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Executive summary

Introduction

ES1 The Country Programme Evaluation of FAO’s contribution in Guyana was conducted in 2015 with the main aim of informing the development of the new CPF cycle starting in 2016. It is intended that this exercise will provide inputs to better orient FAO’s programme in the next biennium, making it more relevant to the government priorities for the country. The evaluation was also intended to assess the strategic relevance in the national context of FAO’s programmes and interventions in Guyana.

ES2 Guyana was selected among a group of Caribbean countries in which to carry out a Country Programme Evaluation in 2015. This choice was based on: i) the status of the CPF cycle ending in 2015; ii) socioeconomic indicators of relevance to FAO; iii) the presence of a newly appointed FAO Representative (FAOR); and iv) the proximity to the eastern Caribbean states that were being evaluated at the same time.

ES3 Furthermore, since the Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness, the international donor community has given increasing attention to country ownership of the development process. In this spirit, the evaluation aimed to emphasize the involvement of national partners in the evaluation process, in particular the government, to facilitate the adoption of the evaluation results by the relevant national agencies and promote their use at the national level. This evaluation was designed to provide a comprehensive review of the entirety of FAO’s assistance to Guyana, including activities funded through regular programme as well as extra-budgetary resources; national, regional and global projects; and emergency and development interventions. It also reviewed the usefulness and impact of FAO’s global normative functions on the respective sectors.

ES4 The evaluation embraced a participatory approach which encouraged ownership of the findings by the country institutions and local partners. First, preparatory work was performed at FAO headquarters in Rome (February-April 2015). Subsequently, the identification of the evaluation team and an inception mission took place in several countries in the region, including Guyana, in order to design the overall evaluation with regional and country office managers. From 6-29 July, the evaluation mission took place in all OECS countries, Trinidad and Tobago, and Guyana. Following ten days of fieldwork and data collection in Guyana (15-25 July), a stakeholder workshop was held at the Subregional Office in Barbados. The preliminary findings were shared with the FAO Regional Representative, technical staff and national correspondents. Afterward, an overall analysis and report preparation took place, with the circulation of the final draft in September 2015 and the completion and distribution of the final report in October 2015.

Scope, purpose and methodology

ES5 The evaluation covered FAO’s cooperation in Guyana from 2012-2015. The main aim of the evaluation was to inform the development of the new CPF cycle which began at the end of 2015, provide inputs to better orient FAO’s programme in the future, and make it more relevant to Guyana’s government and other stakeholders’ priorities.

ES6 In order to promote ownership of the development process, the evaluation emphasized the involvement of national partners, particularly government entities, who will benefit from the resulting improvements to the forthcoming CPF. The main audience for the present evaluation is the FAO staff in Guyana, the FAO Subregional office for Latin America and the Caribbean (SLC), and its national partners.

1 The socio-economic indicators included percentage of undernourished persons, percentage of rural population, contribution of agriculture to GDP and income levels.
ES7 The methodology adopted applied the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact to assess FAO’s assistance in Guyana. The United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards were used as a guide throughout the evaluation process.

ES8 Qualitative data were collected through semi-structured and focal point interviews with government officials, partner organizations, beneficiaries and FAO staff. Extensive literature reviews took place prior to and during the fieldwork, as well as an analysis of reports, project documents, and primary and secondary documents. Quantitative data were also used when considering the country project portfolio. The results of this fact-finding mission were then evaluated and analyzed to report on the relevance of FAO’s work, the effectiveness of its support to beneficiaries, the efficiency of these actions, the impact of its interventions and the sustainability of positive outcomes for post-project activities (e.g. policy development and review, technical advice and financial support). The evaluation team comprised three independent consultants with combined expertise in agriculture, forestry and natural resources; gender; value chains; food and nutrition security; rural development; community engagement; agricultural policy development and institutional arrangements; and Caribbean Community (CARICOM) integrated economies. Two FAO OED staff supported the evaluation team with management, logistics and the provision of background documents.

Findings

ES9 FAO’s assistance to Guyana over the last biennium was distributed across a variety of activities. In order to focus the scope of the evaluation, four sectors were selected to examine FAO’s work. These sectors correspond to the four Country Priority Areas (CPA) that both the Representation and Government of Guyana identified as key aspects for their work together: 1) Support for Food Security and Nutrition; 2) Agriculture and Rural Development; 3) Sustainable Resources and Climate Change; and 4) Agricultural Health and Food Safety.

CPA 1. Support for food security and nutrition

ES10 FAO has offered good and consistent support to the Ministry of Health in policy development, updated the Country’s Food Based Dietary Guidelines, and improved of the National School Feeding Program.

ES11 FAO provided timely assistance to the Ministry of Education for the development of an agriculture school curriculum, and provided funding sources to develop activities such as FAO’s “Telefood” programme.

ES12 FAO funded the development of a new agro-processing curriculum, as requested by the Guyana School of Agriculture (GSA), including support for specialized education in agribusiness and engaging young people in agriculture-related careers.

ES13 FAO contributed to food security through a well-developed strategic campaign for improving the cassava value chain in the country and the Caribbean region.

CPA 2. Agriculture and rural development

ES14 Important work was done on Market Information Systems through FAO’s support for the New Guyana Marketing Corporation (NGMC), facilitating greater market access and information to consumers, producers, agro-processors and exporters.

ES15 Development and continued assistance focused on inland small-scale aquaculture and inland fisheries in several regions of the country.
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ES16 Key interventions were conducted to improve herds through the small ruminants project, training in artificial insemination techniques and other technical advice.

ES17 Relevant steps were taken to minimize post-harvest losses in the country.

**CPA 3. Natural resources and climate change**

ES18 In partnership with the Guyana Forestry Commission, FAO’s work in support of the Forestry Sector (in financing, policy and programming) was considered outstanding, strategic, collaborative and consultative.

ES19 FAO’s technical support was important for Disaster Risk Management (DRM) policy development, awareness raising, reaching the public and bringing FAO’s work to the ground level.

**CPA 4. Institutional capacity development for agricultural health and food safety**

ES20 FAO’s support for pesticide regulation and control surpassed expectations, providing timely and consistent guidance.

ES21 FAO contributed to improved capacities and curriculum development in agro-processing and marketing strategies.

ES22 FAO conducted a State of Food and Agriculture (SOFA) assessment in the Rupununi Region 9, Southern Guyana. This was the first assessment of its kind at the subregional level.

**Conclusions**

ES1 Conclusion 1: FAO is considered a key development partner by stakeholders in Guyana. Its interventions were complementary and supportive to the country’s needs, and within the scope of the CPF as agreed with the Government of Guyana.

ES2 Conclusion 2: Despite a relatively small staff with limited resources, the country office contributed meaningfully in key and strategic areas through the CPF. FAO’s support for the revision of outdated legislation (e.g. for pesticide and toxic chemical management) and the development of new policies, regulations, guidelines and strategies were commended.

ES3 Conclusion 3: Guyana’s progress in the EU FLEGT VPA process gained much impetus as a result of FAO’s support to the development of a road map to guide the process.

ES4 Conclusion 4: FAO Guyana has strengthened the partnership with the government and undertaken important new avenues of collaboration with other organizations.

ES5 Conclusion 5: The following four areas of FAO’s Guyana office operations should be improved: gender mainstreaming, forestry, livestock, support to the national extension service and agricultural health.

**Recommendations**

The recommendations are presented in five themes pertaining to: institutional capacity development; agriculture and rural development; natural resources and climate change; agricultural health and food safety; and food and nutrition security. They were, however, conceived as an integrated unit which contributes to the overall goal of improved production and productivity in Guyana’s agricultural sector.

---

2 The body of the report offers a more elaborate expression of the recommendations.
Recommendation 1: Enhance the FAO Guyana country office’s capacities in the development and management of the country’s forestry resources.
- Considering the extent of Guyana’s forestry resources, FAO’s interventions in forestry are critical to Guyana, although limited so far to the EU Forest Law Enforcement Governance and Trade (FLEGT). With the placement of a forestry officer in the Guyana office, much more could be done by FAO in the areas of Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) and Low Carbon Development Strategy (LCDS).

Recommendation 2: Continue to focus on agricultural and rural development
- Augment genetic improvements in small ruminants through an expanded extension service (e.g. farmer field schools), in collaboration with National Agriculture Research and Extension Institute (NAREI) and Guyana Livestock Development Authority (GLDA), as appropriate.
- Improve access to export markets, as Guyana is currently self-sufficient in fresh bovine meat.
- An agricultural census is strongly recommended to provide baseline data for informed developmental planning, drawing on FAO’s previous census experience in the sub-region. Conducting sub-national state of food and agriculture (SOFA) studies for other hinterland regions (1, 7 and 8) would greatly facilitate planning for the development of those areas.

Recommendation 3: Improve the management of natural resources, and improve resilience to climate change
- Continue support for Guyana’s FLEGT process, as well as the development of a planning database based on an inventory of the country’s forest resources.
- Implement the current DRM plan and ensure that key individuals understand the immediate steps that should be taken in response to actual or impending disasters. As appropriate, conduct additional mock exercises simulating likely disasters, based on historical experience.
- Continue to develop additional inland fisheries actions and management plans.

