executive committee, lack of funding, role of CSOs in CFS, relationship to HLTF, the „Global Partnership“ issue, improved country monitoring reports, using MS to create national FS Commissions, etc.).</p> <p>The main weakness of the CFS was found to be the lack of translating its policies into country programmes via the PRSPs where only agriculture is mentioned but rarely food security (one notable exception being the case of Bangladesh with a large EC and USAID co-funded capacity-building project for national Food Policy).</p>
30/06/09	ESA
	<p>Discussions were held with technical experts on FSTP SP 2, results have been incorporated into chapters 3.2.2, 4.2.2 (and Annex 7.10) of DFR.</p>

	FAO
30/06/09	ESA, EST, ESS Group Meeting on SP2
	Results have been incorporated in chapters 3.2.2. and 4.2.2. (and Annex 7.10) of DFR. Much of the discussion centred around the question of how to obtain reliable primary data on FS on which most of the existing FSIS build. The WB/ FAO project (funded by Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation) on improved agricultural statistics was mentioned as one example. The IPC which is strongly supported by the EC is another case. GIEWS opinioned that the FAO-WFP Joint crop assessment exercises are of particular importance as primary data base. Agreement was on the importance to determine easier indicators coupled with national capacity building. The FSTP was found to cover many areas FAO works on in this field.
30/06/09	PBEE (Evaluation Office)
	The ongoing thematic evaluation by FAO and WFP on Food Security Information Systems (FSIS) would give a systematic overview, see chapter 3.2.2 of DFR for details.
30/06/09	ESS (Statistics Division)
	Discussions centred around the need for reliable and timely primary data as a basis for subsequent databases for use of agricultural and FS related policies. The state of current WCA was discussed. Currently, only one large project is financed in this area to extend the CountrySTAT system of FAO to 17 African countries (Gates Foundation). A Trust Fund to be established with WB is also under discussion. A statistical focus should be proposed by EC for next FSTP. FAO's own Special Programme on Food Security (SPFS) was also discussed, following the 2002 WFS, 16 countries (10 in Africa) are now implementing it, usually at small scale using national consultants (USD 100 to 200,000), but in some cases embedded in larger country programmes such as in Nigeria (300 million USD) or Mali (220 million USD). It was regretted that the EC (which has provided support in 2000) is no more funding FAO regional food security programmes.
01/07/09	IFAD
	Discussions in IFAD centred on the concrete project under joint management/ funding with EC, and they are covered in the respective chapters 3.2.3, 4.2.3 and Annex 7.11 of the DFR.
01/07/09	WFP
	The various food security information systems (FSIS) used by WFP were discussed (as was the previous SENAC project 2003-07 funded by EC): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint Crop and FS Assessment Missions (CAMs) • FEWSNET • Comprehensive FS & Vulnerability Analysis & Studies (CFS&AS), five times a year (funded by Gates Foundation) • FS monitoring systems (quarterly in 20 countries), incl VAC (SADC) • Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) systems • Crop and FS Assessment Missions (CFSAMs), jointly with FAO, 3-week missions, incl FAO crop forecasts • IPC using FSMS (and CFSAM) • Emergency FS Assessments (EFSAs). <p>Evaluation Office: Discussed was also the forthcoming joint FAO/WFP thematic evaluation of FSIS (Executive Board Summary to become available by 24.08.2009),</p>

	FAO
	<p>and review of IPC 2009.</p> <p>Main policy implications relate to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • synthesis of FS information systems is not to be expected from the FSIS evaluation which will not go into the details of FSIS but concentrate more on the coordination issue. • National Commissions on Food Security (NCFS) would be needed • Capacity building to generate information (needs assessment) at one hand - and communication of information (incl wider learning, IEC, knowledge sharing) on the other hand. • The FS debate being seen more as „humanitarian issue“ separates it from agricultural development policies.

ANNEX 5

QUESTIONNAIRE AND SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Annex 5 Questionnaire and Summary of Questionnaire Responses

This appendix contains xx parts:

1. Summary of Questionnaire results
2. List of recipients
3. Distribution of Questions by Recipient
4. Summarised responses to Questionnaires
5. Questionnaire sent to EC HQ staff
6. Questionnaire sent to EC Delegation staff
7. Questionnaire sent to Implementing Partners

1 Summary results of the questionnaires:

The questionnaires were completed electronically and returned directly to the evaluators. A total of 30 Questionnaire replies were received and analysed by the Review Team; 13 from EC HQ, 8 from Delegations and 9 from IPs.

Responses were coded to numbers on the scale - agree strongly=1, agree=2.....disagree strongly =5. A mark in the "don't know/not clear" box is ignored.

The mean score is given below - the lower the score the stronger the agreement - but some questions are answered by few participants

EC HQ

Question Number	Mean score	Number of responses
A	2.6	13
B1	3.0	12
B2	2.8	12
B3	3.2	13
B4	2.8	13
B5	2.7	12
B6	2.5	11
C1	3.1	12
C2	3.2	10
C3	3.5	11
C4	3.6	12
C5	1.8	9
C6	3.0	11
D1	3.3	12
D2	2.9	12
D3	3.3	12
D4	3.5	10
D5	3.4	10
D6	3.5	10
E1	3.2	9
E2	2.2	12
E3	3.3	7
E4	1.9	10
E5	2.2	6
F1	3.2	11
F2	2.2	13
G1	3.5	11
G2	3.3	11
G3	3.7	10

Question Number	Mean score	Number of responses
G4	3.2	5
G5	3.4	8
G6	2.9	12
G7	2.8	5
H	2.5	11
I	3.2	10

EC Delegation

	Question Number	Mean score	Number of responses
Over Arching Issues	1	2.0	7
	2	2.8	6
	3	2.1	7
Stakeholder	1	2.0	5
	2	2.4	7
	3	2.7	7
	4	2.6	7
3 "C"s	1	2.5	8
	2	2.4	7
	3	2.3	7
	4	3.2	6
	5	2.9	8
	6	3.3	7
Other MDGs		2.3	8
Other	1	2.6	8
	2	2.4	5

Implementing Partners

Question	Mean score	Number of answers	
3 "C"s	2	2.4	7
	3	2.7	6
MDGs		1.8	9
Admin	1	2.4	7
	2	2.8	8

2. List of Recipients

Questionnaires were sent to the following recipients at EC Headquarters:

Andrew.STANDLEY@ec.europa.eu	<Philip.Mikos@ec.europa.eu>
<Roberto.RIDOLFI@ec.europa.eu>	<Jean-Pierre.Halkin@ec.europa.eu>
<Simona.Mari@ec.europa.eu>	<Christine.MANCA@ec.europa.eu>
<Francoise.COLLET@ec.europa.eu>	<Dominique.BLARIAUX@ec.europa.eu>
<Heloise.TROC@ec.europa.eu>	<Isabel.Faria-De-Almeida@ec.europa.eu>
<Frederic.COMPEYROT@ec.europa.eu>	<Massimiliano.MESSI@ec.europa.eu>
<Andre.Chalmin@ec.europa.eu>	<Patrice-A.PILLET@ec.europa.eu>
<Arno.SCHAEFER@ec.europa.eu>	<Hermann.Spitz@ec.europa.eu>
<Peter.Cavendish@ec.europa.eu>	<Stephane.DELPIERRE@ec.europa.eu>
<Matthias.LANGE@ec.europa.eu>	<Nicholas.WEATHERILL@ec.europa.eu>
<Marc.Debois@ec.europa.eu>	<Willem.OLTHOF@ec.europa.eu>
<Jozias.BLOK@ec.europa.eu>	<David.RADCLIFFE@ec.europa.eu>
<Philippe.STEINMETZ@ec.europa.eu>	<Panayiotis.Passadeos@ec.europa.eu>
<Patrick.Spirlet@ec.europa.eu>	<Guido.CARRARA@ec.europa.eu>
<Jeremy.LESTER@ec.europa.eu>	<Elisabeth.TISON@ec.europa.eu>
<Jerome.RIVIERE@ec.europa.eu>	<Henriette.GEIGER@ec.europa.eu>
<Thijs.WISSINK@ec.europa.eu>	<Maria.PARIS-KETTING@ec.europa.eu>
<Philippe-D.BERTRAND@ec.europa.eu>	<Manuel.ANCILLOTTI@ec.europa.eu>
<Isabelle.LE-NORMAND@ec.europa.eu>	<Alejandra.SUAREZ-ALLER@ec.europa.eu>
<Remy.NOE@ec.europa.eu>	<Franck.VIAULT@ec.europa.eu>
<Mauro.MARIANI@ec.europa.eu>	<Spiros.POLYCANDRIOTIS@ec.europa.eu>
<Jose.Baiges@ec.europa.eu>	<Jakub.URBANIK@ec.europa.eu>

and to the following former EC HQ staff:

<jean-luc.khalfaoui@cirad.fr>; <paolo.sarfatti@iao.florence.it>

Questionnaires were sent to the following EC Delegations:

Afghanistan,
Armenia
Bangladesh
Burundi
Cambodia,
Central African Republic Congo Brazzaville
Chad,
DRC
East Timor,
Georgia
Honduras
Kyrgyzstan
Laos
Liberia:
Myanmar
Nicaragua,
North Korea
Palestine
Sierra Leone:
Somalia
Sudan
Tajikistan
Yemen
Zimbabwe,

Questionnaires were sent to the following Implementing Partners:

For SPs 4 and 5:

- Burundi - Implementing Partner: CISV Corso Chieri 121/6 – 10132 Torino (ITALIA)
- Sudan - Implementing Partner: Deutsche Welthungerhilfe e.V. (Previously German Agro Action) ; Friedrich-Ebert-Strasse 1, 53173 Bonn, Germany
- Bangladesh - (i) People's Oriented Program Implementation (POPI), Jamalpur, Bhairab, Kishoreganj, Bangladesh, (ii) Sabalamby Unnayan Samity (SUS), Shibganj Road, Netrakona-2400, Bangladesh (iii) Assistance for Slum Dwellers (ASD), 6/4, Sir Syed Road, Mohammadpur, Dhaka-1207, Bangladesh (iv) ICCO (Inter-church organisation for development cooperation) P.O. Box 8190 3503 RD Utrecht, the Netherlands (v) Thengamara Mohila Sabuj Sangha (TMSS), Rangpur Road, Thengamara, Gokul, Bogra 5800, Bangladesh (vi) Integrated Rural Development Foundation (IRDF), House # 03, Stadium Road, Lalmonirhat-5500, Bangladesh (vii) Samakal Samaj Unnayan Sangstha, Village : Jahangirabad Hat, Post: Jahangirabad, Thana: Pirgonj, District: Rangpur. Bangladesh (viii) Debi Chowdhurani Palli Unnayan Kendra (DCPUK) (ix) Thengamara Mohila Sabuj Sangha (TMSS), Rangpur Road, Thengamara, Gokul, Bogra 5800, Bangladesh
- Myanmar (i) Save the Children, Wizaya Plaza, 226 U Wisara Road, Bahan Township, Yangon, Myanmar; (ii) Ecology and Economic Development Company Limited (ECODEV); No J8, Shwesabe Avenue, Bayint Naung Road, Kamaryut Township, Yangon, Myanmar

For SPs 1, 2, 3 and 6:

CGIAR (to the Secretariat and to the Alliance), IFAD, IFPRI, WFP, FAO, WOA, Paris, Agriconsulting and NEPAD

3. Table showing the distribution of Questions by Recipient

Review Question	ECHQ = European Commission Headquarters EC Del = European Commission Delegations IP = Implementing Partners		
	ECHQ	EC Del	IP
1. Strategic Level			
1.1.1.1 To what extent do FSTP's Strategic Priorities reflect its mandate?	✓		
1.1.2.1 How well do the activities fit under the Strategic Priorities?	✓		
1.1.2.2 How adequately are the Strategic Priorities covered by the activities?	✓		
1.1.2.3 To what extent do the activities represent a logical and coherent package?	✓		
1.1.2.4 Were the implementing partners for activities the most appropriate to achieve the objectives?	✓		
1.1.2.5 Are the activities relevant to the needs and problems identified in specific regions and consistent with national, regional and global strategies?	✓		
1.1.2.6 Are the results of the Calls for Proposals satisfactory, and are they likely to foster achievement of FSTP objectives?	✓		
1.1.3.1 Are the objectives and activities in balance with food security needs at the global, continental and regional levels?	✓		
1.1.3.2 Does the set of activities that make up the Programme have a clear focus on the food security of the poorest and most vulnerable groups, and do they contribute to achieving the MDG on poverty and hunger?	✓		
1.1.3.3 Does the Programme's agenda strike the correct balance between food availability, food access, and food use/nutritional adequacy?	✓		
1.1.3.4 To what extent do the geographical programmes, Regional Indicative	✓		

Review Question	ECHQ = European Commission Headquarters EC Del = European Commission Delegations IP = Implementing Partners		
	ECHQ	EC Del	IP
Programmes and FTSP together form a coherent EC approach to food security for the poorest and most vulnerable groups?			
1.1.3.5 Should the strategy offer a more comprehensive package of measures to tackle the three dimensions of food security through a more strategic approach?	✓		
1.1.3.6 Does the yearly available funding (between € 230 to € 250 million) allow for the achievement of the different objectives (structured in components and sub-components) to be reached worldwide in an efficient and effective way?	✓		
1.1.4.1 Where does gender fit under FSTP's Strategic Priorities?	✓		
1.1.4.1 Where does vulnerability fit under FSTP's Strategic Priorities?			
1.1.4.2 To what extent are concerns about the gender dimension of food security reflected in the activities funded by the Programme?		✓	✓
1.1.4.3 To what extent are concerns about threats to food security resulting from climate change reflected in the activities funded by the Programme?		✓	✓
1.1.4.2 To what extent are concerns about the vulnerability dimension of food security reflected in the activities funded by the Programme?		✓	✓
1.1.5.1 Was the involvement of non-state actors in the preparation of the strategy and in the implementation of MIP sufficient and satisfactory?	✓	✓	✓
1.1.5.2 What can be done to involve them more closely in developing Phase 2?	✓	✓	✓
1.1.5.3 What has been the involvement of non-state actors in implementing the activities of FSTP?			✓
1.1.5.4 What lessons were learned from the workshop on Strategic Priority #1 that can be incorporated into a possible future workshop on innovative approaches?	✓		
1.1.6.1 How and to what extent have FSTP subcomponents been integrated with the EC's facility for rapid response to soaring food prices (the Food Facility) established in 2008?	✓		
1.1.6.2 Since both soaring food prices and the recession have a strong global dimension, should the TS be revised better to reflect these issues?	✓		
2. Implementation Level			
1.2.1.1 What measures have been put in place to achieve complementarity?	✓	✓	
1.2.1.2 Are FSTP actions sufficiently complementary and subsidiary to EC geographical programmes particularly in the areas of (a) LRRD in exceptional situations and (b) the special allocation to ALA, Georgia and Armenia?	✓		
1.2.1.3 Are FSTP-funded activities complementary to national strategies? In particular (a) are they integrated within the broad PRSP framework, and (b) were interventions in LRRD countries and fragile states based on national strategies?		✓	✓
1.2.1.4 What specific procedures are followed to ensure that FSTP activities are complementary with those of other donors, particularly EC member states?	✓	✓	✓
1.2.1.5 Can instances be found of donor co-ordination leading to division of labour between FSTP and other donors?		✓	
1.2.1.6 What are the results of implementation through global initiatives or regional partners?	✓		
1.2.1.7 Has EC visibility been sufficiently ensured when working with other partners?	✓	✓	

