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Executive summary

Introduction

ES1 The Office of Evaluation of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) is conducting a series of Country Programme Evaluations (CPEs). The main purpose of the CPEs is to better orient FAO’s programme to the specific needs of the country and make the best use of FAO’s comparative advantages. Furthermore, the CPEs aim to enhance the impact of FAO’s contributions at the country level to achieve the Global Goals of its members, namely: i) the eradication of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition; ii) the elimination of poverty and the driving forward of economic and social progress for all; and iii) the sustainable management and utilization of natural resources for the benefit of present and future generations.

ES2 This report is a summary of the CPE carried out in Burkina Faso in 2015 to facilitate the formulation of the next Country Programming Framework (CPF) that commences in 2016. The evaluation was conducted by a team of five independent experts coordinated by the evaluation manager and supported by an evaluation analyst, both members of the Office of Evaluation. The evaluation process included an initial revision phase of the available documentation followed by a preparatory mission in December 2014. The main evaluation phase was carried out between March and May 2015. The investigation phase entailed holding interviews with about 70 institutions (over 250 people) and making field visits to five regions in the country.

ES3 In line with the principle of encouraging country ownership of the development process, the evaluation ensured the participation of national partners by setting up a Consultative Group whose members included representatives of the following institutions: the Ministry of Agriculture, Hydraulic Resources, Sanitation and Food Security; the Ministry of Animal Resources; the Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development; the Ministry of Scientific Research and Innovation; the Ministry of the Economy and Finance; the Executive Secretary of the National Council for Food Security; and the Coordination Unit for Agricultural Sector Policies, which presided over the group. The Consultative Group was called on to help finalize the terms of reference for the evaluation, provide observations and comments on the key findings and conclusions presented in the preliminary report, and assist with organizing the validation workshop that was attended by the main stakeholders at country level.

ES4 The FAO Country Programming Framework (2013-15) for Burkina Faso was used as the main framework of analysis for the evaluation. The document identified three priority areas of action, namely: i) improve resilience to food and nutrition insecurity; ii) improve income of rural populations; and iii) improve governance of food and nutrition security.

ES5 In Burkina Faso, agriculture remains the main economic sector, contributing up to 40 percent of the GDP and employing 85 percent of the population. Small family farms, whose production is primarily for food consumption, dominate the sector. Given the high dependence of the population on rainfed agriculture, the impact of climate change, which in this Sahelian country results in insufficient and irregular rainfalls, is one of the major challenges facing the country. During the period covered by the country evaluation, the drought of 2011 and the following poor agricultural season of 2011-2012 affected 2.8 million Burkinabés.

ES6 Despite the encouraging economic growth rates (on average the annual GDP growth rate has been six percent in the last ten years) poverty reduction has been limited, with 46.7 percent of the population living below the poverty line. Thus, Burkina Faso faces the ongoing challenge of ensuring sustainable food and nutrition security for its population.

---

1 The CPF is a planning and management tool which outlines how FAO can best assist a country in meeting its development priorities. It sets out jointly-agreed, medium-term priorities for Government-FAO collaboration.

2 INSD, 2012
The last national survey on food security\(^3\) indicated that food security concerned over one-third of the population (35.4 percent of households). While malnutrition rates have improved over the period, progress remains slow. The prevalence of chronic malnutrition among children under the age of five in 2014 was 29.1 percent\(^4\).

This summary presents the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

**Main findings**

**Relevance and strategic positioning**

On the whole, the programme implemented by FAO in Burkina Faso since 2010 was relevant and aligned with the Government’s priorities as identified in the National Programme for the Rural Sector (PNSR). Over this period, FAO also responded to the main crises that affected the country, including the floods in the Centre Nord and in the East in 2010, a poor harvest in the 2011-2012 agricultural season, and the arrival of Malian refugees since 2012.

FAO is a privileged partner of the national institutions involved in the rural sector. At the national level, the Government recognises the valuable contribution made by FAO’s technical expertise and often requested its support. For instance, FAO contributed significantly to the development of the main policies and programmes in the rural sector, and to strengthening capacities at the central level.

FAO is well positioned in the food security sector. FAO is a permanent member of the Technical Committee of the National Council on Food Security (CT-CNSA) and the current co-president of this Committee. This role engendered good visibility for the Organization. More recently, FAO has enhanced its role in the nutrition sector. It is increasingly involved in consultation and coordination meetings on nutrition at the national level. A further indication of its engagement in this area was the recent addition of a nutritionist to the country team. This coincided with the departure of the food security expert, who played a key role in assuring FAO’s contribution to food security at the country level. Partners feared that this departure could weaken FAO’s capacity to fully contribute to the sector.