Recommendation 4: Improve agricultural health and food safety systems and infrastructure
- Strengthen capacities for a rapid response to food safety events by improving food traceability and recall legislation and systems, including the revision and enactment of legislation pertaining to all aspects of agricultural health and food safety (this is unlikely to include legislation for pesticides and toxic chemicals, which the evaluation team understands is up-to-date). The absence of an internationally accredited food safety system and infrastructure is perhaps the single most limiting factor in Guyana’s ability to increase exports of primary and processed agricultural products.
- Based on these increased capacities, provide support for a comprehensive national food safety system and infrastructure, which will ultimately serve to stimulate the country’s export platform.

Recommendation 5: Continue to support ongoing programmes that enhance food and nutrition security, with a focus on gender.
- Continue collaborating with the relevant government ministries on school feeding programmes and dietary guidelines, with a strong focus on the utilization of food sourced locally.
- The focus on and promotion of the Cassava Value Chain should be reviewed and reconsidered. Using cassava as a substitute for wheat flour in the manufacture of composite flour products is import substitution in another guise. Import substitution as a developmental model failed several decades ago and is highly unlikely to make a successful resurgence in today’s open global markets.
- In addition to promoting cassava production intended as a substitute for wheat flour in traditional wheat flour products, it is suggested that the Cassava Value Chain also work on other cassava-based products (e.g. cassava bread, farine, casareep) which are targeted to the requirements of specific markets (national or export). However, considerable product development and market access investigations must precede the attempts to stimulate
cassava production. If producers are encouraged to increase cassava production before market access issues are resolved, it is likely that when the cassava is ready for harvest there will be no markets available in which it can be sold. Such an outcome would be a terrible setback to any future attempts to stimulate cassava production.

- **Continue supporting gender and youth focused projects which contribute to improved food and nutrition security (e.g. through increased household income or minimizing migration to urban areas).** For example, the delivery of training in basic principles for operating a business will be of immense value to the Forestry Community Associations. Such training is likely to impact both women and youth, as about 30-40 percent of operators are women.

- **Although the office has a gender focal point, few resources are available and limited technical support is provided to facilitate gender-related activities.** Due to the current budget constraints, the Guyana country office is unable hire a full-time gender expert. It is advisable to establish and maintain a strong relationship with the appointed Gender Specialist at SLC, and to develop a subregional strategy for the Caribbean. Gender approaches in the Caribbean have different implications than those in Latin America, and this distinction should be taken into account.

---

3 In the mid 1970’s Guyana sought to produce cassava flour in order to launch a cassava-wheat composite flour on to the local market. Four cassava flour mills were purchased from Brazil and farmers were encouraged to expand their production to feed the mills. The farmers responded promptly but the factories were not completed in time to receive the harvested cassava. The farmers suffered heavy losses and were reluctant to resume planting the crop.
1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the evaluation

The Office of Evaluation of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) has launched a renewed series of Country Programme Evaluations (CPEs) with the main purpose of better orienting 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.

Guyana was selected among a group of Caribbean countries in which to carry out a Country Programme Evaluation in 2015. This choice was based on: i) the status of the CPF cycle ending in 2015; ii) socioeconomic indicators of relevance to FAO; iii) the presence of a newly appointed FAO Representative (FAOR); and iv) the proximity to the eastern Caribbean states that were being evaluated at the same time.

The main aim of the evaluation was to inform the development of the new Country Programming Framework (CPF) cycle for Guyana starting in 2016 and to better orient FAO’s programme in the next biennium, making it more relevant to the government priorities for the country. The evaluation was also intended to assess the strategic relevance in the national context of FAO’s programmes and interventions in Guyana.

Furthermore, since the Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness, the international donor community has given increasing attention to country ownership of the development process. In this spirit, the evaluation aimed to emphasize the involvement of national partners in the evaluation process, in particular the government, to facilitate the adoption of the evaluation results by the relevant national agencies and promote their use at the national level. This evaluation was designed to provide a comprehensive review of the entirety of FAO’s assistance to Guyana, including activities funded through regular programme as well as extra-budgetary resources; national, regional and global projects; and emergency and development interventions. It also reviewed the usefulness and impact of FAO’s global normative functions on the respective sectors.

1.2 Scope

This evaluation report analyzed the work conducted by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in Guyana from 2010 to mid-2015. The evaluation embraced a forward-looking perspective, with a particular contribution to the subregional priorities and areas of focus for regional work 2014-15 and beyond, agreed upon at the 33rd FAO Conference for Latin America and the Caribbean held in 2014 in Santiago, Chile.

FAO’s assistance to Guyana over the last biennium was distributed across a variety of activities. In order to focus the scope of the evaluation, four sectors were selected to examine FAO’s work. These sectors correspond to the four Country Priority Areas (CPA) that both the Representation and Government of Guyana identified as key aspects for their work together:

a. Support for food security and nutrition;
b. Agriculture and rural development;
c. Sustainable resources and climate change; and
d. Agricultural health and food safety.

4 The socio-economic indicators included percentage of undernourished persons, percentage of rural population, contribution of agriculture to GDP and income levels.
5 See Box 1 for the complete list of the Focus areas.
Box 1: Focus areas for regional action in LAC

i. Enhancing food security and nutrition, strengthening governance mechanism and legal frameworks for hunger eradication, through the Regional Initiative “Support to the Hunger-Free Latin America and the Caribbean Initiative”.

ii. Increasing production efficiency and adoption of good practices for sustainable agriculture, livestock, forestry and fisheries; enhancing climate change adaptation, improving governance mechanism and supporting decision-making for sustainable development (social, economic and environmental). Addressed through the Initiatives on “Family Farming and Rural Territorial Development” and “Improving national and regional food and feed systems in the Caribbean”.

iii. Reducing poverty and improving social protection in rural areas, enhancing rural territorial development and family farming. Addressed through the Regional Initiatives “Family Farming and Rural Territorial Development” and “Improving national and regional food and feed systems in the Caribbean”.

iv. Developing inclusive, efficient, sustainable and competitive food and agricultural systems and reducing food losses and waste. Addressed by the Initiative “Improving national and regional food and feed systems in the Caribbean”.

v. Reduction of the impact of shocks and disasters, improved food and nutrition security, as well as help reduce the pressure on and rehabilitation of natural resources as part of the Initiative “Family Farming and Rural Territorial Development”.

1.3 Objectives and questions

The general evaluation questions outlined in the elaborated evaluation criteria were adapted to the specific circumstances of the types of activities, individual projects, and stakeholders’ involvement in Guyana

Box 2: Evaluation questions

**Strategic relevance**

- Overall, the fundamental questions are whether the FAO program is aligned with national goals and priorities. To what extent is FAO responsive to emerging country needs?
- Are FAO’s activities designed to achieve its expected outcomes? Is there any gap or emerging need not been addressed?
- Has FAO been addressing the most acute and structurally important challenges in the areas of FAO’s competence?
- Has FAO programme been aligned with relevant national strategies and policies, including the United Nations Development Assistance Framework?
- How are CPF outcomes relevant in achieving FAO Strategic Objectives?

**Partnership and coordination**

- What is the cooperation among FAO and its partners? What is the collaboration between FAO and government and non-governmental stakeholders?
- How did FAO engage in partnerships and to what extent were these partnerships complementary and synergetic?
- To what extent has FAO supported the coordination of actors working in the rural development and food security sector?

---

6 Thirty-third section of the FAO Regional Conference for Latin America and the Caribbean, Santiago Chile 6-9 May 2014, Focus Areas of Work for 2014-15 and Beyond, par. 21, Doc. LARC/14/5 Rev.1
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**Normative values**
- Have normative values of the United Nations, particularly supporting the poor, marginalized, disadvantaged and affected populations been embedded into FAO’s programme, and if so, how?
- To what extent has FAO taken into account equity, gender and human rights in the design of its programme and during the implementation?

**Comparative advantage**
- What role has FAO played vis-à-vis other development actors (national and local government, civil society, the private sector, and other international development partners) and did it draw from its own comparative advantage?
- Programme contribution: Are we making a difference?

**For each CPF outcome**

**Relevance**
- How appropriate have FAO’s activities been to achieve the planned CPF outcome?
- In the areas of capacity development, and in providing policy and technical advice, has FAO supported the key actors and provided the necessary technical contents?
- How relevant is the FAO programme in reducing rural poverty? In direct support, has FAO targeted the poorest and most vulnerable households and responded to their needs, including women and young people?

1. **Impact and effectiveness**
- Overall, to what extent do the FAO interventions (e.g., regional, sub-regional, and country-level) achieve the stated objectives?
- What changes can be observed that are attributable to FAO’s interventions (e.g. behavioral changes; institutional changes; policy changes; technical adaptations; socio-economic benefits)?
- To what extent have these changes contributed to progress towards outcomes?
- What is the impact of FAO’s efforts in enhancing the ability of communities confronted with disasters to withstand damage and rapidly recover?