Review Question	ECHQ = European Commission Headquarters EC Del = European Commission Delegations IP = Implementing Partners		
	ECHQ	EC Del	IP
1.2.1.8 Have other donors' actions on the issues addressed by the FSTP substantially changed in terms of presence, resources and priorities?		✓	
1.2.1.9 Should the Commission maintain the current approach to finance on the one hand mainly global, continental and regional food security programmes under FSTP, and on the other hand national programmes with an impact on food security under the geographical instruments?	✓		
1.2.2.1 Are there mechanisms for creating synergies between FSTP and FP7 and have any instances emerged?	✓		
1.2.2.2 When research projects are FSTP-funded are conditions put in place to cover dissemination of findings in order to impact on food security?			✓
1.2.2.3 In the case of ongoing activities, have issues related to the on-the-ground delivery been satisfactory taken into account in the design?			✓
1.2.3.1 At what level does monitoring take place? (inputs, outputs, outcome, impact)?			✓
1.2.3.2 Is the FSTP arranged in some kind of logical hierarchy akin to the vertical and horizontal logic of the LFA?			✓
1.2.3.3 If so, have Objectively Verifiable Indicators and Means of Verification been identified at the various levels in the <i>Inputs</i> → <i>Outputs</i> → <i>Outcomes</i> → <i>Impact</i> chain of causality?			✓
1.2.3.4 If not, what performance indicators have been developed at the Programmatic level, and have they proved useful in measuring outcomes or (likely) impact?			✓
1.2.3.5 What has been the experience of the Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) exercise with respect to FSTP?			
1.2.3.6 Has this instrument proved adequate or does it need improvement?			
1.2.3.7 Is there a sizeable difference in the impact of national versus regional measures?			
1.2.4.1 Are there any positive impacts on MDGs 4, 5 and 7 that can be attributed to activities under FTSP?			
1.2.5.1 To what extent has timing for commitments and payments been respected?			✓
1.2.5.2 Have there been any particular delays, setbacks, obstacles, and if so what measures were taken to address them?			✓
1.2.5.3 Has the right balance been struck between thematic coverage and administrative cost? (i.e. a large number of relatively small grants with correspondingly high admin costs vs. a smaller number of relatively large grants placing less burden on limited administrative resources)	✓		

2. Summarised responses to Questionnaires

Table 3.1.1 Responses to Questions Regarding Relation of Mandate to Strategic Priorities	
Question	Summary of Responses
To what extent do FSTP's Strategic Priorities reflect its mandate?	Most agreed that the strategy and MIP agree broadly with the mandate. The broadness of the SPs allowing considerable flexibility in programming. While MDG1 focuses on "extreme poverty" as well as "hunger"; extreme poverty is not a priority target of the FSTP. FSTP is largely aimed at LRRD, these countries do not represent the poorest and most vulnerable, food insecure people in the world. Others would prefer a more even spread over the three pillars of food

Table 3.1.1 Responses to Questions Regarding Relation of Mandate to Strategic Priorities

Question	Summary of Responses
	security. One noted that SP1 only addresses the IPG related to research and technology while other IPGs are also important for FS.

Table 3.1.2 Responses to Questions Regarding Relation of Strategic Priorities to Programme	
Question	Summary of Responses
How well do the activities fit under the Strategic Priorities?	<p>Most EC QU staff agreed to some extent to the consistency between the activities and strategic priorities of the FSTP. Ambiguity of the SPs allow for activities to be grouped under various SPs.</p> <p>Lack of geographical focus of SPs create problems of coordination of activities within NIPs and lack of awareness of recipient government of additionally funded activities. Specifically, activities for nutrition falling under SPs 3, 4 and 5 are named as well as activities for FS information financed under SPs 3 and 4.</p> <p>Lack of highly relevant themes such as access and nutrition is also named as major deficiency, albeit again more in terms of a weakly defined SP and not in terms of congruency between a defined SP and an activity under it. Some activities are seen more to fit under geographic budget lines such as EDF or ENPI.</p>
How adequately are the Strategic Priorities covered by the activities?	<p>About half of respondents agreed (no reason given) and half disagreed with this proposition. On the latter, the reasons given relate mostly to gaps in coverage of current FS agendas at global level and of regional bodies (SAARC, ASEAN and in Latin America) due to a lack of dialogue at regional and global levels and resulting lack of ownership.</p> <p>Also, the lack of “access” as one of the four “pillars” of FS is mentioned. Others agree, at least to the extent. The fact that SPs overlap and are complementary is seen as contributing well to the overall FSTP objective. Also, the different speed between the SPs is mentioned. On the other hand, the lack of coverage of Asia and Central Asia regions was mentioned.</p> <p>(The special services concerned with humanitarian activities (ECHO) agree or agree partly mentioning good focus under SP 1 (research) and less focus under other SPs, particularly SP 2 on information systems).</p>
To what extent do the activities represent a logical and coherent package?	<p>Some disagreed stressing the size of the programme and lack of coherence between its components at one hand and the lack of demand side of FS including access and social transfers on the other hand. Also, the lack of coherence with national country programmes is mentioned.</p> <p>A minority agrees at least partially to the statement emphasizing the AAPs being like a sum of actions at least. It is to be noted that most criticisms relate again more to the lack of coherence between the six SPs than those between activities within their respective SP.</p> <p>Others agreed with the statement while seeing room for more linkages, knowledge sharing and coordination between some or all of the six SPs. Criticism mostly relates to the lack of focus on impact at national/ country level and a wrong focus on a non existent regional level due to lack of regional integration.</p> <p>A few clearly disagreed stressing the lack of linkage between the SPs which are merely linked by their lack of funding under country programmes as a “big wish list”. Also, the lack of an overarching link, such as the four pillars of FS is emphasized.</p>
Were the implementing partners for activities the most appropriate to achieve the objectives?	<p>Some agreed to the extent to this question. The lack of capacity of partners selected is mentioned foremostly. The lack of dynamic regional integration in Africa is given as an example.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that in some cases the speeding up of contractual procedures was at the basis of partner selection such as in the case of UN agencies with which framework agreements existed already whereas assessments of the institutional capacity of IPs should have been undertaken before implementing the AAPs. Such studies are underway for South Asia (with DFID and the WB) and could be done in preparation</p>

	<p>of the next MIP as well. Such preparatory studies could include IOs, Governments, NGOs and local authorities in future.</p> <p>Others agreed at least partially to the statement, whereby problems with global and regional organisations were seen as obstacles.</p> <p>The special services concerned with humanitarian activities (ECHO), also agreed to the extent. The present strong focus on UN agencies - apart from the SP 2 on information systems where it is perceived as working well - and regional organizations is seen as obstacle to reaching affected population groups more effectively, particularly regarding lack of local authorities as partners in the case of SP 4 on LRRD situations.</p>
Are the activities relevant to the needs and problems identified in specific regions and consistent with national, regional and global strategies?	<p>EC staff operating at more central level (DEV or AIDCO horizontal and quality support units), all agree or agree in part at least. They stress the need to prioritise more clearly the needs and strategies identified to maximise impact. Also, the existence of strategies is seen as a mere assumption in some cases.</p> <p>Some disagreed or even strongly disagreed, saying that FSTP activities are not linked clearly to national strategies and even regional policies, particularly in Africa. Another reason given is the fact that for regional and continental actions AIDCO/F is “disengaging” and no real relay is taken by the Geo-Directorates due to lack of resources for instructing on time.</p> <p>Another problem perceived are situations where no Delegation has a regional role to play in regard to FS. For the special case of DPRK, there is strong agreement as there is no other programme available for funding the EC’s action.</p>
Are the results of the Calls for Proposals satisfactory, and are they likely to foster achievement of FSTP objectives?	<p>Most agree, especially for the specific case of LRRD component (SP 4) where NGOs are the only choice to work with in most cases. However, impact and sustainability of such NGO cooperation remain to be seen.</p> <p>Disagreement is explained by a perceived “top down approach instead of bottom-up”.</p> <p>As before, in the special case of DPRK, there is strong agreement as this cooperation modality is the only one available with ECHO phasing out and AIDCO scaling up its operations.</p>

Table 3.1.3 Responses to Questions Regarding Relation of Programme to Food Security

Question	Summary of Responses
Are the objectives and activities in balance with food security needs at the global, continental and regional levels?	<p>Respondents were fairly evenly split on this issue, with four indicating that there is balance, four disagreeing (one strongly) and four agreeing ‘to some extent’. Those who agreed tended not to elaborate; those who disagreed tended to stress lack of attention to food access, food utilisation and nutrition. Few respondents addressed the geographical dimension, but it was pointed out that little progress has been made in advancing the regional agenda, partly because global discussions did not gain momentum until after the 2008 food price spike, and partly because it has proved difficult to find partners at the regional level. Another respondent noted that Asia receives a disproportionately low share of FSTP resources – around 23 per cent.</p>
Do the activities that make up the Programme have a clear focus on the food security of the poorest and most vulnerable, and contribute to MDG1?	<p>There was broad agreement that the needs of the most vulnerable are poorly taken into account, and that inadequate targeting is the main cause. However quite a number of respondents identified SP4 as an exception to this generalisation.</p>
Does the Programme’s agenda strike the correct balance between food availability, food access, and food use/nutritional adequacy?	<p>Reservations were expressed during the course of interviews as well as in the questionnaire survey, as to the balance of the FSTP with respect to the three ‘pillars’. It was noted that while SP1 has a clear focus on food availability, none of the six SPs has a clear focus on food access, food utilisation or nutrition.</p>

Question	Summary of Responses
To what extent do the geographical programmes, Regional Indicative Programmes and FTSP together form a coherent EC approach to food security for the poorest and most vulnerable groups?	There was near unanimity that this set of programmes do not together form a coherent and co-ordinated EC approach to food security for the poorest and most vulnerable groups – once more with the exception of the countries covered under SP4. There was a corresponding degree of unanimity of view that the strategy should offer a more comprehensive package of measures to tackle the three dimensions of food security through a more strategic approach. However it was also noted that the non-cohesive and non-coordinated nature of the present package is hardly surprising in view of the diffuse and highly fragmented character of the EC's food security instruments, and given the severe staffing constraints faced by the various DGs responsible for deploying these instruments.
Should the strategy offer a more comprehensive package of measures to tackle the three dimensions of food security through a more strategic approach?	The great majority of respondents agreed that it should (and most of those who did so said that they felt strongly about this). However very few elaborated on this issue and those who did tended to repeat previous statements concerning lack of coverage of food access, utilisation and nutrition. None elaborated on what form a more strategic approach might take.
Does the yearly available funding allow for the achievement of the different objectives to be reached worldwide in an efficient and effective way?	Most respondents felt that the budget is completely inadequate, given the huge food security challenges to be faced. However a number also pointed out that funding is not the only constraint to be faced. Others include lack of strong regional institutions with which to partner, lack of a conducive policy environment in many countries and a range of governance issues.

Question	Summary of Responses
Where does gender fit under FSTP's Strategic Priorities?	A majority of respondents (7) disagreed with the proposition that gender is adequately covered at SP level, while three agreed and two thought it was covered 'to some extent'. One Implementing Partner also addressed the issue at SP level, noting that 'considering the crucial role of women in ensuring food security and the gender-specific obstacles that exist to women's full participation in society, there could be more emphasis on promoting gender equality in the strategy'.
To what extent are concerns about the gender dimension of food security reflected in the activities funded by the Programme?	Six of the HQ respondents felt that the gender dimension of FS is inadequately addressed at this level. One felt it was adequately covered, and six thought it was covered 'to some extent'. The remainder did not know the situation at this level. The responses of the Implementing Partners, perhaps understandably, differed sharply from this, with almost all of them arguing strongly that gender concerns were adequately addressed. More tellingly, the Delegations which responded to the questionnaire tended to agree with the IPs, with almost all stating that gender was adequately covered in FSTP activities.
Where does vulnerability fit under FSTP's Strategic Priorities?	Almost all respondents felt that this theme is covered at least to some extent, and most identified SP4, with its focus is on LRRD, as the main mechanism for addressing it. Many reported that outside of the countries under SP4 vulnerability is insufficiently addressed
To what extent are concerns about the vulnerability dimension of food security reflected in the activities funded by the Programme?	Of the eight Delegations which responded to the questionnaire, six were from countries supported under SP4: all of these felt that vulnerability was adequately addressed. Of the two non-LRRD Delegations, Bangladesh strongly agreed that the issue is adequately addressed – understandably when that country's only FSTP activity is the FSUP project, which specifically targets vulnerable, food-insecure women and their dependents. The second case was Honduras, where it was reported that

Question	Summary of Responses
	vulnerability was addressed 'to some extent'.
To what extent are concerns about threats to food security resulting from climate change reflected in the Strategic Priorities?	Almost all respondents felt that such concerns were inadequately addressed, or felt that they were addressed 'to some extent'. Most of the latter reported that it was covered only under SP1, although one mentioned SP3 in this respect.
To what extent are concerns about threats to food security resulting from climate change reflected in the activities funded by the Programme?	Among Headquarters staff, six respondents felt that such threats were inadequately addressed, two argued the opposite, three felt it is addressed 'to some extent'. The responses to the questionnaire sent to the Delegations were rather more positive, however. The majority felt that concerns were adequately addressed, while only one felt otherwise. The implementing partners were, the most positive group, with ten agreeing with the underlying proposition, one agreeing strongly, one agreeing 'to some extent' and none disagreeing.