FAO is perceived as a key nutrition partner in Burkina Faso, capable of promoting the adoption of more sensible approaches to nutrition in the agricultural sector. The regional project “Building capacity for better food security programming in emergency and rehabilitation contexts”, with the objective of strengthening the capacities of partners to integrate nutrition into food security programming, is well known among FAO’s partners. The project helped to raise FAO’s profile and visibility in the nutrition sector, and partners agreed that it responded to an existing need.

FAO actively participated in the UN Country Team (UNCT) and in the thematic working groups of the UNDAF. Coordination with other UN agencies was ensured through regular meetings and exchanges. Over the evaluation period, the number of joint projects implemented with other UN agencies was limited. However, a positive evolution was observed with some recent joint initiatives already underway.

At the decentralized level, where development capacity needs are numerous, FAO has been less present. Partners also felt that the Organization’s implementation modalities were not sufficiently participatory. In addition, the existing capacities of partners involved in the interventions were not sufficiently taken into account and utilized. Indeed, FAO’s interventions would have benefited from the increased involvement of national partners (decentralized government technical services and non-governmental organizations) throughout the various project phases, as well as the greater delegation of responsibilities.

---

\(^3\) ENIAM 2008  
\(^4\) National Nutritional Survey (SMART method) 2014.  
\(^5\) OSRO-GLO-303-EC
The adoption of a participatory approach is needed to increase ownership of the interventions by national partners and, consequently, their sustainability.

ES14 The CPF proved to be a practical reference framework for enabling FAO’s interventions to be carried out within a coherent programme. Priority Area 1 (PA1) of the CPF focused on strengthening resilience for food and nutrition security, while Priority Area 2 (PA2) focused on increasing the income of rural populations by linking farmers to markets. Some synergies between these two areas were observed. For instance, FAO supported the seed production sector to increase the availability of improved quality seeds, which facilitated access to seeds for vulnerable households. These two priority areas are closely linked and synergies between the two should be further explored in the next CPF document and in FAO’s interventions.

ES15 FAO’s approach entailed providing support to resilience (PA1) as well as production (PA2). Regarding its production support, FAO did not focus only on the most vulnerable households. Indeed, meeting rural development objectives also required working with structured farmers’ organizations and dynamic producer groups. This was the case, for example, in the support provided by FAO to seed producers. While such a targeting strategy was observed in the implementation of interventions, it was not clearly defined in the CPF or in the project documents, making it difficult for external observers to understand the targeting logic.

ES16 Climate Change Adaptation is one of the major challenges facing the country and FAO has worked extensively in this area in Burkina Faso. Indeed, several activities implemented by FAOBF were in line with the National Programme of Action on Adaptation to Climate Change (PANA). The significant engagement of FAO in this area of work was not sufficiently reflected in the CPF. Another theme that should be reconsidered is food safety. The CPF addressed food safety essentially through environmental concerns or economic issues related to export sectors, while the issue of public health with regard to Burkinabe consumers was of lesser concern. To a certain extent, this reflects how the issue is addressed within the country. Nevertheless, problems have emerged in Burkina Faso regarding the consequences of specific production practices on the health of local populations.

ES17 During the period evaluated, FAO engaged in a reform process that resulted in the integration of the Emergency, Rehabilitation and Coordination Unit into the Representation at the country level. This integration improved the coherence of FAO’s programme at the national level. The integrated office is better suited to deliver a resilience programme.

ES18 A large share of the country programme is funded by the European Union through the Food Security and Nutrition Programme in Burkina Faso (PSAN-BF). This project has also funded many of the technical posts of FAO’s country team. The country office will face the challenge of mobilizing sufficient resources to ensure the continuation of its programme.

**FAO’s contributions in Burkina Faso**

**Improve resilience to food and nutrition insecurity**

ES19 As part of its resilience programme, FAO contributed to several initiatives designed to reinforce national capacities for crisis prevention. However, the identification and mobilization of funds to anticipate and mitigate the impacts of a crisis remains an issue. For example, although FAO promoted a pastoral early warning system at the community level and conducted related training, the system faced difficulties in becoming operational due to lack of funding.