2. **Sustainability of results**
- Have FAO activities had proper exit strategies and have these been followed?
- To what extent are the results owned by beneficiaries?
- Have livelihoods been affected by results on the medium and long-term and how?

3. **Coherence and synergies**
- Has FAO focused on activities that will achieve sustainable results vis-à-vis its resources? Has the TCP played a catalytic role?
- What kind of partnerships has FAO established and to what extent have these enhanced its capacity to achieve desired results?
- To what extent have FAO’s regional initiatives provided coherent and/or complementary support in view of achieving the CPF results?
- To what extent has HQ, RLC, SLC represented an added value e.g. in terms of technical support?
- Has FAO’s knowledge base (norms, guidelines, publications, etc.) been used at country level?
- To what extent is the FAO’s programme logically structured? Are there any synergies/duplications across priority areas?
- To what extent have emergency interventions integrated long-term perspectives, and to what extent do development interventions account for recurrent crises?
1.4 Methodology

The evaluation began with preparatory and background work at the Office of Evaluation (OED) offices at FAO headquarters in Rome. A subsequent inception mission to the region enabled interaction with key FAO personnel in Barbados, as well as the Regional Office for the Caribbean (RLC) office in Santiago. A multidisciplinary team of independent consultants and FAO OED staff dedicated three weeks to data gathering in the region, inclusive of ten days in Guyana. (See Annex 2 Overall Evaluation Matrix and Annex 3 Evaluation Activity Plan).

In order to promote ownership of the development process, the evaluation emphasized the involvement of national partners, particularly government entities, who will benefit from the resulting improvements to the forthcoming CPF. The main audience for the present evaluation is the FAO staff in Guyana, the FAO Subregional office for Latin America and the Caribbean (SLC), and its national partners.

The methodology adopted applied the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact to assess FAO’s assistance in Guyana. The United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards were used as a guide throughout the evaluation process.

Qualitative data were collected through semi-structured and focal point interviews with government officials, partner organizations, beneficiaries and FAO staff. Extensive literature reviews took place prior to and during the fieldwork, as well as an analysis of reports, project documents, and primary and secondary documents. Quantitative data were also used when considering the country project portfolio. The results of this fact-finding mission were then evaluated and analyzed to report on the relevance of FAO’s work, the effectiveness of its support to beneficiaries, the efficiency of these actions, the impact of its interventions and the sustainability of positive outcomes for post-project activities (e.g. policy development and review, technical advice and financial support). The evaluation team comprised three independent consultants with combined expertise in agriculture, forestry and natural resources; gender; value chains; food and nutrition security; rural development; community engagement; agricultural policy development and institutional arrangements; and Caribbean Community (CARICOM) integrated economies. Two FAO OED staff supported the evaluation team with management, logistics and the provision of background documents.

The main evaluation questions were further contextualized and broken down into methodological questions as follows.

The general evaluation questions outlined in the evaluation criteria were adapted to the specific circumstances of the types of activities, projects, and stakeholders’ involvement in Guyana. Also, an online survey was designed and shared with stakeholders to collect additional data during the evaluation period.

Preparatory phase

A preparatory mission, comprising the Evaluation Manager, Team Leader and Evaluation Analyst, was undertaken some six weeks prior to the main evaluation mission. From 18-28 May 2015, the preparatory mission visited Barbados, Saint Lucia, Guyana, and Trinidad and Tobago, and consulted with FAO Representatives and National Correspondants who were attending a subregional meeting in Barbados.

During this time, the evaluation considered the sub-region’s priorities and their alignment with FAO’s strategic objectives, interviewed a sample of internal and external stakeholders in order to develop key evaluation questions, and conducted interviews to select the evaluation team members.
16 The Evaluation Team reviewed relevant documents prior to the visit to Guyana, and also prepared protocols for semi-structured interviews. The Guyana FAO office scheduled interviews with relevant stakeholders. A four-person team spent a total of 10 days in Guyana conducting the interviews, visiting selected field projects and reviewing relevant documentation.

17 Interviews were conducted with:

- The Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture and senior representatives of other government agencies;
- The UNDP Resident Representative;
- Beneficiaries of FAO programmes, including small ruminant farmer and community groups involved in forest utilization and root crops (cassava) farmers;
- Representatives from regional and international organizations, including Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) and Conservation International;
- Representatives from the European Union;
- FAO consultants;
- FAO Guyana staff including the former and current FAOR.

18 The Evaluation Team undertook in-depth project reviews in order to gain an understanding of the interface of FAO’s programmatic framework with national priorities and strategies. The Evaluation Team collected evidence on achievements, positive results, negative outcomes, innovative actions and missed opportunities. In addition to qualitative information from the interviews the Evaluation Team also sought to obtain quantitative data from published reports or otherwise. In addition, selected policymakers were surveyed.

19 Two team workshops were held in Barbados, one immediately prior to the data collection phase and the other immediately afterwards. The first one served to highlight critical issues pertaining to the data collection. The second one facilitated the analysis and refinement of the conclusions and recommendations.

20 The following section delves into the main findings of the study and offers a detailed account of how the FAO Programme has worked toward fulfilling the Country Programme Framework and four Priority Areas agreed upon with the Guyana Government for the period 2012-2015.

1.5 Limitations

21 The evaluation team was confronted by the following limitations during the data collection process in Guyana:

a. Upon arrival, the team faced torrential rains and flash floods, which impeded meetings with some government representatives who were engaged in emergency response activities.

b. There was insufficient time to conduct field visits, particularly to the hinterlands and Region 9 where the SOFA assessment took place also due to the difficult transport conditions after such heavy rains.

c. Key government personnel were out of the country or out-of-town during the period the evaluation took place. The local FAO office personnel worked to find alternatives, but that was not always possible. Accordingly, some interviews took place via Skype, and after the team departed Guyana.

d. Due to the change of government that occurred just prior to the arrival of the evaluation team, some government representatives interviewed were not up-to-date with the measures taken by their predecessors.

e. As the evaluation took place during the summer school recess, it was not possible to meet with students, teachers and school personnel in some districts where Telefood interventions and school-feeding programmes were conducted.
f. The evaluation would have benefited from more information on the uptake of the inland fisheries and aquaculture projects. FAO conducted an aquaculture project in Guyana called “Expansion of Hydroponic Activities in Guyana” (TCP 3501), but the results were unavailable during the evaluation (July 2015).

g. An online survey was designed as part of the evaluation. The evaluation team requested all interviewees to answer the survey (online or on papers) and reminders were sent via email. Unfortunately, the number of responses was too low to be significant for evaluation purposes.

1.6 Structure of the report

The organization of the report is as follows: the Introduction is followed by the Context (Background and Trends) section describing the socio-economic situation in the country, the agricultural sector and its contribution to the national economy. This is followed by a description of the Main Findings of the evaluation in relation to the Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Sustainability of FAO’s work on each Priority Area (PA) of the CPF. Following this are sections on the evaluation’s Conclusions and Lessons Learned. Final Recommendations are then presented and thoroughly discussed. A list of appendices is also included, with key information on the sources consulted, stakeholders’ interviewed, projects reviewed and the list of the technical assistance requested by the government of Guyana to FAO.
2. Context

2.1 Background and trends

According to the World Bank, Guyana is considered a lower middle income country, with a GDP of USD 3.228 billion (2014) and a growth rate of 4.82 percent. The country has an area of 214,971,000 (1,000 ha) with a low population density of 3.5 persons per square kilometer (km2). The population density increases to 9.6 persons/km2 in coastal areas and decreases drastically to less than one person per km2 in the hinterlands. Guyana’s total population in 2012 was 747,884, and is mainly distributed along the northern coast and primarily in the capital, Georgetown, with 191,810 inhabitants representing approximately 25.6 percent of the total population. The highest concentration of the population is on the coastal belt where most of the commercial activities are conducted, and where 666,261 persons were recorded by the 2012 census. The other 81,623 persons, or 10.9 percent of the total population, reside in the hinterland areas. The country is divided into 10 Administrative Regions, but among those, only Regions 2, 4, 6 and 10 have urban centers. Most of the population in rural areas have poor access to potable water and suffer from poor services, sanitation, health and in some cases access to education services.

Over the period 2003 to 2010, the Government of Guyana’s water-related expenditure accounted for an estimated 1.9 percent of total government expenditures. Guyana’s Human Development Index for 2014 positioned the country at 121 (out of 187). The multidimensional poverty level reaches 7.8 percent and an additional 18.8 percent are near multidimensional poor. The percentage of population under the poverty line is 35 percent. Guyana is the third poorest country in the Western Hemisphere, after Haiti and Nicaragua. Guyana has made good progress in achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDG)
by 2015, with the exception of MDG 5 which entails the reduction by three-quarters of the maternal mortality ratio. The country achieved the goals for MDG 1, hunger and poverty reduction, in 2013. It has also met the World Food Summit (WFS) goal, reducing by half the absolute number of undernourished people between 1990-92 and 2010-2012. However, the country has strived to increase basic social services and when access to food does not constitute a problem, there are still pockets of the population that suffer from malnutrition, obesity and chronic non-communicable diseases.