Question	Summary of Responses
Was the involvement of non-state actors in the preparation of the strategy and in the implementation of MIP sufficient and satisfactory?	Non-state actors had little opportunity to participate in the preparation of the strategy and MIP but much more at the later stages - i.e. when national programmes including calls for proposals were being formulated.
What can be done to involve them more closely in developing Phase 2?	More involvement of state and civil society actors would be welcomed for phase II as this is an integral requirement of the Paris Declaration to ensure ownership and alignment of the FSTP with developing countries' objectives and strategies. FSTP should be redefined first so that a clear framework existed on which to build the activities of phase II.
What has been the involvement of non-state actors in implementing the target actions of FSTP?	Most responses from delegations state that due to the weakness of state organisations they play little part in the implementation of FSTP activities. Civil society organisations however play a vital role in many of the activities.
What lessons were learned from the workshop on Strategic Priority #1 that can be incorporated into a possible future workshop on innovative approaches?	Few respondents were aware of the workshop – those that were claimed that it was a considerable success for the future strategic planning of the FSTP and FP7.

Question	Summary of Responses
Should FSTP take over some of the functions of the Food Facility when the latter is phased out?	Most respondents thought that this would be inappropriate. The reasons given included the differing aims and objectives of the two programmes, technical incompatibility between the two, the strong agricultural bias of the FF, conflicts between the short-term nature of the FF and the longer term approach of the FSTP, and the country level focus of the FF vis-à-vis the primarily regional/continental/global approach of the FSTP. In sharp contrast to this, two respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with this proposition, while three agreed somewhat. The logic was that FSTP and FF already co-finance projects in some countries and that it could be done mainly SP4 (LRRD). In both 'camps' the argument was put forward that FSTP could not take on these responsibilities without additional funding.
Should the FSTP be revised better to reflect these emerging	More than half of respondents were in favour of this approach, while a further 23% were to some extent in favour. Among those who elaborated

Question	Summary of Responses
issues?	on their answers, there was a tendency to concentrate on the relationship between increased food price volatility and increased food insecurity, and on the growing need for social protection in the face of these developments. It was also argued that the strategic priorities should be rearranged around the time scale of interventions – i.e. short-, medium- and long-term. However an issue that was raised that possibly rules out this option is the fact that both the present phase of FSTP and the next phase are governed by the DCI Regulation and that the Programme's underlying strategy cannot be changed in any way that makes it incompatible with this framework.

Question	Summary of Responses
What measures have been put in place to achieve complementarity?	<p>Almost half of the EC headquarters respondents to the questionnaire either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposition that adequate measures had been put in place to achieve complementarity, coherence and continuity. It was stated that people tended to work in isolation at DG, Directorate and Unit levels. Lack of continuity between FSBL and FSTP was also reported as a problem, particularly in Asia, with the result that by the time special allocations under FSTPs had been agreed it had often too late to modify the CSPs and give prominence to the food security issue. For some countries this had resulted in a huge budget reduction for food security. Another comment was that rural development projects which have a food security component are currently being phased out in favour of budgetary support, and that this compromises complementarity. Finally, it was noted that without a sound global strategy, the Delegations are at a loss to make the FSTP complementary to the NIPs and CSPs.</p> <p>Of the eight Delegations which responded to the questionnaire, six were in countries supported under the LRRD approach of SP4. All six reported positively about performance in relation to the three Cs. Positive features of the Programme were reported to include (a) its flexibility, (b) the fact that its four-year duration had optimised targeting (coherence), as well as continuity and complementarity with core projects, and (c) its strong support for the government programme. A seventh LRRD country, North Korea, does not have a Delegation, but an interview with the relevant staff member in Brussels revealed that the three Cs are well-served in that case too. In sharp contrast to this, Delegations in the two countries where support is provided under SP5, the 3 Cs were not thought to have been achieved.</p>
Are FSTP actions sufficiently complementary and subsidiary to EC geographical programmes, particularly in the areas of (a) LRRD in exceptional situations and (b) the special allocation to ALA, Georgia and Armenia?	In terms of LRRD, there was a considerable array of views across the respondents. The modal answer (5 respondents) was to disagree that complementarity and subsidiarity had been achieved, with a number of respondents stating that the necessary practical measures had not yet been put in place. Two respondents agreed with the proposition (one of them strongly), but did not elaborate. No responses were obtained on the question regarding Georgia and Armenia.
Are FSTP-funded activities and projects complementary to national strategies? In particular (a) are they integrated within the broad PRSP framework, and (b) were interventions in LRRD countries and fragile states	Among the eight delegations there are four special cases with respect to national food security strategy in general, and the PRSP in particular. (i) In Honduras the FSTP was reported to be in line with the food security component of the revised draft PRSP, but that the recent coup has created great uncertainty; (ii) In the DRC, the Delegation reported that there is not really a national food security strategy to align. (iii) Zimbabwe is a special case for obvious reasons. (iv) In East Timor, the FSTP is in

Table 4.1.1 Responses to Questions Regarding Complementarity, Coherence and Continuity	
Question	Summary of Responses
based on national strategies?	line with national food security strategy, but less in line with government practices because some of these practices are inconsistent with national strategy. The Delegations in the four other countries agreed with the proposition that FSTP interventions are in line with the PRSP and other national food security strategies. In the case of Sudan, the Delegation agreed very strongly with this proposition.
What specific procedures are followed to ensure that FSTP activities are complementary with those of other donors, particularly EC member states?	Answers vary with SP and with level of geographic spread of the activity. At the national level, delegations check with donor coordination groups and with active international organisations. One delegation reported complementarity with the <i>policy</i> of the national government but not with <i>practice</i> of the same government. Seven implementing agents reported good co-ordination of donors to ensure complementarity while one reported that donors and MSs each “follow their own procedures strongly”. At the global and regional level ECHQ staff reported that normal procedures for the formulation of activities and the preparation of action fiches ensure that the issue is addressed.
Can instances be found of donor co-ordination leading to division of labour between FSTP and other donors?	EC delegations responded that donor coordination groups exist within each country but that food security is rarely discussed in the donor coordination meetings. Despite this there is normally a geographical or sectoral division of labour. Delegations did not identify instances of duplication of effort, there being “plenty of work for everyone”
What are the results of implementation through global initiatives or regional partners?	Although there is a risk that these initiatives will have a high transaction cost, it is expected that greater complementarity will be achieved through co-ordination of donor actions in global or regional initiatives. One respondent summed up the position as: “Transaction costs in multi-country multi-actor global initiatives can be very high, but one should compare these costs with the ownership, relevance, impact and sustainability of these initiatives”. All respondents replied that it is too early to tell what the results will be for the FSTP activities.
Has EC visibility been sufficiently ensured when working with other partners?	One third of [EC HQ respondents] stated “don’t know/no answer” indicating a certain reluctance or low degree of concrete experience with this policy which is mostly relevant not at HQ but at field level. Of the rest, half agreed and half disagreed with the statement. Disagreement reasons: Delegations did not report of it, WB trust funds reduced visibility, difficulty of visibility at regional / continental levels. Agreement reasons: Co-financed actions with international organisations, however sophisticated they might be, are worth being pursued, and therefore visibility of EC funded actions is important. Most interviewees at EC Delegations agreed saying that it is mostly the case with NGOs and partners, less so with UN agencies and IGOs; visibility modalities are widely used, however in media communications (TV and newspapers) and NGOs sometimes downplay the role of the EC as a major funding institution. But usually, NGOs excel, and annual visibility plans are now standard with partners, but with UN agencies, visibility reportedly is still low. Previous FAO cooperation projects had low visibility, but in recent partner contracts, visibility has become well integrated.
Have other donors’ actions on the issues addressed by the FSTP substantially changed in terms of presence, resources and priorities?	About half [of EC Delegation respondents] disagreed, mentioning the continuity of the challenges in the FS/ agriculture sector for cooperation agencies although some donors may have their own agenda. The others agreed for varying reasons (change from initial emergency food aid to developmental approach; there is replication by other projects and donors

Table 4.1.1 Responses to Questions Regarding Complementarity, Coherence and Continuity	
Question	Summary of Responses
	of positive results of some FSTP projects; after FSTP was a low priority for some donors for some years, but for some new programmes under preparation, World Bank started a large programme to which the EC FF will contribute.
Should the Commission maintain the current approach to finance on the one hand mainly global, continental and regional food security programmes under FSTP, and on the other hand national programmes with an impact on food security under the geographical instruments?	<p>About half [at EC HQ] disagree with this statement: Partner countries are confused when the EC comes in with different procedures and approaches; continental or regional actions suffer great delays or simply do not work without relay at national level; national programmes in normal countries need to be financed, not only in crisis situations; implementation at global, continental and regional levels is not clear and sure, more flexibility is needed and the country level approach should be possible being the only one really working; in the fight against poverty and food insecurity, national strategy is more efficient, also poverty is a question of sovereignty; the global crisis ask for national priorities to be at the forefront.</p> <p>Another half agreed in various degrees, i.e. support the present approach: to go geographic and thematic in parallel (double approach) is seen as extremely positive; the case of countries like North Korea is a special one as there, FSTP is the only modality working.</p>

Table 4.1.2 Responses to Questions on Technology Development	
Question	Summary of Responses
Are there mechanisms for creating synergies between FSTP and FP7 and have any instances emerged?	The few responses received from HQ staff suggested some complementarities, but these are not always assured and depend on the colleagues involved.
In the case of ongoing actions and projects, has on-the-ground delivery been satisfactory in terms of quality and pace?	Implementing partners reported that dissemination is planned at an early stage. They do however recognise the difficult of achieving effective dissemination to beneficiaries other than those directly involved in the project. A stronger multi-disciplinary approach is called for by one respondent in order to maximise the impact.

Table 4.1.3 Responses to Questions on Results Orientated Monitoring	
Question	Summary of Responses
At what level does monitoring take place? (inputs, outputs, outcome, impact)?	Only a minority of respondents [from Implementing Partners] appeared to have not seriously prepared for the important role of M&E in the FSTP project to be implemented. Most respondents, particularly those from IOs like FAO or linked to global governance structures such as IFPRI or ILC have their own sophisticated M&E system which will be applied independently of any additional EC ROMs. These systems (FAO) include LFA, Performance Assessment Matrix (prepared during Inception Phase), monitoring at all levels (inputs, outputs, outcomes, impact); also mid-term and final evaluations are foreseen in some EC/FAO cooperation programmes (South East Asia); other systems (ILC) include M&E framework at three levels (performance of work plan and budget, strategy framework outcome, outcome of global network, processing indicators); external evaluation of outputs, outcomes and impact is used in the case of IFPRI, besides monitoring of governing bodies at three levels. Another example (Uganda, Bangladesh) is the employment of a PME expert paid by the IP to guide other IPs to properly monitoring activities
Is the FSTP arranged in some kind of logical hierarchy akin to the vertical and horizontal logic of the LFA?	As pointed out before, logical frameworks (LFs) have been reconstructed for the overall FSTP and its six SPs on the basis of the design documents (TS, AAPs). The six SPs can be grouped as results under the overall FSTP objective in a logically coherent way, with each SP reproducible as

Table 4.1.3 Responses to Questions on Results Orientated Monitoring	
Question	Summary of Responses
	individual LF under it (interlocking/ cascading LFs).
If so, have Objectively Verifiable Indicators and Means of Verification been identified at the various levels in the Inputs → Outputs → Outcomes → Impact chain of causality?	Results have been clearly defined, in some cases result levels have been inserted (global; continental/ regional, case of SP1, SP2) or broad result areas (risk reduction, policy development, NRM, case of SP3; innovative approaches, special allocation countries, case of SP5) or area based levels (Africa, ALA, case of SP3) or a combination of both (SP3). Results usually are well defined as are OVIs. The numbering of OVIs does not always easily align with the results (an effort was made to realign them, see Annex 7.7, re-constructed LFs). In the case of IOs as (FAO), LF application is planned or already applied (sometimes in parallel to own Performance Assessment Matrix), also MTR and terminal evaluations will be used. In other cases, the instrument described in the grant proposal (IFPRI) will be used (LF in the case of ILC, embedded in own results based M&E framework).
If not, what performance indicators have been developed at the Programmatic level, and have they proved useful in measuring outcomes or (likely) impact?	Reference was made to the indicators contained in the standard documents (LFs) to be used as a routine. Country-specific LFs are foreseen for inception phase with indicators to be developed with in-country stakeholders (FAO). One third found it too early in the project cycle to comment on any additional indicators to be developed in the course of the project. Also mentioned were Country Strategy Support Programs to develop their own performance indicators mentioned (IFPRI). Own core and specific indicators developed by members themselves but too early to assess their usefulness (ILC). Another example stressed indicators for cross-cutting issues included in the design (gender and environmental sustainability-related (FAO).

Table 4.1.4 Responses to Questions on FSTP and the Other MDGs	
Question	Summary of Responses
Are there any positive impacts on MDGs 4, 5 and 7 that can be attributed to activities under FTSP?	Most Brussels-based respondents agreed that there are positive impacts, but none was able to give specific examples. This is not surprising, given that such knowledge is most likely to spring from close acquaintance with projects in the field. Delegation-level respondents also agreed and were able to provide some specific information. The most systematic contribution across the board seems to be in Bangladesh, where the Delegation reported that the Food Security for the Ultra Poor (FSUP) project supports awareness-raising activities on the reduction of child mortality, maternal health, and environmental issues all of which may make an indirect contribution to achieving MDGs 4, 5, and 7. Other Delegations were less precise, however. In the Central African Republic it was reported that one of the activities involves the health system. In Sudan there was strong agreement with the proposition with respect to MDGs 4 and 7, but less for MDG 5, whereas exactly the opposite was reported by the West Bank/Gaza Delegation, which disagreed for MDGs 4 and 5, but agreed for MDG7. In the case of the Implementing Partners, the results seem reasonably encouraging in at least a few cases. All respondents agreed that there have been positive contributions, with responses ranging from 'strongly agree' (42%) through 'agree' (33%) to 'agree to some extent' (25%).