ES20 The efforts to improve the production capacity of vulnerable households represented the largest share of the programme. Activities included distribution of quality certified short-cycle variety seeds in response to the reduced rainy season; distribution of animals and animal feed; water management through activities supporting small-scale irrigation,
the construction of wells and boulis for vegetable gardening and livestock and the
development of lowlands for rice production.

ES21 Some interventions clearly strengthened production capacities and brought concrete
improvements to households. For instance, the distribution of small animals, mainly
targeting women, proved to have lasting impacts on beneficiaries' livelihoods. Indeed, the
effects could be seen well after the projects had ended in most of the households visited. In
the majority of cases observed, there had been some births and also some sales to respond
to beneficiaries' needs, but the number of animals was maintained. The income generated
from sales was found to be significant.

ES22 FAO also contributed to water management, one of the major goals of the National
Programme of the Rural Sector (PNSR). The construction of wells and boulis for vegetable
gardening was accompanied by the provision of seeds to beneficiaries, particularly
women. The resulting products were mainly sold at markets, enabling women to increase
diversify their incomes. Beneficiaries expressed a need for support to transformation
and conservation activities. These activities are especially important when production
increases above the demand of the local market.

ES23 A large share of FAO's programme was allocated to the development of lowlands for rice
production. Overall, these interventions were found to be pertinent and had positive
impacts on beneficiaries' livelihoods. In the sites visited, however, production was found
to be variable and below expectations, partly due to limited rainfall and in some cases
to technical problems. In addition, at certain sites the team observed tensions between
livestock owners and farmers, caused by conflicts over the use of the land. Searching for
equitable solutions for the different users of natural resources at the planning phase of
interventions is crucial.

ES24 In the CPF, interventions to improve nutrition were part of the efforts to strengthen resilience.
In this area, FAO promoted the production and consumption by rural households of high
nutritional value food by focusing attention on vegetable gardening and the production
of moringa and baobab. Production and consumption of food of animal origin received
less support. Although the evaluation observed that nutrition education activities were
frequently included in the project documents, the low number of beneficiaries targeted by
these types of activities limited their impact. The nutrition education activities were mainly
planned for projects supporting vegetable gardening and non-wood forestry products
(NWFP); however it would have been relevant to include them in other interventions as
well, such as animal distribution.

ES25 The impact of certain interventions was limited by problems encountered during
implementation. For instance, the evaluation team observed distribution delays in a number
of the projects visited. Moreover, while mechanisms designed to enhance sustainability
were frequently planned in the design phase of projects, the evaluation noted that the
effectiveness of these mechanisms was in some cases limited. Some technical problems
were also observed in the construction of the wells, some of which were not functioning.
Field visits also showed that the targeted beneficiaries did not always satisfy the criteria
specified in the project documents.

Improve the income of rural populations

ES26 The main goal of the CPF's second priority area was improving the income of rural
populations, with a focus on linking farmers to markets.

ES27 In this area, support provided by FAO to the seed sector was identified as a key programme
achievement. At the institutional level, FAO contributed to drafting and disseminating
the national seed act and strategy. FAO also helped the National Institute for Agronomic Study
and Research (INERA) by providing training and equipment. This included refurbishing
the seed analysis laboratory of the Central Region and building and equipping four other
laboratories in other regions. Despite some operational issues, three out of the four

6 “Bouli” is a word used in the local language to describe an artificial pond.
laboratories were found to be functioning. However, certification was still centralized at national level. FAO also supported seed producers by distributing inputs and equipment, constructing storage warehouses and providing training. One outcome of the programme was a sharp and rapid increase in the number of seed producers, which increased the availability of quality seeds. The larger number of producers made the planning and control of seed production more difficult.

At the strategic level, FAO helped to integrate NWFP into the National Programme for the Rural Sector (PNSR), giving them more recognition. At the community level, FAO supported women’s organizations in the production and transformation of NWFP. Field visits showed that these interventions succeeded in enabling women to increase and diversify their incomes. The evaluation found, however, that inadequate consideration was given to the sustainable management of NWFP natural resources. Actions to protect these resources from overuse, or to ensure their sustainability in the future, were not always foreseen. Certification is another area that FAO could explore further, considering the potential of this sector.

FAO’s support to the seed and NWFP sectors improved the enabling environment and reinforced the capacities of all actors along the value chain. Less effective strategies, however, were applied in other sectors. The evaluation found that in other sectors FAO’s efforts focused mainly on production, and not enough on the post-production phases (such as storage, transformation and commercialization).