26 The agricultural area is estimated at 1,678 (1,000 ha), with a total land area of 19,685 (1,000 ha) and a forest area of 15,205 (1,000 ha). Guyana is still considered an agricultural resource-based country. The agricultural sector vital for attaining food security at the country level, while also contributing to exports in a variety of commodities.

27 The agricultural sector also accounts for roughly one-third of the GDP, and contributes up to 30 percent of total employment and up to 40 percent of export earnings. The major agricultural exports include rice and sugar, as well as seafood products. Other areas of economic activity predominate in the extractive industry (gold, diamond and bauxite mining, and timber), with smaller contributions from garments and pharmaceuticals.

28 In the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), Guyana is the country least dependent on food imports with a ratio of 41 percent. There is an active Grow More Food campaign sponsored by the Ministry of Agriculture, which is also promoting crop and export diversification.

29 Guyana’s forestry sector is very important and contributes between 3-5 percent of the GDP, directly employing over 20,000 persons and scores of community forestry associations. The sector produces timber-, plywood- and fuelwood-based products for the domestic market, as well as exports to the Caribbean, Europe and Asia. The country has also embarked on a new economic pathway with the launch of the Low Carbon Development Strategy (LCDS) in 2009, pursuing an additional revenue stream through a low carbon, climate resilient economy that maintains low deforestation rates currently ranging between 0.02 – 0.079 percent over the last 20 years. A key outcome of this strategy was the performance-based five-year Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Kingdom of Norway and the Government of Guyana. The MoU, which could result in revenue of up to USD 250 million, outlines the countries’ collaboration on issues related to climate change, the protection of biodiversity and the enhancement of sustainable development. The Guyana Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD)+ Investment Fund was established to finance priority projects under the LCDS. Approximately 80 percent, or 18.5 million hectares, of Guyana is covered by forests, where most of the indigenous population live.

30 Guyana, like other Caribbean countries, faces persistent inequalities in land tenure, access to resources and structural challenges besides poverty. One particular threat is its vulnerability to climate change: rising sea levels, rainfall unpredictability and flash flooding. The effects of climate change have consistently disrupted the local economy and rural and urban livelihoods, and ultimately will impact the country’s ability to achieve higher levels of human development.

31 The following section provides a description of FAO’s programme in the Caribbean Sub-Region, as well as the main functional aspects of the FAO Guyana Office.

2.2 FAO programme

32 FAO has long had a presence in the Caribbean, which was strengthened over the past two decades through the Subregional Office in Bridgetown, Barbados. The FAO subregional programme takes into account the diversity of member countries with contrasting aspects, such as extreme differences in land mass, population growth, various levels of socio-economic development, and vulnerability to external shocks, which affects the whole region. The economies of Barbados and the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) countries are largely service oriented, while Trinidad and Tobago is primarily energy-based. In Dominica and Guyana, agriculture remains the primary economic activity.
FAO implemented a subregional strategy (2014-2015) which addressed several main challenges in the region:

- High levels of food insecurity and malnutrition;
- Recent and drastic changes in food consumption patterns, influencing a rapid dietary, nutritional and epidemiological transition that contributes to the increase in levels of obesity linked to non-communicable diseases;\(^7\)
- High levels of poverty;
- High exposure to risks and limited resilience capacity;
- Inadequate rural area and territorial development strategic approaches;
- Weak public policy and governance; and
- Underdeveloped agriculture and food systems.\(^8\)

In order to address this wide range of issues, FAO has spearheaded four main programmes that also relate to the five Strategic Objectives embraced by FAO. The programme areas are:

- Zero Hunger Challenge Initiative (Hunger-Free Latin America and the Caribbean Initiative (SO1 and SO3));
- Value Chain (Food and Feed Systems) Initiative and Small Scale/Family Farming (SO2 and SO4);
- Risk Management, Resilience Building and Territorial Development (SO3 and SO5);
- Public Policy and Governance (SO1 and SO3).

Each of these overarching initiatives is being implemented with different timeframes and rates of adoption in the countries of the Sub-region. This is also influenced by in-country differences in crosscutting issues such as national capacity and capability, economic well-being, governance and gender.

**Overview of FAO Guyana office operations**

FAO and the Government of Guyana worked together prior to the appointment of a country representative and the opening of an FAO office, which started operations officially in 2009. In 2013 the FAOR Guyana was transferred to the sub-regional Office in Barbados. From that time until late 2014, the office was coordinated by a National Officer (the Assistant FAO Representative for Programming) while the UNDP Resident Representative oversaw the continuity of agreements, government relations and commitments as related to the UN System in the country until the appointment of a new FAO Country Representative (FAOR). A new FAOR assumed office in early 2015 and the office resumed fluid operations locally. In addition, linkages were strengthened with the Barbados office at the sub-regional level.

Currently, the office’s portfolio is 80 percent operations. As FAO Guyana undertakes additional country requests and responsibilities, it will require additional human resources, and administrative and technical expertise to effectively respond to the country’s growing demand for technical support. Although FAO Guyana currently has a small portfolio of projects, the office has good potential to grow in order to support the country in each of the four priority areas that were highlighted in the Country Programme Framework (CPF) document. These priority areas guided the FAO-Government partnership over the period 2012-2015. The four priority areas agreed upon by the Government of Guyana and FAO were: 1) Support to Food Security and Nutrition; 2) Support to Agriculture and Rural Development; 3) Renewable Natural Resources and Climate Change; and 4) Capacity Development for Agriculture Health and Food Safety.

Most recently, the FAO Office in Guyana coordinated the development of a new CPF 2016-2019 by organizing a stakeholder workshop. Through this process, country needs are to be aligned with strategic objectives, government policies, civil society needs, while engaging non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and farmers in this participatory process.

---

7 Including diabetes, hypertension, stroke, heart disease and cancer.
8 Wherever in this document the statement agriculture and food systems appear it includes crops, livestock, fisheries (including aquaculture) and forestry systems.
It is important to mention that the design of the CPF has changed over time. Initially, the CPF was developed by an independent consultant hired by FAO. Now, the document is drafted through a participatory process, including the input of a wide number of stakeholders at the country level. The new CPFs focuses on FAO’s five Strategic Objectives (See Annex 4) instead of 11 that were taken into account before. During the evaluation mission, the FAO office shared a matrix detailing the portfolio of projects that were executed during the current evaluation period (See Annex 5).

When looking into programme continuity in Guyana, it is important to recognize that during the period 2012-2015 the country changed its Minister of Agriculture three times. During May 2015, there were general and regional elections that resulted in a change of Government. While still new to their offices, the Ministers and senior officials have expressed their intention to focus on crop diversification in the hinterland regions, concentrating on ginger and black pepper, livestock rearing and large scale agriculture investments (particularly in Region 9). The Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture is regarded as a key person for the development of the CPF, and some possible changes in focus can be expected. Because of these circumstances, the government’s priorities have changed slightly and FAO has organized accountability seminars or workshops to revise the CPF on a yearly basis, and to keep all partners abreast of the programmes and activities.

FAO’s relationship with the Guyana government has been very good since the inception of the office in 2009. Nonetheless, there are some challenges at the governmental level to facilitate the participation of local personnel in regional and sub-regional events organized by FAO. FAO works with governments through Technical Cooperation Projects (TCP), while the engagement with other national organizations is through MOUs. Currently, the FAO local office is developing strong partnerships with IICA, Caribbean Agricultural Research and Development Institute (CARDI) and NAREI. FAO is also an integral member of the recently assembled new donor platform that is intended to enhance and guide new funding streams to satisfy the country’s needs in a more targeted way.

As per the work with partners, FAO and IICA collaborate in three areas: i) cassava; ii) coconut; and iii) livestock (small ruminants). Each has good potential to forge lasting partnerships based on the core competencies of the respective agencies: FAO leads on cassava and small ruminants while IICA leads on coconuts. FAO has also worked with other partners, namely CARDI, NAREI and Conservation International, among others. Presently, FAO is working with the University of Guyana, sharing information and materials to upgrade the University web interface in a variety of agricultural and curricular related topics. These efforts will be fully operational by September 2015.

Some other overarching themes that require FAO’s expertise to attend Guyana’s development priorities include:

- The enhancement of forest governance and trade in timber products, which entailed the drafting of a “roadmap” for a Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA) to negotiate with the European Union (EU) through FAO’s African Caribbean and Pacific EU-Forest Law Enforcement Governance and Trade (ACP EU-FLEGT) support program.
- The collection and dissemination of agricultural production data requested by Guyana within the context of the country’s thrust to promote the diversification of the agricultural sector, increase rural incomes and expand its local and international markets for non-traditional crops. This country request has been satisfied with the development of two projects, particularly the project TCP/GUY/3402: “Support for the enhancement of the National Agriculture Market Information System in Guyana”. The resulting system allowed the New Guyana Marketing Corporation (GMC) to collect and publish current price data for seven of the key national markets, as well as offer SMS service on two main
regional markets. This intervention assisted the New Guyana Marketing Corporation (GMC) in the establishment of a web-based market information system, a significant innovation in the dissemination of current market data.