Table 4.1.5 Responses to Questions on Administration	
Question	Summary of Responses
To what extent has timing for commitments and payments been respected?	Implementing partners report widely differing experiences – most agree that the timing has been respected and that there are few problems. Two partners report delays in the approval and contracting phase. This is

Table 4.1.5 Responses to Questions on Administration	
Question	Summary of Responses
	particularly problematic when funding from a previous source has stopped and a hiatus occurs before EC funding commences. There are few delays in payment after the contracts are signed.
Have there been any particular delays, setbacks, obstacles, and if so what measures were taken to address them?	Delays in signature of the contract can cause significant knock-on problems to project implementation. One partner reported that different programmes have different starting dates – this makes co-ordination and the development of synergies difficult. Other partners reported problems causing delays in project implementation but these are internal problems and unrelated to EC management.
Has the right balance been struck between thematic coverage and administrative cost? (i.e. a large number of relatively small grants with correspondingly high admin costs vs. a smaller number of relatively large grants placing less burden on limited administrative resources)	Resources at AIDCO are limited. At present there is a major difficulty handling the existing projects and this burden will increase as more of the 2009 and 2010 projects come on-stream. This project size restriction is leading to more projects being funded through International Organisations such as IFAD and FAO. Projects managed by delegations – including those devolved from centrally managed calls for proposals are often smaller but the problem of resources still exists at the delegations as they do not have staff dedicated to working on FSTP projects. In the comments from the delegations it was also noted that “small is often better” as communities and local organisations often do not have the capacity to handle large projects. It was also remarked that clear rules regarding project size should be set from the beginning, in order to avoid a number of very small projects. This was not the case with the MIP.

5. Questionnaire sent to EC HQ staff

HTSPE

**Mid Term Review of the
EC Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP)**

**Questionnaire for EC Commission
Headquarters Personnel**

The firm HTSPE has been requested to conduct a Mid Term Review of the EC Food Security Thematic Programme.

The objective of the present mission is to review the MIP (2007-2010) together with the AAPs implementing the strategy over the period 2007-2009 so as to provide inputs and recommendations for the preparation of a second phase of the thematic strategy for 2011-2013. The outcome of these questionnaires will serve as a basis for more in-depth interviews with a selected number of stakeholders. Together, the questionnaires and interviews will provide crucial inputs to the review process.

Confidentiality: Please note that this survey is strictly confidential. Findings will be released ONLY in aggregate form. Under no circumstances will the name of the individual providing the information be released to anyone outside of the Mid Term Review team.

Guidelines

1. Under each heading a statement or series of statements is made (in italics) with which you are asked to agree or disagree. Please place a cross in one box per statement. You are then given space to substantiate your answer. We would appreciate it if you used this opportunity, as it would allow us to present a more in-depth analysis. Please expand the relevant text box as necessary.
2. The questionnaire is divided into nine sections. At the start of each section, a short explanation is provided.
3. **Deadline:** The deadline for the report is tight. In order to collate and interpret your responses we would like to receive your response at the latest by 19th June.
4. **Follow-up:** Please indicate if you are willing to take part in a telephone interview as follow up to this questionnaire. This does not apply to those of you that we interview personally during our visits to Brussels.

Return per email: Please complete this questionnaire electronically and return it by email to

coombs_david@hotmail.com

Personal Details

Name of person completing this form:

Position held within EC:

Role in FSTP – which Strategic Priority?

Are you willing to take part in a telephone interview as follow up to this questionnaire?

YES

NO

If YES, please provide an office telephone number and a time/date you would be available
NUMBER:

AVAILABILITY:

A. From Mandate to Strategic Priorities

The overall objective of the FSTP is 'To improve food security in favour of the poorest and the most vulnerable and to contribute to achieving the first MDG on hunger, through a set of actions which ensure overall coherence, complementarity and continuity of Community interventions, including in the area of transition from relief to development'.

The Programme's six Strategic Priorities accurately reflect this mandate.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.
.

B. From Strategic Priorities to Programme

The FSTP operates by funding a series of activities, each of which is classified under one or other of six Strategic Priorities. Looking at the FSTP as a whole over 2008 to 2009:

1. The activities fit under the Strategic Priority to which they are assigned.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.
.

2. The six Strategic Priorities are well covered by the activities supported under FSTP

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.
.

3. The FSTP represents a logical and coherent package.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

Strongly
Agree

Agree

Agree to
Some Extent

Disagree

Strongly
Disagree

Don't know/
Not clear

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

5. *Activities funded under the FSTP are relevant to the needs and problems identified in specific regions and consistent with national, regional and global strategies.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.
.

6. *The activities funded under Calls for Proposals are likely to foster achievement of FSTP objectives*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.
.

C. From Programme to Food Security

According to EC policy, 'Food security is multi-disciplinary and involves three dimensions: (i) availability of food (at national and regional levels); (ii) access to food (by households); and (iii) food use and nutritional adequacy (at individual level)'. Again you are asked to state the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement, looking at the FSTP 'on the whole'

1. *The objectives and activities of the FTSP are well aligned with food security needs at the global, continental and regional levels*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.
.

2. *The set of activities that make up the Programme have a clear focus on the food security of the poorest and most vulnerable groups*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

3. *The Programme strikes an appropriate balance between food availability, food access, and food use/nutritional adequacy.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

4. *The geographical programmes, Regional Indicative Programmes and FTSP together form a coherent EC approach to food security for the poorest and most vulnerable groups*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

5. *The FSTP should offer a more comprehensive package of measures to tackle the three dimensions of food security through a strategic approach.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

6. *The yearly available funding of between €230 to €250 million allows for the achievement of the objectives worldwide in an efficient and effective way*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

D. Overarching Themes

In addition to the three dimensions – or ‘pillars’ – of food security, two overarching themes are also widely recognised. The first of these is gender, because in some cases food insecurity affects women and men differently, given such practices as intra-household discrimination in the allocation of food. Gender in turn affects food security, since women are usually responsible for handling, storing, processing and cooking food, and the way these tasks are performed can affect food safety and therefore food utilization. Vulnerability to food insecurity can affect all three pillars, i.e. at national, household and individual levels. Again you are asked to state the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement, looking at the FSTP ‘on the whole’

1. *Gender aspects of food security are adequately covered under the six Strategic Priorities of FSTP.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

2. *Vulnerability aspects of food security are adequately covered under the six Strategic Priorities of FSTP.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

3. *Threats to food security resulting from climate change are adequately covered under the six Strategic Priorities of FSTP.*

Strongly
Agree

Agree

Agree to
Some Extent

Disagree

Strongly
Disagree

Don't know/
Not clear

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

4. *Gender aspects of food security are adequately covered under the activities funded by FSTP*

Strongly
Agree

Agree

Agree to
Some Extent

Disagree

Strongly
Disagree

Don't know/
Not clear

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

5. *Vulnerability aspects of food security are adequately covered under the activities funded by FSTP*

5. *Vulnerability of food security are adequately covered under the activities funded by FSTP*

Strongly
Agree

Agree

Agree to
Some Extent

Disagree

Strongly
Disagree

Don't know/
Not clear

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

6. *Threats to food security resulting from climate change are adequately covered under the activities*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

E. Stakeholder Consultation

In addition to governments, civil society actors potentially have a great deal to contribute to the development of FSTP, as they are major sources of both theoretical and practical innovation. In particular, fulfilment of Strategic Priority #5 requires wide consultation if the full range of innovative approaches to food security for the poor and vulnerable is to be properly explored, and promising new modus operandi considered for adoption by the Programme.

1. *The involvement of state and civil society actors in the preparation of the strategy of the MIP was sufficient and satisfactory*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

2. *It would be possible to involve state and civil society actors more strongly in the development of Phase II of the FSTP*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

3. *The involvement of state and civil society actors in the implementation of the MIP has been sufficient and satisfactory*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

4. *It would be possible to involve state and civil society actors more fully in the implementation of future activities under FSTP*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

5. *Important lessons can be learned from the workshop on Strategic Priority 1 that could be used in involving stakeholders in a possible future workshop on innovative approaches under Strategic Priority 5.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

F. Emerging Issues

Although the FSTP was adopted only two years ago, critical new issues have subsequently emerged which have fundamentally and negatively affected food security prospects for poor and vulnerable people. Prominent among these are the recent phenomenon of spiralling food prices followed by deep global economic recession. Although food prices have dampened somewhat since their peak last year, there are worrying signs that the underlying issues remain unresolved.

1. *In 2008 the EC established a Food Facility as a temporary response to spiralling food prices; the FTSP could take over some of these functions when the Food Facility is phased out.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

2. *Since both soaring food prices and the recession have a strong global dimension, the FSTP could be revised better to reflect these issues.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

G. Coherence, Complementarity and Continuity

The fact that the EC's food security activities, which were previously financed under a comprehensive instrument (the FSBL) are now funded under an array of different instruments, raises the possibility of lack of coherence, complementarity and continuity. The FSTP is therefore designed to complement other EC-supported interventions on the food security front, and hence add value, ensure coherence and continuity and, by inference, achieve synergy.

1. Adequate measures have been put in place to achieve coherence, complementarity and continuity (the '3 Cs) under the FSTP

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

2. FSTP activities are sufficiently complementary and subsidiary to EC geographical programmes, particularly in the areas of (a) LRRD in exceptional situations and (b) the special allocation to ALA, Georgia and Armenia

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

3. Specific procedures are followed to ensure that FSTP activities are complementary with those of other donors, particularly EC member states

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

4. *Implementation through global initiatives or regional partners has been satisfactory*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

5. *EC visibility has been sufficiently ensured when working with other partners*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

6. *The Commission should maintain the current approach to finance on the one hand mainly global, continental and regional food security programmes under FSTP, and on the other hand national programmes with an impact on food security under the geographical instruments*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

7. *Adequate mechanisms are in place to ensure coherence and complementarity between FSTP and FP7.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

H. FSTP and Other MDGs

The FSTP's objectives include contributing to achievement of the first MDG on hunger. However, food security programmes are also relevant to three other MDGs, namely MDG 4 (Reduce Child Mortality), MDG 5 (Improve Maternal Health) and MDG 7 (Ensure Environmental Sustainability).

There are instances where FSTP-funded activities address the food security agenda inherent in MDGs 4, 5 and 7

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

I. Administration

A large number of relatively small grants means high administrative costs, whereas a smaller number of relatively large grants impose fewer burdens scarce administrative resources. On the other hand, a relatively large number of relatively small grants can achieve good thematic coverage across the programme as a whole.

The right balance has been struck between thematic coverage and administrative cost

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

6. Questionnaire sent to EC Delegation staff

HTSPE

Mid Term Review of the EC Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP)

Questionnaire for EC Delegations

The firm HTSPE has been requested to conduct a Mid Term Review of the EC Food Security Thematic Programme.

The objective of the present mission is to review the MIP (2007-2010) together with the AAPs implementing the strategy over the period 2007-2009 so as to provide inputs and recommendations for the preparation of a second phase of the thematic strategy for 2011-2013. The outcome of these questionnaires will serve as a basis for more in-depth interviews with a selected number of stakeholders. Together, the questionnaires and interviews will provide crucial inputs to the review process.

Only those questions which are seen as being relevant to the work of the EC delegations are included here.

Confidentiality: Please note that this survey is strictly confidential. Findings will be released ONLY in aggregate form. Under no circumstances will the name of the individual providing the information be released to anyone outside of the Mid Term Review team.

Guidelines

1. Under each heading a statement or series of statements is made (in italics) with which you are asked to agree or disagree. Please place a cross in one box per statement. You are then given space to substantiate your answer. We would appreciate it if you used this opportunity, as it would allow us to present a more in-depth analysis. Please expand the relevant text box as necessary.
2. The questionnaire is divided into several sections. At the start of each section, a short explanation is provided.
3. **Deadline:** The deadline for the report is tight. In order to collate and interpret your responses we would like to receive your response at the latest by 26th June.
4. **Follow-up:** Please indicate if you are willing to take part in a telephone interview as follow up to this questionnaire. This does not apply to those of you that we interview personally during our visits to Brussels.
5. **Other stakeholders:** Although the current review is desk based, we wish to canvas as wide a range of views as we are able. For this reason we ask that you let us know what other stakeholders are involved in the work of the FSTP or carry out similar work in the country or region. Please indicate whether we should contact directly or whether it would be more productive if the process was mediated by you. The stakeholders may include:
 - a. Representatives of member states and European organisations working with the FSTP. Other donors

- b. International organisations - both partners and those with complementary programmes Governmental and regional organisations
- c. CSOs

Organisation	Contact	Email address	Nature of linkage to FSTP work	Should the questions be submitted through you? Yes/ No

Return per email: Please complete this questionnaire electronically and return it by email to coombs_david@hotmail.com

Personal Details

Name of person completing this form:

Position held within EC:

Role in FSTP – which Strategic Priority?

Are you willing to take part in a telephone

YES

NO

If YES, please provide an office telephone number and a time/date you would be available
NUMBER:

AVAILABILITY:

Background - The Food Security Thematic Programme

The FSTP is defined by a strategy for the period 2007- 2010, which sets the overall policy orientations and objectives. This strategy is accompanied by a Multi Annual Indicative Programme (MIP), which provides guidelines for implementation along with budget envelopes by component over the same period of the strategy. The overall financial allocation for the period 2007-2010 is €925m, of which €30.6m have been foreseen to finance activities that benefit ENPI countries.

Each year the MIP is further detailed in Annual Action Programmes which define the annual budget allocation in concrete actions.