**Improve governance of food and nutrition security**

The CPF’s third priority area concerned developing the capacities of national actors working in food and nutrition security, particularly with regard to formulating policies, programmes and projects, and facilitating consultations and coordination forums. Overall, FAO made a strong and positive contribution to this area of intervention.

Most of the partners met by the evaluation team rated FAO’s contribution to national food security coordination positively. As co-president of the Technical Committee of the National Council on Food Security (CT-CNSA), FAO leads the Group of the Technical and Financial Partners. Partners found that FAO’s technical expertise and responsiveness facilitated rapid decision-making by the Technical Committee. At the decentralized level, the Regional Committees on Food Security (CRSA) are not functioning very well. Several partners believe that greater support should be given to coordination mechanisms at the decentralized level.

During the period covered by the evaluation, FAO contributed to the development of the National Policy for the Rural Sector (PNSR), which is the reference framework for actors engaged in the rural sector. More recently, FAO played an important role in formulating the National Policy for Food Security and Nutrition (PNSAN), ensuring the involvement of all relevant partners in the process. FAO also contributed to the development of the Country Resilience Priorities (PRP) document as part of the Global Alliance for Resilience Initiative (AGIR). However, implementation of these policies has been slow due to governmental resource constraints. The evaluation also noted a proliferation of policies and strategies at the national level, which could dilute the focus and lessen the impact of efforts on each initiative.

FAO’s contribution to food security and agricultural statistics – through CountryStat, ADePT and the agricultural census (prior to the evaluation period) – was much appreciated. ADePT in particular responded to an existing demand to improve national capacities regarding the analysis of existing data. FAO also contributed to developing the Ministry of Agriculture’s capacities in analysing food and agricultural policies through the MAFAP project. Several examples were provided showing the influence of MAFAP’s policy analysis on the decision-making process.

ADePT-FSM aims to improve the quality, consistency and availability of food security statistics derived from National Household Surveys (NHS), such as Living Standard Measurement Surveys (LSMS), Household Income and Expenditure (HIES) and Household Budget Surveys (HBS) containing food consumption data. These statistics are useful for assessing and monitoring food security at national and subnational levels.
ES34 Since 2010, FAO made efforts to strengthen national capacities by training government officials (mainly in the country’s capital); establishing an enabling environment (developing strategies, programmes, policies and legislative frameworks); and implementing interventions focused on the “organizational dimension” (for example, FAO supported the preparation of a programme for reorganizing and strengthening the capacities of the Ministry of Agriculture that had not yet been implemented). At the decentralized level, the evaluation team observed a need and a demand for strengthening the capacities of government technical services.

Crosscutting themes

ES35 Gender, land tenure and youth employment were addressed as crosscutting issues in the CPF.

ES36 Regarding gender, the evaluation observed that several FAO interventions primarily targeted women. This was the case, for instance, with projects on NWFP, vegetable gardening and small animal distribution. However, the adoption of a gender approach should not be restricted to the inclusion of women among the beneficiaries of interventions. To guarantee an equitable impact, gender equality should be integrated into the entire process, from planning to the implementation of interventions. The country office does not possess sufficient capacities in this area.

ES37 The land tenure issues encountered on some project sites visited by the team showed the tenuous situation of some producers, and the relevance of addressing this issue at the country level. These difficulties were even more pronounced when the producers were women. At the national level, FAO helped to disseminate the Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Tenure. Several partners who met with the evaluation team were familiar with the Guidelines and considered them as a reference document. Over the period evaluated, FAO implemented only one initiative on youth employment and a new project was just starting during the evaluation.

Conclusions

ES38 Conclusion 1: On the whole, the programme implemented by FAO in Burkina Faso since 2010 is relevant and aligned with the Government’s priorities in the rural sector. FAO also addressed the major crisis that had affected the country. FAO has a recognised expertise on climate change adaptation and has worked extensively on this issue in Burkina Faso. The significant engagement of FAO in this area was not sufficiently reflected in the CPF.

ES39 Conclusion 2: Efforts to strengthen the resilience of vulnerable households represented the largest share of the programme. Some interventions clearly increased households’ production capacities and brought concrete improvements to their livelihoods. FAO also provided noteworthy support to the development of the seed and NWFP sectors. In other sectors less structured approaches were observed. Support to post-production activities (including storage, transformation and commercialisation) was more limited.