- The development of a long-term (2010-2020) food security policy and action plan to reach out to the hinterland communities, as well as other remote rural and urban populations.
- The development of a study focused on a Food Systems Approach in Guyana’s Rupununi Region to understand local needs and achieve sustainable livelihoods, along with food security and agricultural strategies in this unique region.
- Confronting the effects of climate change while supporting the country in the management of disaster risks (through disaster risk management (DRM)) to secure livelihoods countrywide.

The above priorities included concrete requests from the government that framed the previous CPF priority areas at the country level. While some of this work is still ongoing, the present evaluation exercise found significant follow-up effects that will be analyzed in the Main Findings section of this report.

**FAO Guyana programme budget**

The FAO country portfolio accounts for both traditional resources (FAO regular budget) and non-traditional resources, which include a variety of donor countries and agencies. The total budget for FAO operations in Guyana is USD 794,403, corresponding to six Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) projects totaling USD 744,229 and six Telefood projects totaling USD 50,174 (see Table 1 and Figure 3). FAO relies on a variety of sources to implement its country programmes, including the Technical Cooperation programmes (TCP), which are the most common ones, regional and subregional programmes, Telefood projects (considerable smaller), as well as a number of other instruments including MoU and Letters of Agreements (LoA).

**Table 1: National projects by fund group (2010-2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund type</th>
<th>Number of projects</th>
<th>Budget (US$)</th>
<th>% of the total budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>744,229</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telefood</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50,174</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>794,403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FPMIS (2015)

**Figure 2: Distribution of budget for national projects by fund group (USD)**
Field programme sources and the delivery of funds accounted for USD 497000 from 2010 to February 2015 (Figure 3).

Some small differences exist regarding sources of information that the Evaluation Team accessed at the Subregional Office in Barbados and at the country office in Guyana, depending on the dates information was accessed. Finally, a table reproducing the geographical coverage for the overall subregion, including Guyana, is presented in Table 2.

### Table 2. Total number of projects per country by geographical coverage over the period 2010-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Parents and babies</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>794403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9418970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-regional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2037736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2833019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15084128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Main findings

47 The evaluation analyzed the relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and impact of FAO’s assistance to Guyana in order to inform the new CPF in 2016-2019.

48 The evaluation mission took into account each of the four CPF Priority Areas outlined for the period 2012-2015 to determine whether FAO’s programme was responsive to the country’s needs. Each of the priority areas is analyzed to assess its completion or identify gaps that may still exist. The findings are described in the present section corresponding to respective country priority areas.

49 The four country priority areas are:
   a. Support for food security and nutrition;
   b. Agriculture and rural development;
   c. Sustainable resources and climate change;
   d. Agricultural health and food safety.

50 An additional section (3.2) has been included detailing Crosscutting Themes observed during the evaluation mission. The formulation of the main findings of the study is based on data collected from the instruments designed during the mission, including questionnaires, surveys, observations, field visits and stakeholder meetings, as well as feedback from a stakeholder workshop to present preliminary findings at the Subregional office for Latin America and the Caribbean (SLC) in Barbados.

3.1 CPA 1. Support for food security and nutrition

51 Food security and nutrition outcomes are a central piece of FAO’s strategy to support the country. This CPF priority area includes the reduction of household food insecurity, malnutrition and persistent poverty at the country level, with emphasis on the hinterland communities and other rural areas. The most prominent pieces of information to determine the programme’s relevance include the interaction with very specific groups of stakeholders, including the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Education and the Guyana School of Agriculture.

The main findings under CPA 1 are presented below.

Finding 1: FAO’s Guyana office provided good and consistent support to the Ministry of Health in policy development, updated the Country’s Food Based Dietary Guidelines, and improved of the National School Feeding Program.

52 Relevance: The evaluation team commends the work done by FAO supporting the development and final approval of the country Food and Nutrition Security strategy. FAO provided pivotal guidance in the development of the country’s Nutrition Policy, which was approved in 2011.

53 Effectiveness: There are several concrete interventions on-going between FAO and the Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education and Ministry of Agriculture.

   • The first intervention is a response to a direct request from the government of Guyana (Ministry of Health) to review and update the country’s Food Based Dietary Guidelines. The current guidelines need to be updated, as they were developed in 2008. Approval for the guidelines is still pending for institutional and technical clearance from FAO’s regional office in Santiago, Chile, while approval from the subregional office was already granted.
   • The second intervention involves improving the National School Feeding Program. A series of high level meetings between FAO and the Guyana government took
place recently to discuss support. FAO is currently guiding the development of these programmes toward sustainability (i.e. buying crops produced locally by smallholder farmers). The School Feeding Programme complements FAO’s Zero Hunger Challenge Initiative developed in the region.

- Presently, Guyana is analyzing Brazil and Chile’s experiences through South-South cooperation. After several meetings between governmental bodies and FAO, there is consensus to develop a feeding programme for children two years of age and younger with FAO support. In addition, the Ministry of Health has been supporting a school feeding programme for hinterland schools in Regions 1, 7, 8 and 9, which includes hot meals, as well as another ‘juice and biscuit’ programme for children under two years of age. FAO’s technical support enhanced these programs.

Finding 2: FAO provided timely assistance to the Ministry of Education for the development of an agriculture school curriculum, and provided funding sources to develop activities such as FAO’s Telefood programme.

Relevance: The agricultural curriculum programme was expanded to several regions with the aim of involving teachers, school food handlers, parents and students in a learning experience that includes positive health and nutrition habits at the grassroots level.

FAO supported Guyana through the development of educational programs and modules about food safety aimed at school canteen operators, cooks and vendors. A series of training sessions were organized and a knowledge, attitude and practices survey took place afterward to check whether safety guidelines were implemented. The duration of this programme was 2012-2013 and the schools in Region 4 (Georgetown) were targeted. FAO also provided funding to implement this programme. There is still a need for more training in this area, with a focus on the preparation of nutritious, balanced meals, such as lunches for primary/secondary schools and morning snacks for pre-schoolers or nursery school.

FAO’s Telefood programme (TFD-11/GUY/001 Establishment of a vegetable garden at the Ptolemy Reid Rehabilitation School) had an important impact at the school level. The project was implemented in five schools for children with special needs through the installation of shade houses for farming. The schools included in this project were: New Amsterdam (Region 6), David Rose, Linden (Region 10) and Diamond Grove (Region 4) in addition to the one labelled Telefood. The project was implemented through Partners for the Americas (a US-based NGO) and covered approximately 500-600 children.

Efficiency: These FAO project interventions were successful because the teachers embraced a strategy that was inexpensive to implement through multisector collaboration. Through technical support from FAO, the schools produced cash crops and sold vegetables for the school feeding programme during the period 2012-2013. There were several advantages: the children worked in the school garden and brought vegetables home for consumption and the vegetables harvested were used to prepare healthy meals at the school. Today, all support is channelled through the government but some local NGOs also provide help to particular schools.

Effectiveness: FAO participates and partly funds a food competition for secondary schools as part of the School Home Economics Competition event during World Food Day. The event has taken place since 2009. FAO reviews the recipes prepared by the school children. More than 100 recipes are presented and the best ones are selected. Later, the winning recipes are used in the school feeding programs. The competition targets all 10 Regions and the themes change every year. In 2015 the theme selected was non-communicable
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diseases and in 2013 it was foods prepared with cassava. A recipe book was also published by FAO. This strategy is perceived as a very good approach to improve nutritional content at the school level. All schools have a home economics department and the competition is about strategies for meal preparation, and learning about balanced diets. Further, the students are tasked to conduct research and present their projects.

Impact and Sustainability: Through FAO’s help in the development of an agriculture and science curriculum, the students were exposed to health and nutrition education. They benefited by learning about dietary guidelines rich in vegetables, something of utmost importance in the hinterlands. The Ministry of Education has also involved other donors, such as the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), to secure support and continuity of this health programme initiated by FAO.

The Ministry of Education plans to participate in the FAO-led stakeholder seminar to develop a new CPF with good possibilities to forge new partnerships with the education sector.

Finding 3: FAO funded the development of a new agro-processing curriculum, as requested by the Guyana School of Agriculture (GSA), including support for specialized education in agri-business and engaging young people in agriculture-related careers.

This curriculum addressed not only agricultural topics but also the development of new market products, while following standard dietary guidelines and packaging regulations.