The FSTP objective is to be pursued through the following strategic priorities:

1. Supporting the delivery of international public goods contributing to food security: research and technology: this component aims to support pro-poor and demand-driven agricultural research and technology and improve its outreach and dissemination.
2. Linking information and decision making to improve food security response strategies: this component aims to strengthen national and regional stakeholders' capacities to produce and analyze food security information, with a view to designing effective response strategies to prevent food crises and reduce chronic food insecurity.
3. Exploiting the potential of continental and regional approaches to improve food security: this component aims to support regional initiatives in Asia and Latin America and continental/regional priorities set in a new AU-EU partnership with Africa (disaster and risk reduction, agricultural policy development and harmonisation, sustainable management of natural resources).
4. Addressing food security in exceptional situations of transition, and in fragile and failed states: this component aims to link relief, rehabilitation and development. It will support the most vulnerable in protecting and recovering livelihood assets, while improving self-reliance and crisis prevention.
5. Promoting innovation to combat food insecurity: this component aims to foster innovative practices and approaches to food security and their South-South up scaling/dissemination. A special, final allocation is earmarked for countries in Asia, Latin America and Neighbourhood countries phasing out food security assistance.
6. Fostering advocacy and advancement of the food security agenda, harmonisation and alignment with development partners and donors: this component aims to promote food security at international level and aid effectiveness, in line with the OECD Paris Declaration.

The main implementing partners are global players in the field of food security, such as the UN agencies specialized in food and nutrition security, research institutions active in agricultural research for development and networks like the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, donor and civil society organizations and platforms, continental organizations of states such as the African Union and the NEPAD, regional economic communities and regional organizations and institutions, including non state actors, civil society/NGOs and, in specific situations, national governments.

The end beneficiaries of any actions implemented by the thematic programme are the rural poor in all food insecure countries: small-holder women and men working in the agriculture, family owned farms, farmers' organizations, indigenous groups and most vulnerable people.

Overarching Themes

In addition to the three dimensions – or 'pillars' – of food security, two overarching themes are also widely recognised. The first of these is gender, because in some cases food insecurity affects women and men differently, given such practices as intra-household discrimination in the allocation of food. Gender in turn affects food security, since women are usually responsible for handling, storing, processing and cooking food, and the way these tasks are performed can affect food safety and therefore food utilization. Vulnerability to food insecurity can affect all three pillars, i.e. at national, household and individual levels. You are asked to state the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement, looking at the FSTP 'on the whole'

1. *Concerns about gender aspects of food security are adequately reflected in the activities funded by the programme*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

2. *Concerns about the threats to food security resulting from climate change are adequately reflected in the activities funded by the programme*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

3. *Concerns about vulnerability aspects of food security are adequately reflected in the activities funded by the programme.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

Stakeholder Consultation

In addition to governments, civil society actors potentially have a great deal to contribute to the development of FSTP, as they are major sources of both theoretical and practical innovation. In particular, fulfilment of Strategic Priority #5 requires wide consultation if the full range of innovative approaches to food security for the poor and vulnerable is to be properly explored, and promising new modus operandi considered for adoption by the Programme.

1. *The involvement of state and civil society actors in the preparation of the strategy of the MIP was sufficient and satisfactory*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

2. *It would be possible to involve state and civil society actors more strongly in the development of Phase II of the FSTP*

Strongly Agree

Agree

Agree to Some Extent

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

Don't know/ Not clear

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

3. *The involvement of state and civil society actors in the implementation of the MIP has been sufficient and satisfactory*

Strongly Agree

Agree

Agree to Some Extent

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

Don't know/ Not clear

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

4. *It would be possible to involve state and civil society actors more fully in the implementation of future activities under FSTP*

Strongly Agree

Agree

Agree to Some Extent

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

Don't know/ Not clear

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

Coherence, Complementarity and Continuity

The fact that the EC's food security activities, which were previously financed under a comprehensive instrument (the FSBL) are now funded under an array of different instruments, raises the possibility of lack of coherence, complementarity and continuity. The FSTP is therefore designed to complement other EC-supported interventions on the food security front, and hence add value, ensure coherence and continuity and, by inference, achieve synergy.

1. Adequate measures have been put in place to achieve coherence, complementarity and continuity (the '3 Cs) under the FSTP

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

2. FSTP activities are sufficiently complementary to national strategies, particularly they are Integrated within the broad PRSP and (a) interventions in LRRD countries and fragile states is based on national strategies

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

3. Specific procedures are followed to ensure that FSTP activities are complementary with those of other donors, particularly EC member states

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

4. Donor co-ordination is leading to division of labour between FSTP and other donors

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

5. EC visibility has been sufficiently ensured when working with other partners

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

6. Other donors' actions on the issues addressed by the FSTP have substantially changed in terms of presence, resources and priorities

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

FSTP and Other MDGs

The FSTP's objectives include contributing to achievement of the first MDG on hunger. However, food security programmes are also relevant to three other MDGs, namely MDG 4 (Reduce Child Mortality), MDG 5 (Improve Maternal Health) and MDG 7 (Ensure Environmental Sustainability).

There are instances where FSTP-funded activities address the food security agenda inherent in MDGs 4, 5 and 7

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

Administration

A large number of relatively small grants means high administrative costs, whereas a smaller number of relatively large grants impose fewer burdens scarce administrative resources. On the other hand, a relatively large number of relatively small grants can achieve good thematic coverage across the programme as a whole.

1 There have been no particular delays, setbacks, obstacles in implementing the activities.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer. If you disagree what measures were taken to address them?

2 The right balance has been struck between thematic coverage and administrative cost)

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

7. Questionnaire sent to Implementing Partners

HTSPE

Mid Term Review of the EC Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP)

Questionnaire for Implementing Partner of FSTP activity

The firm HTSPE has been requested to conduct a Mid Term Review of the EC Food Security Thematic Programme.

The objective of the present mission is to review the Multi-annual Implementation Plan (2007-2010) together with the Annual Action Programmes implementing the strategy over the period 2007-2009 so as to provide inputs and recommendations for the preparation of a second phase of the thematic strategy for 2011-2013

The outcome of these questionnaires will serve as a basis for more in-depth interviews with a selected number of stakeholders. Together, the questionnaires and interviews will provide crucial inputs to the review process.

Only those questions which are seen as being relevant to the work of implementing partners are included here. They particularly focus on the practical aspects of implementation of FSTP activities.

Confidentiality: Please note that this survey is strictly confidential. Findings will be released ONLY in aggregate form. Under no circumstances will the name of the individual providing the information be released to anyone outside of the Mid Term Review team.

Guidelines

1. Under each heading a statement or series of statements is made (in italics) with which you are asked to agree or disagree. Please place a cross in one box per statement. You are then given space to substantiate your answer. We would appreciate it if you used this opportunity, as it would allow us to present a more in-depth analysis. Please expand the relevant text box as necessary.
2. The questionnaire is divided into several sections. At the start of each section, a short explanation is provided.
3. **Deadline:** The deadline for the report is tight. In order to collate and interpret your responses we would like to receive your response at the latest by 7th July.
4. **Follow-up:** Please indicate if you are willing to take part in a telephone interview as follow up to this questionnaire. This does not apply to those of you that we interview personally during our visits to Brussels.

Return per email: Please complete this questionnaire electronically and return it by email to coombs_david@hotmail.com

Personal Details

Name of person completing this form:

Position and institution:

Role in FSTP – which Strategic Priority?

Are you willing to take part in a telephone

YES

NO

If YES, please provide an office telephone number and a time/date you would be available
NUMBER:

AVAILABILITY:

Background - The Food Security Thematic Programme

The FSTP is defined by a strategy for the period 2007- 2010, which sets the overall policy orientations and objectives. This strategy is accompanied by a Multi Annual Indicative Programme (MIP), which provides guidelines for implementation along with budget envelopes by component over the same period of the strategy. The overall financial allocation for the period 2007-2010 is €925m, of which €30.6m have been foreseen to finance activities that benefit ENPI countries.

Each year the MIP is further detailed in Annual Action Programmes which define the annual budget allocation in concrete actions.

The FSTP objective is to be pursued through the following strategic priorities:

1. Supporting the delivery of international public goods contributing to food security: research and technology: this component aims to support pro-poor and demand-driven agricultural research and technology and improve its outreach and dissemination.
2. Linking information and decision making to improve food security response strategies: this component aims to strengthen national and regional stakeholders' capacities to produce and analyze food security information, with a view to designing effective response strategies to prevent food crises and reduce chronic food insecurity.
3. Exploiting the potential of continental and regional approaches to improve food security: this component aims to support regional initiatives in Asia and Latin America and continental/regional priorities set in a new AU-EU partnership with Africa (disaster and risk reduction, agricultural policy development and harmonisation, sustainable management of natural resources).
4. Addressing food security in exceptional situations of transition, and in fragile and failed states: this component aims to link relief, rehabilitation and development. It will support the most vulnerable in protecting and recovering livelihood assets, while improving self-reliance and crisis prevention.
5. Promoting innovation to combat food insecurity: this component aims to foster innovative practices and approaches to food security and their South-South up scaling/dissemination. A special, final allocation is earmarked for countries in Asia, Latin America and Neighbourhood countries phasing out food security assistance.
6. Fostering advocacy and advancement of the food security agenda, harmonisation and alignment with development partners and donors: this component aims to promote food security at international level and aid effectiveness, in line with the OECD Paris Declaration.

The main implementing partners are global players in the field of food security, such as the UN agencies specialized in food and nutrition security, research institutions active in agricultural research for development and networks like the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, donor and civil society organizations and platforms, continental organizations of states such as the African Union and the NEPAD, regional economic communities and regional organizations and institutions, including non state actors, civil society/NGOs and, in specific situations, national governments.

The end beneficiaries of any actions implemented by the thematic programme are the rural poor in all food insecure countries: small-holder women and men working in the agriculture, family owned farms, farmers' organizations, indigenous groups and most vulnerable people.

Overarching Themes

In addition to the three dimensions – or 'pillars' – of food security, two overarching themes are also widely recognised. The first of these is gender, because in some cases food insecurity affects women and men differently, given such practices as intra-household discrimination in the allocation of food. Gender in turn affects food security, since women are usually responsible for handling, storing, processing and cooking food, and the way these tasks are performed can affect food safety and therefore food utilization. Vulnerability to food insecurity can affect all three pillars, i.e. at national, household and individual levels. You are asked to state the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement, looking at the FSTP 'on the whole'

1. Are gender aspects reflected in the activities funded by the programme?

Please explain.

.

2. Are concerns about the threats to food security resulting from climate change adequately reflected in the activities funded by the programme?

Please explain.

.

3. Are concerns about nutrition and social protection aspects reflected in the activities funded by the programme?

Please explain.

.

Coherence, Complementarity and Continuity

The fact that the EC's food security activities, which were previously financed under a comprehensive instrument (the FSBL) are now funded under an array of different instruments, raises the possibility of lack of coherence, complementarity and continuity. The FSTP is therefore designed to complement other EC-supported interventions on the food security front, and hence add value, ensure coherence and continuity and, by inference, achieve synergy.

1. Are specific procedures followed to ensure that FSTP activities are complementary with those of other donors, particularly EC member states?

Please explain.

.

2. When research projects are FSTP-funded conditions are put in place to cover dissemination of findings in order to impact on food security.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

3 Sufficient resources (financial, human resources...) are dedicated to putting research results into practice (practical benefits for farmers) in your FSTP-supported programmes (e.g. participatory farmer research, field trials, pilots, concrete application of research results)

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.

.

Monitoring

Although some of the activities under the FSTP use the Logical Framework Approach (LFA), the FSTP itself does not. This raises important question regarding programme monitoring and periodic review, and therefore issues concerning the measurement of implementation performance.

1 Does monitoring take place at all levels - inputs, outputs, outcome and impact?

Please explain.

.

2 Are activities under the FSTP monitored strictly in accordance with the logical framework submitted to FSTP

Please explain.

.

3 Objectively Verifiable Indicators and Means of Verification been identified at the various levels in the impact pathway (1233)

Strongly	Agree to	Strongly	Don't know/
----------	----------	----------	-------------

3. Have other performance indicators been developed at the Programme level, and have proved useful in measuring outcomes or (likely) impact?

Please explain.

.

FSTP and Other MDGs

The FSTP's objectives include contributing to achievement of the first MDG on hunger. However, food security programmes are also relevant to three other MDGs, namely MDG 4 (Reduce Child Mortality), MDG 5 (Improve Maternal Health) and MDG 7 (Ensure Environmental Sustainability).

There are instances where FSTP-funded activities inherently address MDGs 4, 5 and 7 as well

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.
.

Administration

1 Timings for commitments and payments have been respected

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer.
.

2 There have been no particular delays, setbacks, obstacles in implementing the activities.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree to Some Extent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/ Not clear
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please explain the reason(s) for your answer. If you disagree what measures were taken to address them?
.

Other

1. Do you have any other observations, ideas, suggestions and/or issues with regards to possible revision of the FSTP and its future implementation?

Please explain.
.

ANNEX 6

PROGRAMMING TABLE

Annex 6 Programming Table

INSERT DOCUMENT 'FINAL REPORT ANNEX 6 (MAIN) OCTOBER 2009'

ANNEX 7

RECONSTRUCTED LOGFRAMES

Annex 7 Reconstructed Logframes

#0	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators	Sources of verification	Assumptions
Overall objectives	Achieve the MDGs; Reduction of malnutrition and poverty	Not defined	Not defined	Not defined
Project purpose	Improve food security for the poorest and most vulnerable and to help achieve the first MDG, through a set of actions which ensure overall coherence, complementarity and continuity of Community assistance, including in the transition from relief to development	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below
Results/ „strategic priorities“ (1) to (6)	(1) supporting the delivery of international public goods contributing directly to food security: research and technology	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below
	(2) linking information and decision-making to improve food security strategies	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below
	(3) exploiting the potential of continental and regional approaches to improve food security	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below
	(4) addressing food security in exceptional situations of transition, and in fragile and failed states	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below
	(5) promoting innovation to combating food insecurity	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below
	(6) fostering advocacy and advancement of the food security agenda and harmonisation and	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below	Not defined at this level, see the six LogFrames by result below

#0	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators	Sources of verification	Assumptions
	alignment with development partners and donors			
Activities	See the six LogFrames by result below			
		Means	Costs	
				Preconditions

#1	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators/ re-arranged	Sources of verification/ OVI comment	Assumptions
Overall objectives	Improve food security for the poorest and most vulnerable and to help achieve the first MDG, through a set of actions which ensure overall coherence, complementarity and continuity of Community assistance, including in the transition from relief to development	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level
Project purpose: strategic priority (1)	Supporting the delivery of international public goods contributing directly to food security: research and technology ³¹	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level
Results	i) deliver pro-poor scientific, technological innovations and policies	i) the availability of innovative pro-poor agricultural technologies, contributing to an integrated and sustainable use of land, water, soils and natural vegetation	OVI OK - easy to measure	
	ii) develop research programmes, capacity and institution building, thus responding to beneficiaries' needs	ii) the availability of innovative pro-poor agricultural policies	OVI OK - easy to measure	
	iii) enhance the active role of low-income smallholder farmers in research programmes	iv) the degree of participation of farmers, local communities and other stakeholders in research programmes iii) the adoption of innovative pro-poor sustainable agricultural technologies and policies	OVI difficult to measure	
	iv) exchange information, experience and knowledge, through scientific networks and (multi-)stakeholder platforms (e.g. GFAR and its continental and regional stakeholders)	v) the quality and effectiveness of scientific networks and (multi-)stakeholder platforms on ARD	OVI difficult to measure	
	v) generate complementarity and synergy	No OVI defined	Measurable OVI	

³¹ As the Strategy states: „The objective of the programme is to reduce food insecurity and promote agricultural development through the delivery of global/international public goods in the area of agricultural research. The programme will operate at two levels: 1) global and 2) continental/regional“.