ES40 Conclusion 3: FAO contributed significantly to the formulation of rural development policies, strategies and programmes. At the national level, implementation of these policies and programmes had been slow due to governmental resource constraints. FAO also supported several initiatives designed to reinforce national capacities to anticipate and mitigate the impacts of a crisis. However, the identification and mobilization of resources to fund national contingency plans and early warning systems remains a challenge.

ES41 Conclusion 4: FAO is well positioned in the food security sector and has been increasing its presence in the nutrition sector. FAO is perceived as a key nutrition partner in Burkina Faso, capable of facilitating the involvement of the food security and agricultural sectors in a multi-sectorial strategy to combat malnutrition. The arrival of a nutritionist to the country team presents an opportunity for strengthening FAO’s position at the national level and increasing its impact on nutrition at the field level. FAO played an important role in coordinating actors in the food security sector at the national level. At the decentralized
level, where coordination mechanisms remain weak, there is a need for support. The presence of FAO’s sub-national offices in three regions is clearly an advantage that could facilitate the Organization’s efforts in this area.

**ES42 Conclusions 5:** Certain inefficiencies in project implementation limited the impact of FAO’s efforts, including distribution delays and a lack of effective measures to ensure sustainability of the interventions. Moreover, at the decentralized level, intervention modalities were found to be insufficiently participatory. The adoption of more participatory approaches and the increased utilisation of existing partners’ capacities would have contributed to increased ownership of interventions and, consequently, sustainability. Finally, FAO’s strategy for targeting beneficiaries was not always clearly defined.

**ES43 Conclusion 6:** A large proportion of the beneficiaries of FAO’s interventions were women; however, a gender approach was only partially adopted in the programme. The capacity of the country office in this area needs to be strengthened. Youth employment, another crosscutting theme addressed by the CPF, is very pertinent to the context of Burkina Faso. However, this area of work was not sufficiently explored by the country office.

**ES44 Conclusion 7:** The integration of the Emergency, Rehabilitation and Coordination Unit (ERCU) into the main FAO Representation improved the coherence of FAO’s programme at the country level. The integrated office is better suited to deliver a resilience programme.

**Recommendations**

**ES45** On the basis of the information collected and assessments carried out, the evaluation team formulated seven key recommendations. These are intended to improve FAO’s contribution to the challenges faced by Burkina Faso in terms of rural development and food and nutrition security.

**Recommendation 1**

FAO should use the CPF revision in order to clearly emphasize, in its intervention strategy, its comparative advantage in capitalising and sharing knowledge, innovations and good practices and in reinforcing national capacities. FAO should further promote the new CPF internally among its staff, while using it more as a communication and resource mobilisation tool to be shared widely with partners.

**ES46** In a context of limited resources, FAO will need to prioritize its work. This process should be guided by discussions with Government partners and should be based on FAO’s comparative advantages.

**ES47** The new CPF should be in line with the new national policy on food and nutrition security (PNSAN). This alignment will also ensure coherence with the Global Alliance for Resilience Initiative (AGIR) and the efforts being made to foster resilience among communities. The new CPF should also give particular attention to the country’s needs in terms of support to early warning systems and contingency planning, as these factors are important for fostering resilience among communities.

**ES48** The strategy should explicitly integrate climate change adaptation and address food safety issues by factoring in all risk dimensions, including the health of producers and consumers.

**Recommendation 2**

FAO should continue to support the formulation of coherent policies and programmes; reinforce its support to improve national capacities for implementing, monitoring and evaluating policies; and help the Government to mobilize financial resources for the execution of its programmes and projects.
The evaluation highlighted the importance of FAO’s contribution in the formulation of national policies and programmes, and the necessity to remain involved in the subsequent steps: assisting the Government with the mobilization of resources; the implementation of programmes; and the monitoring and evaluation of completed activities.

FAO also has a role in improving the coherence of relevant programmes and policies at the national level, in order to maximize results and maintain the focus on core activities. As the National Policy for the Rural Sector (PNSR) is coming to an end, FAO will need to ensure that the revision of this document is in line with the PNSAN.

**Recommendation 3**

FAO should continue to support the food security sector and take advantage of current opportunities to strengthen its position in the nutrition sector. FAO should also advocate for nutrition to be included in the next revision of PNSR and other rural development programmes and policies. In addition, FAO should ensure that its strategic position on nutrition translates into concrete efforts and results in its interventions in the field.