Relevance: GSA accounts for 264 students at two campuses (Main Campus in East Coast Demerara, Georgetown and the Essequibo Branch in Region 2). The student body is very balanced with 50 percent male and 50 percent female. The School of Agriculture offers a variety of learning programs: a one-year certificate in fisheries, forestry (and agro-processing); and a two-year Diploma in Agriculture, Animal Health and Veterinary Public Health, and a Diploma in Livestock Production and Management. In the period 2012-2013, the academic body realized the need to open a new programme with a focus on agro-processing; therefore the School requested support from FAO to develop a new curriculum. FAO hired a consultant tasked with the development of a new curriculum, offering new guidelines and learning opportunities in agro-processing. This new curriculum opened the possibility for young people to learn how to process food and market their products. In order to complete the degree, the students must design and complete a hands-on agri-business project.

Effectiveness: The new certificate at the school level allows the students to use local products and resources to reach the market and mobilize the local economy by processing the following products: dairy, beef, chicken, pork, crops and backyard gardens. The students learn to use local products harvested at the school gardens to develop new products; this is an integrated system to reach sustainability. There is a market for agro-processing programmes which are funded by the government.

Efficiency: In the first year, a small group of students graduated (eight females and one male); since then, the number has more than doubled. The students learn how to transform food and the substantial differences between cooking and processing food.

Sustainability: Due to high student demand for this agro-processing curriculum, the GSA will continue offering this certificate. They also have plans to enhance the curriculum to enable students to continue studying food processing at the university level. The students are involved in a hands-on project and they also develop a marketing strategy to sell the new product (e.g. salsas, fish nuggets, sweets, spices, seasoning, cassava chips, sweet potato chips, cassava bread) in the local market.

---

13 A Non-Communicable Disease (NCD) is a medical condition that is non-transmissible. Generally non-infectious, their aetiology is often linked to nutrition and other life-style factors. The category includes four main types: cardiovascular diseases, cancers, chronic respiratory diseases, and diabetes.
Impact: FAO’s contribution to the development of a school curriculum has had an impact at the school level and opens the possibility for the student body to choose a new career; in addition to focusing on food security and nutritional security, they also learn about food and health standards, processing, marketing and budgeting.

The Guyana School of Agriculture has requested FAO’s help to develop another new curriculum, this time in fisheries. FAO is uniquely positioned to support GSA in building capacities in fisheries. The development of a curriculum and training session for teaching assistants will give students the opportunity to learn new skills and engage in food processing and fisheries (aquaculture), as these are two feasible options in the Guyana market. Finally, FAO and GSA are considering the design of new educational packages to teach students through online courses and hands-on practical modules (e.g. lab work, processing plants, labelling).

Finding 4: Contributed to food security through a well-developed strategic campaign for improving the cassava value chain in the country and the Caribbean region.

Relevance: FAO contributed to the subregional and country level in the development of the cassava value chain as well as other products (e.g. sweet potato). Production capabilities were improved (e.g. capacity development and seminars) and there is room for considerable work to be done on processing capabilities, transformation, transportation, and other aspects related to marketing the value chain. FAO considers the cassava value chain development as a priority for Guyana and the region.

Efficiency: FAO supports the use of cassava as a substitute for wheat flour in an amount of 20 percent or more for baking. It is presumed as much as 40 percent cassava mash can be used for baking purposes to replace a similar proportion of wheat flour imports. However, the issue pertaining to import substitution remains a challenge, as the cost of cassava flour is much higher than that of wheat flour. The data provided the Team indicates that cassava mash is 2.8 times the cost of wheat flour while cassava flour is 3.6 times the cost of wheat flour. Given the scale on which cassava is produced it is unlikely that parity will be attained in the foreseeable future. In addition, experience has shown that products made from a cassava/wheat composite flour fail to retain many of their desirable characteristics as the percentage of cassava flour increases beyond 20. If a health benefit can be definitively demonstrated, then that may induce people to switch from wheat to cassava flour. At the time the evaluation took place was not possible to project any price savings. FAO is currently spearheading studies with respect to the projection of cassava being used as a substitute for wheat flour. Cassava has been identified as a potential crop to reduce hunger and it is used in a variety of dishes; most recently it has been used for baking purposes. The work with cassava value chains also falls under the FAO’s Zero Hunger Challenge Initiative.

Effectiveness: Through the Project Cassava Rapid Multiplication and Best Practices in Production, carried out in the framework of the FAO regional project on Integrated Development of Cassava in the Caribbean, FAO supported the development of a value chain through a series of training exercises conducted with a large attendance of farmers. These training initiatives included demonstrations of new techniques and mechanical planting of cassava to help farmers increase their production. These trainings also provided a common ground to share information about the mechanization possibilities, and to observe the functioning of the machine in the field. Considerable time saving has been achieved through mechanization. The farmers benefited from the training, as well as the opportunity to learn from specialists and to share information and techniques.

Sustainability: There is a need to look for new and reliable markets for cassava while emphasizing the health benefits of cassava dishes in the local diet. One way to achieve sustainability may be through the adoption of cassava in the menus of fast food restaurants that apply for permits to operate in the country. FAO can lend the in-house expertise to develop nutritious alternative dishes for massive consumption of cassava. FAO’s expertise in value chain development and support for the family farm present comparative advantages to guide Guyana and the Caribbean in the development of a commercial value chain of this crop.
There is the perception that the cassava value chain is being publicized profusely and that farmers have not bought-in to this strategy. More research needs to be done on all aspects of the value chain, including the transformation of the cassava into forms that are readily utilizable by bakeries and/or flour mills. In addition, the price differential between cassava intermediary products and wheat (as mentioned above) remains a huge constraint to easily accessing the market with a price competitive cassava/wheat composite product. FAO can continue studying and developing alternatives while collecting needed data on this crop.

3.2 CPA 2. Agriculture and rural development

The focus of CPA 2 is enabling the country’s institutions and the policy sector to enhance sustainable agricultural growth, while linking farmers to markets and raising production (e.g. crops, livestock, fisheries, aquaculture and forestry. CPA 2 also involves the analysis of rural employment; the value added to products and channeling them to markets; supporting partnerships (private/public); and strengthening value chains.

The main findings under CPA 2 are presented below.

Finding 5: Important work was done on Market Information Systems through FAO’s support to the New Guyana Marketing Corporation (NGMC), facilitating greater market access and information to consumers, producers, agro-processors and exporters.

FAO sponsored the project TCP/GUY/3402 Support for the enhancement of the National Agriculture Market Information System in Guyana.

The NGMC is the main marketing programme in the Ministry of Agriculture, with a focus on non-traditional crops (not including rice or sugar). NGMC offers a wide variety of services to the public (producers and exporters), including: marketing and agri-business information; development, utilization and marketing of local agricultural produce and value-added products; coordination and facilitation of agricultural commodities; and the creation of linkages among farmers, exporters, agro-processors, transport providers and other market agents.

NGMC’s main stakeholders are exporters of fresh produce. NGMC provides a variety of services to its stakeholders such as washing and packaging of their products. The agency collects and publishes prices on a weekly basis from seven key markets across the country. Interestingly, NGMC also offers an SMS service for the Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago markets. With respect to value-added products, the agency computes the nutritional facts and advises agro-processors accordingly to enable accurate reporting on the respective product labels. At the local level, the NGMC also operates a retail outlet in Georgetown, the Guyana Shop, for several locally produced value-added items.

Relevance: The web-based market information service offered by NGMC is extremely relevant. Since its 2011 launch, there have been 350000 visits to the site. The data provided are generally current and all prices are updated weekly, with the exception for one of the seven markets monitored. NGMC also offers training, cold storage, packaging and transportation, and market advisory information. These services contribute to increased market access by its clients.

Effectiveness: The NGMC’s services were considered effective by many of the partners interviewed, in particular farmer’s organizations, producers and exporters. As portrayed in the GMC 2013 Annual Report field visits were conducted to update the production database to create market linkages between farmers, exporters and potential exporters. The agency identifies and promotes the economic potential of Guyana’s non-traditional agricultural products by disseminating market information, training and other related activities.

---

14 Parika (region 3), Kumaka (region 1), Bourda&Stabroek (region 4), Charity (region 2), Anna Regina (region 2), and McKenzie/ Linden (region 10)
16 http://www.newgmc.com/gmc_docs/annual_reports/GMC%20Annual%20Report%202013.pdf
support measures. These include collaboration with researchers, food safety and agricultural health agencies to help resolve producers’ and exporters’ challenges.

81 **Sustainability:** The agency has promoted the growth of Guyana’s market for non-traditional agricultural products for more than two decades. The recent web-based database launched with the FAO’s support was one of the more significant innovations in support of its goal. In 2013, 270 metric tonnes of produce were shipped to Antigua, Barbados, St Maarten, Suriname and the USA, and these exports have continued to increase. In the same year, the Parika agro-processing facility processed 73 metric tons of produce for Barbados alone. These successes highlight the sustainability and impact of NGMC’s services, and provide support for the country level plans detailed in the newly introduced 2013-2020 National Agriculture Strategy for Guyana. Furthermore, these results show that access to relevant and timely market data is a powerful economic and social tool in fighting and eliminating poverty and hunger.