#1	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators/ re-arranged	Sources of verification/ OVI comment	Assumptions
	with research programmes and activities financed through the 7th Framework Programme on research, technological development and dissemination		easy to be defined	
Activities	Not defined at this level			
		Means	Costs	
		Total Budget 2007-2010: €233,1m (Global level, incl. CGIAR, €158,1m; continental/ regional levels €75m)		Preconditions

#2	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators/ re-arranged	Sources of verification/ OVI comment	Assumptions
Overall objectives	Improve food security for the poorest and most vulnerable and to help achieve the first MDG, through a set of actions which ensure overall coherence, complementarity and continuity of Community assistance, including in the transition from relief to development	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level
Project purpose: strategic priority (2)	Linking information and decision-making to improve food security strategies ³²	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level
Results	(i) tools for food security analysis are designed/ improved/harmonised and disseminated (e.g. the Integrated Humanitarian and Food Security Classification Phase) where required	(i) number of users of analysis and strategy development tools	OVI difficult to measure	
		(v) degree of consistency in methodologies and responses at national, regional and continental levels	OVI OK - easy to measure	
	(ii) improved continental (AU), regional and national capacities result in more effective, harmonised food security policies/strategies	(ii) number and quality of national and regional demand-driven policies developed/reviewed	OVI OK - easy to measure	
		(iii) number of "non-food aid" responses to food security problems	Rationale of OVI?	
	(iii) collaboration with donors and international agencies is improved and aligned more on national, regional and continental policy priorities	(iv) degree of attention devoted to food security at national, regional and continental levels, resulting in better prevention of food crises and improvement of food security	OVI difficult to measure	

³²

„The objective of the programme is to strengthen national and regional stakeholders' (public and non-state actors') **capacities in the areas of food security analysis, policy/strategy design, monitoring and evaluation**, in order to prevent food crises more effectively and reduce chronic food insecurity...

The programme will operate: a) at horizontal, global level: developing, testing and disseminating tools and methodologies, undertaking and disseminating global and thematic analyses and lessons learnt, using satellite imagery and other technologies, policy-maker networking, etc.; and b) at continental/regional level: the programme will cooperate with and support continental (e.g. AU) and regional institutions in Africa (in Western, Eastern and Southern Africa), Asia and Latin America; national administrations will receive technical assistance and support through the regional level to improve national information systems, analysis and policy/strategy development capacities“.

#2	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators/ re-arranged	Sources of verification/ OVI comment	Assumptions
		indicators		
		(vi) number of joint programmes and partnerships	OVI OK - easy to measure	
Activities	Not defined at this level			
		Means	Costs	
		Total Budget 2007-2010: €65m		Preconditions

#3	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators/ re-arranged	Sources of verification/ OVI comment	Assumptions
Overall objectives	Improve food security for the poorest and most vulnerable and to help achieve the first MDG, through a set of actions which ensure overall coherence, complementarity and continuity of Community assistance, including in the transition from relief to development	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level
Project purpose: strategic priority (3)	Exploiting the potential of continental and regional approaches to improve food security	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level
AFRICA				
Result 1	Disaster and Risk Reduction			Not defined at this level
Activities³³	(i) scaling up, where feasible, the use of market-based instruments to reduce risks related to food price and producer income	(i) the number of food-security related market-based deals that are concluded...	OVI OK - easy to measure	
	(ii) capitalising on lessons learnt from risk reduction instruments and systems (including safety net programmes, food security reserves, market-based instruments)	...(ii) their coverage in terms of food-insecure populations (iii) the production and dissemination of risk management guidelines	OVI OK - easy to measure OVI OK - easy to measure	
Result 2	Policy development and harmonisation			Not defined at this level
Activities³⁴	1) greater capacity of the relevant	(i) the number of PRSPs or comparable	OVI OK - easy to	

³³ Defined as (sub-) „objectives“ in the TS but represented at activity level here to fit in overall (cascading) LogFrame structure. Alternatively, or in a subset of LogFrame, the following activities could be listed: „**Areas of intervention** could include: (i) providing capacity building to public and private stakeholders, (ii) conducting research & development on novel instruments; (iii) supporting information dissemination, awareness raising and exchanges of best practices; and (iv) aiding the implementation of pilot initiatives.“

³⁴ Figuring as „results“ in the TS. „**Areas of intervention** could include: (i) capacity building and institutional strengthening of the relevant organisations in policy and strategy development (national, regional levels), (ii) capacity building in the coordination and harmonisation/alignment of national policies and strategies, (iii) capacity

#3	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators/ re-arranged	Sources of verification/ OVI comment	Assumptions
	institutions to engage in policy development and	documents that place agriculture and food security at the heart of poverty reduction	measure	
	2) policy agendas that reflect the pivotal role of agriculture and food security in poverty reduction	(ii) the increase in food security and agriculture-focused activities of centres of excellence and regional organisations	OVI OK - easy to measure	
Result 3	Sustainable management of natural resources³⁵			Not defined at this level
Activities³⁶	(i) strengthened capacity among regional and continental organisations to engage in policy development and implementation programmes	(i) the number of cross-border natural resource management initiatives taken	OVI OK - easy to measure	
	(ii) improved coordination/harmonisation of management regimes and/or the establishment of cross-border management regimes	(ii) the number of capacity building activities in natural resource management undertaken by stronger institutions	OVI OK - easy to measure	
ALA				
ASIA				
Result 4	Targeting vulnerable groups such as children, women, the disabled and indigenous people in rural and urban areas and focus on chronic malnutrition problems that are trans-boundary	i) improved nutritional status of the target populations	OVI OK - easy to measure	
		ii) improvement of surveillance/disaster preparedness systems	OVI OK - easy to measure	

and institutional development of the AUC's political and facilitation role, and (iv) capacity and institution building of civil society organisations in policy dialogue (such as regional labour unions and farmers' organisations)."

³⁵ „The objective is to improve policy and governance on natural resource management, combining environmental sustainability with profitable utilisation and poverty reduction.“

³⁶ Labeled „results“ in the TS. „**Areas of intervention** could include: (i) capacity building in policy coordination and harmonisation (including on cross-border resources), (ii) strengthening cross-border resource management bodies; (iii) learning lessons and dissemination of good practice on sustainable resource use; and (iv) peer review of management regimes and their effectiveness in improving natural resource management.“

#3	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators/ re-arranged	Sources of verification/ OVI comment	Assumptions
		iii) a lower number of malnourished people	OVI OK - easy to measure	
Activities	Not defined at this level			
<i>LATIN AMERICA</i>				
Result 5	Improve food security and nutritional conditions of the most vulnerable rural populations (women, children and indigenous people) and to promote regional integration by developing regional food security and harmonising national and local policies	i) improved nutritional status of the target populations	OVI OK - easy to measure	
		ii) better surveillance/disaster preparedness systems	OVI OK - easy to measure	
Activities	<i>not defined</i>			
		Means	Costs	
			Total Budget 2007-2010: €135m (Africa €100m, Asia €20m, Latin America €15m)	Preconditions

#4	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators/ re-arranged	Sources of verification/ OVI comment	Assumptions
Overall objectives	Improve food security for the poorest and most vulnerable and to help achieve the first MDG, through a set of actions which ensure overall coherence, complementarity and continuity of Community assistance, including in the transition from relief to development	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level
Project purpose: strategic priority (4)	Addressing food security in exceptional situations of transition, and in fragile and failed states	iv) nutritional status improved	OVI OK - easy to measure	Not defined at this level
Results	(i) participatory strategic framework to link relief to rehabilitation and development is in place	No OVI defined	OVI to be defined	
	(ii) productive and social assets, in particular natural resources, vital for food security are protected and recovered	(i) livelihood assets, such as capital, labour, etc., recovered (ii) coping strategies consolidated	OVI OK - measureable OVI OK - measureable	
	(iii) vulnerability to shocks is reduced and people's resilience is strengthened at national and local levels	(iii) resource management improved	OVI difficult to measure	
Activities	Not defined at this level			
		Means	Costs	
			Total Budget 2007-2010: €267.480m (DCI €243m; amount for ENPI countries €24.480m)	Preconditions

#5	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators/ re-arranged	Sources of verification/ OVI comment	Assumptions
Overall objectives	Improve food security for the poorest and most vulnerable and to help achieve the first MDG, through a set of actions which ensure overall coherence, complementarity and continuity of Community assistance, including in the transition from relief to development	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level
Project purpose: strategic priority (5)	Promoting innovation to combating food insecurity ³⁷	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level
Result 1	Innovative approaches to food insecurity			
	(i) innovative sustainable solutions to food insecurity problems, especially as proposed by the food-insecure themselves, are “captured”, encouraged and tested, and South-South replication and dissemination is facilitated...[2nd half of para from result 2] ...including support for agricultural reforms, social protection policies and formulating and testing novel food security approaches	(i) the number of programmes and policies, including innovative approaches (ii) the number of new approaches and practices adopted/ scaled up/mainstreamed (ii) implementation of reforms, social protection schemes and programmes	OVI OK - easy to measure OVI OK - easy to measure OVI OK - easy to measure	
	(ii) preparatory and pilot projects lead to the adoption of a national food security strategy/plan and programme approach	(iii) the number of new food security strategies and sector programmes building on pilot and preparatory initiatives (i) the number and quality of pilot initiatives proposed	OVI OK - easy to measure OVI OK - easy to measure	
Result 2	Special allocation to chronically food-insecure Asian, Central Asian, Latin American, Middle-Eastern and European Neighbourhood countries (transitional programmes)	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level
	Funding of multiannual country programmes, to support strategies and programmes to address the	iii) reduction in the number of food-insecure people and improved nutritional status	OVI OK - easy to measure	

³⁷ TS objective: „address old and new food security challenges through innovative and locally owned, sustainable solutions, which could be scaled up and mainstreamed“.

#5	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators/ re-arranged	Sources of verification/ OVI comment	Assumptions
	root causes of food insecurity... [rest of para moved to result 1]			
Activities	Not defined at this level			
		Means	Costs	
		Total Budget 2007-2010: €159.1m (innovations + global €63m; special final allocation ALA €90m; special allocation for ENPI countries €6.1m)		Preconditions

#6	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators/ re-arranged	Sources of verification/ OVI comment	Assumptions
Overall objectives	Improve food security for the poorest and most vulnerable and to help achieve the first MDG, through a set of actions which ensure overall coherence, complementarity and continuity of Community assistance, including in the transition from relief to development	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level
Project purpose: strategic priority (6)	Fostering advocacy and advancement of the food security agenda and harmonisation and alignment with development partners and donors ³⁸	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level	Not defined at this level
Results	(i) actions under this component make advocacy, awareness raising and education on food security more effective	(i) key international events/organised or supported (ii) policy communication material produced and disseminated	OVI OK - easy to measure OVI OK - easy to measure	
	(ii) donor coordination is improved (EU in particular, e.g. EIARD ²⁰ in the research area) and harmonisation and alignment are promoted (e.g. GDPRD, etc.)	(iii) joint initiatives developed with other donors	OVI OK - easy to measure	
	(iii) participation of civil society in international policy dialogue and its role more generally is increased	(iv) civil society and non-state actors' contribution to the local, national and international policy dialogue	OVI difficult to measure	
Activities	Not defined at this level			
		Means	Costs	
		Total Budget 2007-2010: €8m		Preconditions

³⁸

TS: „enhance the international commitment to food security, while fostering donor harmonisation and alignment of partners' roles“

ANNEX 8

LRRD QUESTIONNAIRE

Annex 8 LRRD Questionnaire

*N.B. This questionnaire is meant to provide support to delegations in looking at the relief-rehabilitation-development 'contiguuum' and ensure that essential co-ordination and dialogue is taking place at all three different stages: **I.** Understanding of situation; **II.** Needs assessment; and **III.** Analysis and response.*

Part I - Situation analysis and Dynamics	
<p>1. Origin and type of crisis (<i>several types possible</i>)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> natural disaster</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> conflict (internal/external)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> forgotten crisis</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> protracted crisis</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> post-conflict</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> other:</p>	<i>Include here a summary of recent events (chronology) and analysis of main causes / dynamics of the crisis</i>
<p>2. Present situation (<i>phases could overlap</i>)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> emergency</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> peace process / agreement (in case of conflict)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> rehabilitation <input type="checkbox"/> reconciliation / DDR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> reconstruction <input type="checkbox"/> institution building</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> economic recovery <input type="checkbox"/> other:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> development</p>	<i>Include here a summary of present situation (including security situation)</i>
<p>3. Context and evolution:</p> <p>Context: <u>Risk assessment</u> (risk of falling back into crisis, institutional/political risks etc...):</p> <p>Evolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Progress towards resolution (in case of conflict) - Progress towards stabilisation (in case of political and/or economic crisis) 	<i>In addition, summarise here the status of existing or past EU cooperation activities and Government involvement/responsibilities</i> <i>Including "do no harm" principle</i>
Expected result: consensus on situation analysis	Agreement on situation and launching of joint assessment and analysis