FAO should maintain its presence and support for national level coordination forums on food security. To this end, the country team should replace the recently departed food security expert in order to lend support to the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MARHASA). At the central level, FAO should help to initiate the National Concertation Committee on Nutrition (CNCN). Most importantly, at the regional level and especially where FAO has sub-national offices, it should support the Regional Concertation Committees (CCR), help to make the Regional Committees on Food Security (CRSA) operational, and participate in meetings of the Regional Committees on Nutrition (CRCN).

FAO should further advocate for the integration of nutrition into national policies and programmes. This is necessary to ensure that nutrition is not treated as an emergency issue and addressed only as part of the response to crises, but instead is factored into development interventions. FAO should also ensure follow-up of the regional project “Building capacity for better food security programming in emergency and rehabilitation contexts”, with the objective of strengthening the capacities of partners to integrate nutrition into food security programming. In the framework of this initiative, FAO should identify the specific development needs of partners and contribute to collecting and sharing knowledge on good practices developed in Burkina Faso.

FAO should strengthen the capacities of its technicians and professionals to ensure they can develop and deliver interventions factoring in nutrition. In addition, FAO should associate nutrition awareness activities with all interventions helping households to increase their income and, consequently, improve their food consumption. In order to have a discernible impact, FAO should increase the number of beneficiaries who participate in awareness-raising activities on nutrition, hygiene and healthcare practices.

**Recommendation 4**

FAO should invest in youth employment and improve gender mainstreaming in its interventions.

FAO should further develop opportunities to work on youth employment, an area of work that is still underexplored by the country office.

FAO should also ensure that the gender dimension is integrated throughout the lifecycle of a project, from design to monitoring and evaluation. FAO should also reinforce staff capacities in adopting a gender approach at the country level, and disseminate the FAO policy on gender equality among the implementing partners ensuring it is understood and applied.
Recommendation 5

FAO should take more advantage of national capacities and reinforce them where necessary. The modalities of intervention should give greater responsibilities to government technical services, civil society and professional organizations with regard to the design, implementation and monitoring of projects.

ES56 FAO should revise its intervention modalities with greater consideration of national partners’ capacities. It should give greater responsibility to local actors, in particular government technical services, but also partner NGOs, and involve them more in the design and implementation of interventions in order to encourage ownership and achieve better results. At the national level, there are a wealth of skills and expertise that FAO could benefit from in its interventions. FAO could also carry out a capacity needs assessment in order to provide targeted capacity development support, particularly with regard to decentralised government technical services.

ES57 FAO’s country office in Burkina Faso has a solid team of national experts, working in different areas of intervention and funded through project budgets. In a country like Burkina Faso, where local human resources are available at the required technical level, FAO should provide flexible regular budget resources to the country office. This would enable the office to develop its capacities and to maintain a small team capable of covering key strategic areas of FAO’s work. This team could facilitate collaboration with other partners, ensure FAO’s presence in key forums and contribute to developing proposals and ideas for resource mobilisation.

Recommendation 6

FAO should improve the quality of beneficiary targeting with regard to vulnerable households. It should also specify its strategy for targeting beneficiaries by clarifying which interventions are aimed at vulnerable households, which ones address more dynamic farmer organizations, and underlining the possible synergies between the two dimensions.

ES58 The new CPF should make a distinction between interventions intended to strengthen resilience, and actions designed to support production and markets. At the same time, it is important to strengthen the linkages and synergies between these two dimensions.

ES59 FAO should improve the quality of targeting by clarifying the inclusion criteria; reinforcing the capacities of those operational partners responsible for identifying beneficiaries; providing training; and, when appropriate, by involving the technical services of the Ministry for Social Action and National Solidarity in the selection of beneficiaries.

Recommendation 7

FAO should strengthen its monitoring system to guarantee better implementation of its interventions, and assess the results achieved by key initiatives to improve future actions.

ES60 The country team should reinforce its monitoring system, including more systematic verifications at each step of project implementation. In order to gauge the impact of its actions, FAO should ensure the integration of pertinent indicators. For instance, interventions promoting food security should systematically include indicators measuring the adequacy and quality of beneficiaries’ food consumption.

ES61 In the case of key interventions implying either a large investment by FAO or the introduction of new approaches, it is important to assess the results of these interventions in order to make the necessary adjustments to improve future actions.