**Finding 6:** Development and continued assistance was successfully provided for inland small-scale aquaculture and inland fisheries in several regions of the country.

82 One of FAO’s first achievements in this area was the guidance provided for the development of an Inland Fisheries Policy and the aquaculture (ponds) strategy in several regions of the country. Inland fish stocks came under threat due to overfishing and other anthropogenic actions, including logging, mining, road construction and other infrastructural activities which, if not properly regulated, can negatively impact aquatic life and reduce availability of this important protein source to communities in Guyana’s interior. Harvesting of inland fish by non-Amerindians has increased and may adversely affect their food supplies and traditional lifestyles. Over the years the Fisheries Department and other agencies have expressed concern over the increase in inland fishing activities on a commercial scale, with the use of seines and nets becoming more evident.

83 **Relevance:** FAO implemented project TCP/GUY/3501 *Promotion of Small Scale Aquaculture in Guyana for Food Security and Rural Development* with the goal of increasing the aquaculture sector’s contribution to national food security and rural employment, as well as the generation of export earnings. The beneficiaries’ targeted by this project were aquaculture farmers, new developers in fish farming, and the government Fishery Department. The project resulted in the development of Guyana’s Inland Fisheries Policy, which was adopted and founded on FAO’s Inland Fisheries Guidelines.

84 **Effectiveness:** In order to develop the inland fisheries guidelines, there was an extensive consultation with a number of stakeholders throughout the country. The consultations adopted a livelihoods focus, taking into account female and youth contributions at the community level. FAO’s support was helpful in collecting in-depth information during a strategic planning event that included the Ministry of Agriculture and others. Today, the Fisheries Department hopes to work with FAO to promote inland fisheries regulation at the country level. A good relationship was established between the FAO local office and the Regional Office in Barbados, and there is an expectation to develop technical assistance in a variety of areas.

85 **Efficiency:** The development of regulations with FAO’s help has been important to raising awareness, particularly in coastal management. A series of communications tools were developed, such as briefing packages for the industry on the appropriate management of seaweed. Most recently, a particular seaweed genus (Sargassum)\(^{18}\) has grown exponentially which reduces fishermen’s catch, damages the nets, increases coastal erosion when removed, and is a nuisance in the tourist destinations (including causing cancellation of bookings). FAO’s circulation of a factsheet\(^ {19}\) during July 2015 raised awareness on this phenomenon, including its likely causes and how it may be managed.

---

18 *Sargassum* is a genus of brown (class Phaeophyceae) macro algae (seaweed) in the order Fucales. Numerous species are distributed throughout the temperate and tropical oceans, where they generally inhabit shallow water and coral reefs, and the genus is widely known for its plankton free-floating species.
Evaluation of FAO’s contribution in Guyana

86 **Sustainability:** Aquaculture is being promoted at the country level, but this is a slow process. It is costly to establish a pond and access to regular supplies of suitable feed. Most importantly, there is a need to develop new markets. The Guyana local market is small and largely supplied by fish and seafood (mostly shrimp and prawns). One aspect to consider is the development of fish ponds attached to the school feeding program. This will help to reduce imports and promote the use of local ingredients for the fish feed. In the marine sector, the development and updating of existing policies, such as the Fisheries Act of 2002, needs FAO support and revision. In addition, Guyana still needs to develop management plans and regulations for shark fishing. Finally, FAO can support Guyana in conducting studies about bycatch, as well determining how the “turtle excluder devices” work during deep sea operation.

87 **Impact:** Among the achievements of the aquaculture project is the development of hatcheries in Regions 1 and 9. FAO support to the programme was relevant, however, there is a possibility to enhance uptake at the local level, contributing to sustainability in all sectors (aquaculture, inland and marine fisheries). The Fisheries sector addresses all CPF priorities.

Finding 7: Key interventions were conducted to improve herds through the small ruminant project, training in artificial insemination techniques and other technical advice.

88 **Relevance:** The livestock sector is very important to the local economy. FAO’s support for this sector included implementation of the project TCP/GUY/3401 Development of a National Livestock Development Policy and Strategic Plan for the Guyana Livestock Development Authority (GLDA), which facilitated the development of: i) a national livestock development policy; ii) a strategic five-year plan for Guyana livestock; and iii) preparation of livestock farmers’ manuals aimed at building the capacity of GLDA staff through basic information and guidance in rearing practices and the management of different categories of livestock (e.g. goats, sheep, bovine). This project intervention also supported the improvement of veterinary laboratory facilities at GLDA, and training personnel in artificial insemination techniques, including collecting and storing semen.

89 **Effectiveness:** The five-year Strategic Plan, included a training of trainers component which has been incorporated into Guyana’s 2020 Agriculture Plan, is considered as the working document for the Ministry of Agriculture. Exposure gained from the development of the Strategic Plan is considered supportive of the GLDA’s ability to meet SMART objectives, which the Ministry of Agriculture has implemented, requiring all agencies to focus efforts and implement specific actions against set budgets and targets.

90 FAO also organized a regional training programme on artificial insemination for goats, which was attended by representatives from GLDA in July 2015. The GLDA noted the relevance to improving artificial insemination techniques, as it aligned with the new push to improve the country’s genetic base. Furthermore, the small ruminant sector was identified nationally as an important income contributor to rural farmers. Other participants in the training were from Antigua, Dominica, Suriname and St Lucia. This was the second such training done by FAO in the region.

91 **Efficiency:** The GLDA deemed FAO’s support as timely and relevant. The use of the manual, training and exposure gained through collaborating with FAO provided regional scope in accessing semen and equipment from suppliers (including Jamaica) at a reasonable cost to the agency, and for breeds that are already adapted to local conditions.

92 **Sustainability:** Several opportunities have arisen from the FAO collaboration, including the upgrading of GLDA’s laboratory facilities through the acquisition of specialized equipment. Currently, this laboratory is fully functional for the collection and storage of semen, and the facility can host more training opportunities for local and regional technicians. The GLDA plans to purchase more animals to expand this training programme and extend it to farms, thereby improving the success rates of the technicians and improving the genetic base.

---

20 SMART Objectives stand for: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-phased. The SMART criterion is used to monitor progress towards a specific objective.
Another outcome of the GLDA-FAO collaboration was a small seminar on artificial insemination for pigs. GLDA acquired the equipment and semen from Jamaican suppliers, while FAO provided training, technical support and funding for technical kits with the basic tools to hone the participants’ skills.

**Impact:** Further work in addressing veterinary health and nutrition as part of a larger programme to improve farmers’ capacities to meet the nutritional and housing needs of their livestock should be conducted. The following areas were identified for possible partnership with FAO to enable more science-based decision-making in the sector:

- Developing methodologies and strategic plans to improve the most promising species in Guyana;
- Continued enhancement of breeding programmes, including emphasizing the parameters with modern and specific objectives, to improve the gene pool;
- Developing and refining feeds and feed formulation from local products to derive optimal benefits for growth rates, reduce feed importation and improve uptake of locally produced feeds and grain.

**Finding 8:** Relevant steps were taken to minimize post-harvest losses in the country.

**Relevance:** Vital training and advances were made under the FAO regional project *Reduce Post-Harvest Losses along the Food Chain in the CARICOM Sub-Region (TCP/SLC/3404).* The project focused on research and training for improved practices to reduce losses of key root crops, fruits and vegetables identified in each country, and is conducted with a variety of stakeholder groups.

**Effectiveness:** Post-harvest losses are generally estimated between 30-40 percent, while in-field losses can be as high as 20 percent. A new method of calculating losses, based on value rather than percentage, has been developed under this FAO regional project. This development of placing a dollar-value on losses is more relevant to farmers, consumers and other key actors, and would encourage them to apply better management practices to its reduction. Field visits were conducted in each country to identify and link each issue observed in the field; supply chains were discussed; and management practices were developed or shared in the training sessions.

**Efficiency:** Fieldwork and research began in 2013 and were conducted first in Guyana, Barbados and St. Lucia. Post-harvest losses of root crops (cassava), fruits (mango) and vegetables (tomato) were conducted following FAO guidelines to determine percentage losses at specific points along the value chain. Some activities supported by this project included an initial workshop held in Barbados in 2014 to present findings of the preliminary work and to chart the way forward on the project.

**Sustainability:** Project implementation included training of trainers segments, and the beneficiaries included government ministries and agencies, market extensionists and other extension officers; and the public and private sector, including marketing boards, supermarkets, hotels, farmers and exporters. Approximately 35 - 45 participants were targeted for each country workshop. Training sessions continued across the Caribbean region, with the most recent one held in Suriname in July 2015.

Project beneficiaries in each country were expected to develop action plans to be incorporated into their Country Programme Frameworks (CPFs) for FAO’s future action. This project intervention enhanced the links between the Ministries of Agriculture and the markets, including how to monitor and estimate volume and supply in the marketplace. Overall, the method of implementation of this regional project has been successful in addressing post-harvest priorities, identified not only in Guyana but also by each country in the region.