TRANSITION SITUATION ANALYSIS and MAIN LINES of ACTION for a CONSOLIDATED RESPONSE

Part II • Assessment of needs and capacities, Analysis, Partnerships

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1. Key data identified and collected for needs assessment and analysis:
Other existing related documents (i.e. ECHO needs assessments, internal/external conflict assessment) can be annexed to the questionnaire.
If necessary, mission date <i>(if possible agreement for a joint mission ECHO/AIDCO and/or DEL/RELEX):</i></p> | |
| <p>2. Assessment of existing capacities and profiles of possible partner institutions/organisations (Government, NGOs, UN, ICRC, World Bank and other local partners)
- international
- local</p> | |
| <p>3. Planning and results of joint missions (as much as possible) for designing the main elements of the response
- summary of the main conclusions</p> | |
| <p>4. Coordination and consultation with other actors (International organisations, local partners, NGOs, other donors incl. EU Member States and existing co-ordination structures)</p> | <p><i>Include here a list of partners with the main contact points, their areas of concern and their on-going and/or planned interventions (see also table of projects on part IV), as well as a list of existing co-ordination mechanisms</i></p> |

Expected result: consensus on needs and partners

Preliminary Transition Analysis Framework
Include here a preliminary list of priority sectors and issues to be addressed
NB: Priorities are not just for the EC, but the priority needs should be assessed in a consolidated way in order to be responded to by the international community

TRANSITION SITUATION ANALYSIS and MAIN LINES of ACTION for a CONSOLIDATED RESPONSE

Part III - Main Lines of Action and Proposed Consolidated Response

<p>1. Preparation missions, if <u>any</u> and if necessary</p>	<p><i>Describe here expected or on-going missions (conducted by external consultants, with joint briefings and debriefings under DEL supervision)</i></p>
<p>2. Linkages with existing EC strategy(ies):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> ECHO's action plans <input type="checkbox"/> RELEX strategy papers <input type="checkbox"/> DEV strategy papers <input type="checkbox"/> preparation/implementation of other related AIDCO development programmes 	<p><i>Please detail: (indicate here whether ECHO has already developed phasing out or transition plans or programmes)</i></p>
<p>3. Coherence and complementarity (other instruments, other actors)</p>	<p><i>Describe here on-going or planned activities (meetings, surveys, databases...) to ensure that proper coordination is taking place with all relevant actors on the different programmes (in particular, but not exclusively, <u>within EU</u>, and with other donors as well)</i></p>
<p>4. Objectives and priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sectors: <input type="checkbox"/> Areas: 	<p><i>Describe here the objectives of the overall transition and LRRD programmes, identify the gaps (taking into account other donors and partners' actions), and define what should be the priorities for Commission interventions</i></p>
<p>5. Expected indicative budget</p>	<p><i>Present the indicative EC budget needed for implementation of LRRD programmes as pre-identified above</i></p>

Expected result: Transition main lines of actions

<p>Country or Region: Delegation in charge: ECHO Expert: AIDCO Desk: DEV/RELEX Desk: Delegation Task Manager:</p>	<p>LRRD - Landia</p>	<p><u>PART IV</u></p>	<p>Last revision: 23-11-07</p>
--	----------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------

Livelihoods
protection
Social
rehabilitation
Water / sanitation
Others

ANNEX 9

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FSTP AND OTHER MILLENNIUM GOALS

Annex 9 Additional Information FSTP and the other Millennium Goals

Attainment of MDG1 on hunger is a specific focus of FSTP, and none of the other MDGs are mentioned in the TS. Nevertheless within the Programme's remit there is potential to address certain other MDGs. The main ones are: MDG 4 (Reduce Child Mortality), MDG 5 (Improve Maternal Health) and MDG 7 (Ensure Environmental Sustainability). The most systematic contribution across the board seems to be in Bangladesh, where the FSUP project supports awareness-raising activities on the reduction of child mortality, maternal health, and environmental issues all of which may make an indirect contribution to achieving all three of these MDGs.

Responses to the questionnaire survey on this issue are summarised in Annex X Table 4.1.4. In the Central African Republic it was reported by the delegation that one of their activities involves the health system. In Sudan there was strong agreement from the delegation with the proposition with respect to MDGs 4 and 7, but less for MDG 5, whereas exactly the opposite was reported by the West Bank/Gaza delegation.

Specific examples from project documentation of other MDGs being addressed are:

- Inter-church Organisation for Development Cooperation. In the four projects that have been submitted and approved, specific attention is given to environmental issues (water management, organic farming, climate change, etc), and hence MDG 7. However, maternal and child health are not specifically addressed in these four projects.
- International Land Coalition: The Coalition promotes secure and equitable access to land and other natural resources, which provides an incentive for sustainable land management (MDG7). It also promotes women's access to land, thus helping to address MDG 3 (empowerment of women and gender equality)
- Bangladesh Food Security for the Ultra Poor: Health sessions with the participants contribute to reduced child mortality and improved maternal health, thus contributing to MDGs 4, 5, while environmental awareness raising helps contribute to MDG 7.
- International Food Policy Research Institute: The project addresses health and nutrition issues related to MDGs 4 and 5.

ANNEX 10

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON SP3

Annex 10 Additional Information on SP3

In the 2007 AAP, there was only one project under SP-3, the “*Better Training for Safer Food in Africa*” is being implemented by **DG SANCO** under delegation from AIDCO with a budget of M€ 10. Its objective is to enhance the safety of agricultural produce (raw and processed) for improved reliability, nutritional value and tradeability through a series of training and capacity building measures for authorities responsible for food safety standards (SPS) in countries across six regions in Africa and a range of other beneficiaries. It contains also a separate subcomponent in cooperation with the OIE World Animal Health and Welfare Fund. The OIE promotes three areas, control of animal diseases, animal welfare and animal production and food safety. The service contract with SANCO (with a budget of M€ 1.89) comprises four activities, veterinary services, legal frameworks, laboratory equipment and training/ national focal points.

A draft “mid-term evaluation”/ Inception Report (running from 12/2008 through 05/2010)³⁹ is available as main reference document by mid 2009. As late as March 2009, the kick-off meeting was held to prepare for identification of beneficiaries using email and telephone interviews mostly. With the design phase underway from 2007 to 05/2009, this project had a very slow start.. Also, implementation arrangement via DG SANCO appears not to be the most efficient modality given SANCO’s limited experience with ACP countries. Complementarity with other FSTP actions is certainly given, but complementarity to other, non DCI-related services (DGs SANCO, Trade...) appears greater (due to technical specificity of the subject). In the absence of a ready design document it is too early to assess the expected impact and sustainability. The relevance of the programme, however is positive as it addresses a gap in Africa in the area of animal health, SPS, and food safety both at consumer level and trade related.

The 2008 AAP contains two projects under SP-3 (budget M€ 10).

“*Support to Farmers’ Organisations in Africa Project (SFOAP)*” implemented jointly **with IFAD** (EC contribution M€ 5 over three years plus minor contributions from IFAD). The project works with four regional farmers’ platforms consisting of farmers’ organisations (FOs), ROPPA (14 members), PROPAC (10 members), SACAU (14 members) and EAFF (8 members) plus the pan African Farmer Platform. as main constituency and with the EC, IFAD, FAO, CTA, CDE, COLEACP/PIP, RECs, African CSOs and others as partners. Its two main components are (i) FO institutional development (training, CB, strategic plans, consultations, exchange visits) and (ii) FO lobbying capacity including influencing agricultural research agendas of FARA, CORAF, ASARECA (policy workshops, forums, national/ regional consultations, advocacy).It started in 01/2009 (after the contribution agreement had been signed with IFAD in 12/2008) and reached inception stage (Johannesburg workshop 19.06.2009).

A work programme⁴⁰ exists. Project design involved the four RFOs in a needs based way. The purpose is defined as “strengthening capacity of small FOs in African countries and of their regional and pan African networks to influence policies affecting agriculture, RD and FS” through institutionalizing of FOs participating in decision-making (for goal to improve livelihoods of African rural poor producers). The majority of funds provided to RFOs is passed on to national level (NFOs), according to IFAD 55-60% trickle-down rate (equipping and staffing secretariats, TA, training, consultation, studies, regional forum meetings, advocacy). Regional and national work programmes are formulated as basis for the continental POW (AWPBs 2010-12 planned). A LF and detailed cost tables exist and M&E arrangements have been set up at the different levels involved. In the LF, however, the programme purpose of “strengthening the capacity of small FOs in African countries and of their regional and pan African networks **to influence policies** affecting agriculture, RD and FS” is no more mentioned. NFOs are to be in the driving seat as a key principle. With nearly half of NFO members women, gender activities will play a great part. Concerns are with the sustainability of the

³⁹ EC/ SANCO, Mid term Evaluation of the „Better training for safer food in Africa“ activities, FWC/ Lot 3, Inception Report version 1.0, FCEC, 31.03.2009

⁴⁰ See: Support to Farmers Organisations in Africa Programme, Continental Programme of Work, EAFF/PROPAC/ROPPA/SACAU/EU/IFAD, June 2009

recurrent costs beyond project duration as NFO membership fees are low to be affordable, and subsidising this cost from national agricultural budgets could be legitimate in the near future.

The relevance of the programme can be judged as very high, as is the expected impact on improved articulation of African smallholder farmers' concerns at various policy-making levels. The design and implementation arrangements appear to be efficient (apart from a late start) and effective. Cross-cutting concerns, such as gender, natural resources and climate change are well articulated. Regarding sustainability, more stable funding sources for the institutionalization of the structures created are to be found. The complementarity to and coherence with other (EC funded) programmes is very high as is the EU value added.

“Strengthening CAADP Institutions and Processes” implemented through a Trust Fund located with the **World Bank** (EC contribution M€ 5 over three years, other donors USAID, DFID). CAADP is coordinated by AUC/ NEPAD and RECs. Its objectives are higher levels of agricultural production and growth (achievement of Maputo goal of 10% national budget share for agriculture sector) leading to reduction of rural poverty, hunger and malnutrition organised around **four pillars**; (i) sustainable land and water management (lead institution: CILLS/ Univ. Zambia); (ii) market access and infrastructure (lead: CMA/ AOC); (iii) food security (lead: CILLS/ Univ. KwaZuluNatal); (iv) agricultural research and innovation (lead: FARA, plus ASARECA, WECARD, SADC/FANR).

The two subcomponents (results) of the EC project are (a) strengthened CAADP institutions (NEPAD, RECs: ECOWAS, ECCAS, SADC, COMESA; ReSAKSS, platforms, Roundtable processes); (b) improved effectiveness of development cooperation (pillar frameworks, cross-cutting themes, see also Annex 7.7 showing the reconstructed LF as context of the overall component). The program document of the multi-donor Trust Fund (MDTF) dates from November 2008⁴¹ and describes the planned activities including a Results Framework and Chain (proposed budget of US\$ 55 million 2009-13 for three redefined components).

This programme is highly relevant in the context of renewed political emphasis on agricultural development in Africa. New cross-continental networks (4 pillars) are created addressing cross-sectoral concerns, such as on nutrition. The expected impact is great as African agriculture (Maputo plan) is likely to receive much higher levels of funding in the next future. This prospect also points to positive sustainability perspective. Coherence/ complementarity and value added are high as the programme operates in the context of African RECs with which the EC cooperates already in the FSTP and with other instruments. Implementation efficiency and effectiveness and financial transparency and accountability are assured through World Bank managed MDTF arrangements albeit procedures might be slow sometimes and original EC objectives and results merged with overall but similar objectives defined in a multi-donor context.

The 2009 AAP contains five projects under SP-3 (budget of M€ 29.0945, M€ 37 in recent programming table).

“Putting a pro-poor agenda into practice - support for the International Land Coalition” in joint management **with IFAD** (EC contribution M€ 2.950 over three years which represents 63% of total contributions, other donors comprising IFAD, NL, Belgian Survival Fund, IDRC and CIDA). The programme document has been prepared and is ready for signature with the EC. It builds on a predecessor project with EC 2007-09 in Africa, Asia, LA (for about 15 M€)⁴².

The project has been designed in the new strategic framework (focused on Africa with Benin, Niger; DRC, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Madagascar, regional node in Nakuro/Kenya) and the project document (grant application, annex description of the action) is awaiting countersignature by the EC. The objective is to ensure that natural resources/ land are accessed and used equitably and managed sustainably reducing vulnerable households' food insecurity. Among its key results to be achieved are pro-poor land policy reform and influencing policy dialogue based on broad membership

⁴¹ See: The CAADP Trust Fund Program Document, A Multi-Donor Trust Fund to Support the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP), November 05, 2008

⁴² See: Final Action Implementation Completion Report on the ILC's Action „Land and Sustainable Development: Linking Secure access to the Implementation of Environmental Agreements, ILC 2009

comprising IGOs and global, continental, regional and national and local level CSOs and other stakeholders.

The programme is highly relevant filling the gap in global land tenure rights advocacy and monitoring land access and use sector, particularly of poor women and men deprived of secured access and highly land dependent (small farmers, vulnerable groups). Given the EC's previous involvement and ILC's linkages with major stakeholders (like UN-ECA, AU/ NEPAD/CAADP and RECs and others like Terrafrica, LandNets, IUCN/WISP, IFFPRI/CAPri, IIED, AGTER, RRI, CIFOR), efficient and effective management can be expected. Impact prospects are prospective as many of the initiatives supported will contribute to improvements urgently needed (African land policy guidelines, land watch, land portal, land index, etc.). ILC herself also aims (result 5) at making it an autonomous, financially sustainable organisation. Cross-cutting and emerging issues (gender, climate change, commercial pressure on land) are given prominent status.

“Regional Cassava Initiative in support of vulnerable smallholders in Central and Eastern Africa” in joint management **with FAO** (budget M€ 4.761). The project relates to the seven countries most affected by new strains of viruses threatening the entire cassava production system mostly of subsistence smallholders on marginal lands and thus their food security status in Central and Eastern Africa (Tanzania, Burundi, Rwanda, Uganda, DRC, CAR, Gabon). It is the continuation of previous ECHO assistance 2006-09 (M€ 2) and in line with other major ongoing projects (USAID, Gates Foundation, IFAD, FAO). Its main components (results) relate to improved (a) variety distribution, (b) surveillance and (c) cassava commissions in countries (following the positive example of Burundi). Main partners are MOAs, NARS and CBOs and global and regional institutions like IITA, ASARECA.

The project is extremely relevant as due to the erratic rainfall and poor soil conditions, aggravated by climate change and financial market crisis, resort to cassava as a “hunger gap crop” and “living stock” has risen with millions of poor being affected. This project is very clearly structured (high quality LF). Efficiency/ effectiveness will be assured by working through established procedures with the long-standing partner FAO. Impact prospects are mixed as previous results in effectively reaching the farmers with effective prevention including replacing infected plants have been incomplete. The cross-cutting issue of HIV/AIDS and gender is very well addressed.

“Livestock for Livelihoods: Strengthening Climate Change Adaptation Strategies through Improved Management at the Livestock-Wildlife-Environment Interface” in joint management **with AU-IBAR** (budget M€ 4.883 over 42 months). The DEC Nairobi coordinates this project. A visit of the implementing partner to Brussels being imminent at time of reporting (mid July 2009) for elaboration of Annex 1, Grant Application, Description of the Action (full project description). The project is still in an early stage. It is a follow-up to a previous similar project funded by UNEP/GEF in Kenya and Burkina Faso. It will cover four transboundary “hotspots” being natural parks and/or transhumance related fragile ecosystems of the ASAL type (involving 12 countries). It is well integrated into relevant regional networks (UNCCD/RAP, AU/NEPAD TNP-3 and TNP-6, AU-IBAR, AU/SAFGRAD, AU/CAADP, IGAD/REFORM, IUCN, AWF, WISP, CILSS, ECOPAS, FFEM, RECOPA as well as ECCAS and ECOWAS). It aims at strengthening livestock-based livelihoods and improving food and environment security in ASALs in response to increasing risks from and vulnerability to climate change.

This innovative project is very relevant to solving the problems of affected rural and pastoral poor in ASALs using state of the art approaches (NRM plans, zoning, restoration of degraded lands, climate-proofed livestock and agro-pastoral production, alternative livelihoods, information-communication and policy dialogue, conflict management, community based M&E). Climate change as a new threat is incorporated in the design. It has a strong participatory community and gender orientation with cross-cutting human rights to a sustainable livelihood dimension. The LF is of a high quality. New AUC-EU M&E instrument AMERT will be used.

“Supporting the Platform for rural development and food security in Western and Central Africa” in joint management **with UNOPS** (EC contribution M€ 3.5, cofinancing M€ 2.924 by IFAD, MAEE, World Bank). It is based on a predecessor project with the same title (IFAD-EU-UNIFEM-France), called the “rural Hub” (evaluated in 2007) and which has implemented inter alia projects for ECOWAS and designed projects for AFD (AAFEX), the World Bank (CoP Horti) and assisted countries (Mali,

Burkina Faso, Senegal). A number of partnerships have been successfully established with global and regional organisations (research: CIRDES, CORAF, IFPRI; IGOs: CMA/AOC, CEMAC, CEEAC, UEMOA, CILSS; NGOs: ROPPA, RECAO, PROPAC) and the GDPRD. The present project is designed as phase II. The DEC Dakar coordinates this project. The objective is defined to improve the coherence and effectiveness of policies and programmes in the rural sphere of the Region (Western and Central Africa) through dialogue and coordination of regional and national stakeholders around relevant themes in rural development and food security. Despite its role as an expertise network (64% of funds foreseen for TA), ownership appears to be weak, and problems exist reportedly with the implementing agency foreseen (UNOPS, financial problem with the Hub in Senegal). However, the project is reported to be before signature stage.

The relevance of this project is difficult to assess as it comprises a diversity of activities (studies, coordination, TA, communication, dialogue, etc.) without a clear focus. The main objective does not mention “poverty” or “food security” even but is confined to the level of “coordination, dialogue and capacities...of regional and national actors”. Also, the expected impact is unclear (lack of clear focus, scattered activities). Reported problems with UNOPS and/or the “Hub” cast doubt also on the efficiency/ effectiveness of management arrangements. Sustainability prospects are overshadowed by apparent lack of ownership.

“Regional Programme of Food Security and Nutrition in Central America II –PRESANCA II” in joint management **with UNDP** (EC contribution M€ 13, UNDP M€ 5 fully for FONSAN, INCAP M€ 1, local communities M€ 0.5). The project is designed to be a successor to the PRESANCA ending in September 2009 in the four countries of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua. The Nicaragua DEC functions as regional delegation for the project in the three countries of Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua. The project objective is to reduce food and nutritional insecurity among the most vulnerable populations by strengthening consistency between regional and national (sector) policies and linking up with subnational level through a **local development fund** (FONSAN).

It focuses on human resources development at regional level, and a bi-national or tri-national (border area) approach for effecting decision-making at country level through local associations of municipalities. A “sister” project, PRESANCA I, on strengthening regional/ national information and decision-making processes, has been designed (see 4.2.2) built on the model of PRESANCA I (following its 2007 MTR). It complements other EC funded projects in food and nutrition security (FNS) in the region such as sector budget support (SBS) and rural and local development projects in Guatemala (M€ 25 and 34), FS budget support programme (PASAH) in Honduras (M€ 14) and local development and FS programme (PRODELSA) in Nicaragua (M€ 6.5). PRESANCA II will be located at INCAP within the Central American Integration System (SICA) and will be embedded in the regional framework of CSR-SAN and related to SISCA, CRHH, SCAC, BCIE, SE CCAD, SIECA and others.

With its intelligent project design translating regional policies into sector and national policies with local development effects, it can be expected to have a relevant impact on raising nutrition awareness and standards for the benefit of deprived population segments. With UNDP as implementing partner and strong involvement of regional and national stakeholders, ownership and sustainability prospects are positive. A local development/ fund approach also allows for integration of inter-sectoral and cross-cutting issues and direct benefits for the poor. Coherence and complementarity are also evident.

Summing up, it can be said that the three AAPs under implementation comprise a set of interesting projects covering a diversity of topics with a **strong focus on Africa** (food safety, Farmers organisations to influence policies, land access for poor smallholders, crop diseases/ nutrition for smallholders, agro-pastoral livelihoods and climate change, dialogue platform) and with just one major project in another region, Central America. Except for two projects which show weaknesses (food safety with a very slow design phase ranging from 2007-2009, and “Platform for Rural Development” with an array of planned activities without a clear focus), the projects are all **highly relevant and with strategic and innovative focus**.

It is evident that the project selection based on the mandate as defined did not allow for assembling projects which would aim in the same direction such as would have been possible when **aligning**

them under a common theme such as the “pillars” of food security. The projects, therefore appear somewhat mixed together addressing quite different topics and areas dictated by the need to formulate projects and to identify available partners. On the other hand, when looking at the reconstructed LogFrame of the SP3 (see Annex 7.7), there were three results planned for Africa, (a) disaster and risk reduction, (b) policy development and harmonisation, and (c) sustainable management of natural resources. The programmes implemented appear to have not much in common with this planning as only two out of seven (maximum three if counting the somewhat scattered approach of the “Platform” project as oriented towards the result of “policy development & harmonisation”) show a clear linkage to the planned results (see following table):

SP3 - Africa, AAPs 2007 - 2009: Linkage of Projects to three Results Planned				
	(a) Disaster & Risk Reduction	(b) Policy Development & Harmonisation	(c) Sustainable Management of Natural Resources	Comment
2007 AAP				
- food safety				no linkage
2008 AAP				
- SFOA				no linkage
- CAADP		X		clear linkage
2009 AAP				
- ILC				no linkage
- Cassava				no linkage
- Livestock			X	clear linkage
- Platform		X		some linkage

It is difficult to say why the implementation did not follow clearly the logical framework. One reason might be that no logical framework was made out of the existing descriptive planning in the design documents. But that these contained a clear logical framework is demonstrated by the fact that the Consultant was able to reconstruct it easily from this information. And this is further demonstrated by the fact that the Consultant engaged for formulating the AAP 2010 also was able to follow these three results in the proposed AAP which was accepted by the implementing DGs. In any case, the FSTP SP3 (but this is true also for the other SPs) could have a much more focused approach and likely impact, not to speak of coherence, if the logical framework structure which was inherently available in the design documents, would have been used as usual as a basis for the project cycle management of the FSTP.

The overall component of SP3 with its four AAPs over the period 2007-2010 has been allocated an **indicative budget of M€ 135** (Africa M€ 100, Asia M€ 20, Latin America M€ 15). According to original planning, for Africa M€ 6 are not yet committed, for Latin America M€ 2.

Components	2007	2008	2009	2010	TOTAL	Planned
3. Continental/ Regional Programmes						
Africa	10,000,000	10,000,000	24,000,000	50,000,000	94,000,000	100
Asia	0	0		20,000,000	33,000,000	35
Latin America	0	0	13,000,000			
Total	10,000,000	10,000,000	37,000,000	70,000,000	127,000,000	135

However, in real spending this plan was not fully reached:

- for 2007, the 10 M€ for Africa were committed, albeit with one project which did not yet materialize until mid 2009 still being in the design phase
- for 2008, the 10 M€ planned for Africa again were committed as planned, with two very innovative and strategic projects
- for 2009, for Africa four projects were committed (three of which highly relevant and prospective) with a volume of M€ 16 instead of M€ 24 planned according to schedule (balance of M€ 8)

- for 2009, one major project was committed for Latin America for M€ 13 as planned
- 2007-09, **for Africa** M€ 36 were committed instead of M€ 44, leaving a **balance of M€ 8**
- over 2007-09, for Africa and Latin America, M€ 49 were committed instead of M€ 57, leaving a balance of M€ 8
- for 2010, commitments are planned: for Africa M€ 50 and for Asia+Latin America M€ 20, leaving an **additional final balance of M€ 8** from the M€ 135 to be spent through the four AAPs 2007-10.

The overall budget volume and structure can be regarded as being appropriate also for the FSTP II follow-up phase in principle as it represents a reasonable distribution of funds across the priority continents of Africa with a planned share of 74%, followed by Asia with 15% and Latin America 11%.

**IMPLICATIONS OF RECENT STRATEGIC POLICY ON 'WORLD FOOD CRISIS'
AND IFPRI PROPOSAL**

Annex 11 Implications of recent Strategic Policy on “World Food Crisis” and IFPRI Proposal

Implications of recent strategic policy on „world food crisis“ for re-designed FSTP 2010 and beyond (2011-13)

Amidst the current global economic and food crisis, FAO as international lead agency in agriculture and food security⁴³ is undergoing a major „reform with growth“ process, based on its first Independent External Evaluation (IEE), the **Immediate Plan of Action (IPA)** whereby FAO’s vision is of a „world free of hunger and malnutrition where food and agriculture contributes to improving the living standards of all, especially the poorest, in an economically, socially and environmentally sustainable manner. To foster the achievement of this vision and of the Millennium Development Goals, FAO will promote the continuing contribution of food and sustainable agriculture to the attainment of three global goals:

- **reduction of the absolute number of people suffering from hunger**, progressively ensuring a world in which all people at all times, have sufficient safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life;
- **elimination of poverty and the driving forward of economic and social progress for all with increased food production, enhanced rural development and sustainable livelihoods;**
- **sustainable management and utilization of natural resources**, including land, water, air, climate and genetic resources, for the benefit of present and future generations“.

The EU position under the **Swedish presidency** (non-paper) is **for FAO contributing to the implementation of the (UN-HLTF) CFA coupled with reform of CFS** aiming at global governance of food security and possibly also incorporating the **Global Partnership for agriculture, food security and nutrition (GPAFSN)** as „political pillar“ within CFS. Furthermore, the following two global events are of particular importance for a re-designed comprehensive food security and nutrition policy:

- **October 2009 FAO Council of agriculture ministers** meeting on „policy coherence for food security“ plus
- **October 2009 (high-level) meeting on „How to feed the world in 2050“** plus
- **November 2009 World Food Summit at Rome (FAO).**

This new policy focus on global FSN is to be placed in the context of other recent global policy and strategy plans of action and events such as:

- plan for „**Food Security for All**“ emanating from the **January 2009 Madrid Meeting** to build „Global Partnership for Food, Agriculture and Nutrition“
- **June 2008 „food summit“ Rome Declaration** by 181 states and the EU (where WFP pledged to feed 100 million people in 77 countries, FAO to deliver TA and inputs for an additional USD 600 million in over 80 countries plus 500 million USD for 2009 emergency and rehabilitation assistance, 200 million USD by IFAD for smallholder inputs, and 1.2 billion USD by World Bank for a „food crisis fund“ and 700 million USD in a pipeline for rapid delivery).

IFPRI Proposal „Preventing World Food Crisis: Support for Appropriate Policy Responses at Country Level“

Conclusion

An example of a very prospective way of tackling the current „world food crisis“ is the recent IFPRI proposal to the EC on „Support for appropriate policy responses at country level“ by **using information for evidence-based policy actions** comprising a state of the art database synthesizing in real time all relevant aspects of FS including responses to the crisis („World Food Security Portal“) as a support tool for policy makers. Complementing some relevant FAO instruments like GIEWS, it also includes interpretation of data, latest IT for exchange of data, webpage communications it allows for policy-making including for productivity-enhancing investments in agriculture and infrastructure through policy dialogues, country level food security forums, including micro-regions within countries. It has started in 2008 with a budget of 2.2 million USD with 5 African countries (Tanzania, Malawi, Mozambique, Kenya, Ethiopia) **targeting 10 countries in Africa plus 5 each in Asia and Latin**

⁴³ See also: FAO, Responding to the food crisis: synthesis of medium-term measures proposed in inter-agency assessments, 2009

America. Additional funding is sought to expand to more poor countries in Latin America including Mexico, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, and Panama; In Asia: Afghanistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Laos, Cambodia, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea and for more detailed work in India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh. With additional funds more countries in Africa could be covered.

Recommendation

Innovative projects like the one proposed by IFPRI to the EC on „Preventing World Food Crisis: Support for Appropriate Policy Responses at Country Level“ in an integrated way (using **enhanced FS information packages delivered to country level FS forums and policy-makers in a user friendly and ready-for application way**) deserve not only to be included in the remaining period of programming of the 2010 FSTP, but also to be replicated and upscaled at global, regional and country level in Africa, Asia and Latin America for a next phase FSTP.