**Sustainability and Challenges:** The following aspects affect the sustainability of work conducted under CPF 2 *Agriculture and Rural Development*, and should be taken into account when developing the new CPF for the next biennium:
• Praedial larceny continues to be a problem for farmers and hampers agricultural development. New legislation alone is unlikely to solve the problem, which requires the sensitization of the judicial system to the consequences of praedial larceny on farmers and the need to apply the law instead of trivializing the issue, as is often the case.

• The design and coordination of an Agricultural Census is the next step to be considered by the Ministry of Agriculture, with strong FAO support. FAO has a comparative advantage and sound technical expertise to help the country in the design of an agricultural census. The last agricultural census in Guyana was carried out in 1953. The new census will offer needed information in order to establish a baseline, as well as setting attainable production targets. The survey instrument could also be tailored to collect certain key information on a periodic basis to provide useful information until the next census.

3.3 CPA 3. Natural resources and climate change

CPA 3 aims to enhance national capacities in sustainable management and use of renewable natural resources, and to improve the response to environmental global challenges. FAO supported CPA 3 through important work in the Forestry Sector and the development and implementation of a National Disaster Risk Management (DRM) plan for the agricultural sector, while targeting food insecure groups affected by extreme climate events.

The main findings under CPA 3 are presented below.

Finding 9: In partnership with the Guyana Forestry Commission, FAO’s work in support of the Forestry Sector (in financing, policy and programming) was considered outstanding, strategic, collaborative and consultative.

Relevance: FAO’s collaboration with the Government of Guyana, the Guyana Forestry Commission (GFC) and the Forestry Training Centre Inc. were valuable for ensuring the sustainable management of the country’s forest resources, while also addressing livelihood needs; enhancing the forestry (timber and non-timber) sector; conserving biodiversity; promoting a green economy; and helping to mitigate the global effects of climate change. FAO’s guidelines have informed GFC in the development and review of Guyana’s legislation, guidelines, codes of practice, and other areas in the country’s forestry sector. In turn, the Commission has contributed to the formulation of principles, criteria and indicators upon FAO’s request. Some other actions supported by FAO included:

• Enabled access to funds that helped to advance Guyana’s progress in the Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA) process through three strategic actions and at a critical time to:
  - Enhance stakeholder engagement;
  - Draft a communication strategy for the negotiation process with the EU; and
  - Develop a road map to guide the VPA process nationally.

• FAO provided support to train representatives from communities engaged in the logging and timber trade in order to improve coordination and planning of activities and ensure sustainable forest management. The Forestry Training Centre Inc. conducted training exercises to improve forest management practices undertaken by community forestry associations.

• FAO offered timely support for the informed review and update of the National Forest Policy and National Forest Action Plan, and participated in national consultations to inform the development of the policy based on stakeholders’ feedback.

• This was a timely intervention, as it coincided with a review of Guyana’s forest legislation, policy, plans and guidelines (Codes of Practice), as well as the promotion of a low carbon development strategy.

• FAO’s intervention and support were central to improving informed decision-making at the policy level through the provision of periodic forest resource assessment reports, and access to technical support via the Regional Forestry Officer based in the Subregional Office in Barbados.

21 “Praedial larceny” – the theft of agricultural produce, livestock, equipment and inputs from a farm – is considered the single greatest disincentive to investment in the agricultural sector in the Caribbean. See: Praedial Larceny in the Caribbean, Issue Brief #3, FAO/SLC, July 2013, available at: http://www.fao.org/docrep/019/as086e/as086e.pdf
Effectiveness/Efficiency: FAO’s support to the Forest Law Enforcement Governance and Trade (FLEGT) programme was significant, as it helped to advance Guyana’s progress in the Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA) process with the European Union. It filled the gap in availing funds for smaller projects, enabled increased stakeholder engagement to more areas across the country, and covered the cost of an impact assessment study. All of these actions are aligned with the Road Map, which guides the process and was developed with FAO’s assistance.

In addition, Guyana shared its experiences and lessons learned with other countries currently engaged in or considering engagement in the VPA. One such example was Guyana’s invitation to present these experiences at a conference held recently in Panama for the benefit of participants from Guatemala, Suriname and others, in order to build confidence and demonstrate that becoming a FLEGT certified country is achievable.

Sustainability: There is scope for a second phase of FLEGT support to sustain and strengthen the work already accomplished. Such a continuation could be directed toward developing standards for forest legality and criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management, while pursuing synergies with other certification programmes. This will improve recognition of Guyana as a FLEGT country, and improve access and competitiveness of its forest products in European markets.

Impact: FAO contributed to improving forest management practices by supporting training for twenty community representatives in improved planning and execution of forest activities.

FAO Guyana also promoted synergies among project partners on community forestry through the development and implementation of technical cooperation (TCP) on long-term productivity of lowland tropical forests.

Guyana concluded the third VPA negotiation session with the European Union in April 2015 and plans to formally sign the VPA agreement with the EU in 2016, which would allow the country to immediately begin issuing certificates. Thus, consideration could be given to extending FAO’s support through a second phase project that would facilitate full FLEGT readiness and implementation across all stakeholders directly and indirectly linked to timber trade. Although FAO’s role is to support the implementation of FLEGT in Guyana, it is not involved in the negotiations, and will not be a signatory to the agreement.

The effectiveness of FAO’s work in forestry and natural resource management could be improved with the placement of an expert in the country office who could work with the non-island Caribbean states. Overall, greater participation of FAO in forestry matters in Guyana could help the country manage its sizeable forest resources more sustainably, while at the same time expanding the FAO country office’s delivery and profile.

Finding 10: FAO’s technical support was important for Disaster Risk Management (DRM) policy development, awareness raising, reaching the public and bringing FAO’s work to the ground level.

Relevance: FAO offered technical support at the policy level, as well as in awareness raising and capacity development with communities, in order to enact DRM plans. FAO’s DRM efforts were perceived as an outstanding contribution from FAO. An official from the Department of Governance, Natural Resources and the Environment confirmed that elements of the DRM plan were activated following the flash floods that accompanied torrential rains. He also noted that the Civil Defense Commission (CDC) was charged with implementing the DRM policy.

22 Guyana formally entered into the VPA negotiation process with the EU in December 2012 and it is now in the final phase of the negotiations. A VPA is a legally binding trade agreement between the EU and a timber-producing country outside the EU.
**Effectiveness:** A DRM plan for the Guyana Agricultural sector was developed in 2013, as well as a comprehensive report analyzing the current situation related to prevention, mitigation, preparedness and, most importantly, the response and recovery mechanisms of the agriculture sector to the occurrence of natural disasters. FAO also contributed to the establishment of the Agriculture Disaster Risk Management Oversight Committee that supports the implementation of this plan.23

**Efficiency:** The end targets stated in the CPF priority areas in the Country Implementation Report 2014 were achieved in relation to the enhanced capacity of extension officers and/or technical personnel of the Ministry of Agriculture and other stakeholders in livelihoods assessment, mainly using the FAO Livelihood Assessment Toolkit. Nonetheless, this effort is still ongoing and more support might be needed to effectively promulgate the critical elements of the DRM action plan, update the current strategies, and communicate key aspects of the DRM across government bodies and civil society (e.g. NGOs and community-based organizations (CBOs)).

**Impact:** The plan to roll out some components of the DRM Plan at the community level is ongoing and awareness raising events are part of the strategy, which includes the community in order to gain ownership of this plan. This action has a very strategic relevance, bringing FAO’s work to the community level.

**Challenges:** Raising awareness of the plan across Guyana is not easy, as DRM crosscuts several sectors. Thus, a strong communication strategy is needed across the government and civil society networks.

The work on fresh water resources and climate change needs more coordination among the main players. The work developed in these areas should have strong linkages with the country’s priorities for rural development (CPA 2).

### 3.4 CPA 4 Institutional capacity development for agricultural health and food safety

**Finding 11:** FAO’s support for pesticide regulation and control surpassed expectations, providing timely and consistent guidance.

The Pesticides and Toxic Chemicals Control Board (PTCCB) considers FAO one of its major supporters. The PTCCB has a regulatory function primarily, but it also performs a training and sensitivity function as well as inspection and enforcement. FAO was credited with guiding, mentoring and supporting the PTCCB since its inception in 2009. Among the useful tools to which the PTCCB was introduced by FAO are: Code of Conduct; Pesticide Stock Management System; and Chemicals Management. Funding was provided under the GEF project managed by FAO. The registrar received personal support and guidance from FAO and considers FAO a unique mentor. With FAO’s guidance, Guyana has evolved from a position of having virtually no functioning pesticides and toxic chemicals control authority to establishing a system that is considered a model for the Caribbean, with the country possessing the most stringent regulatory system for pesticides and toxic chemicals. Some specific benefits received included post-graduate training for four inspectors at considerably subsidized costs, and assistance with the disposal of over 10 tons of obsolete chemicals.

Evaluation of FAO's contribution in Guyana

120 **Relevance:** The relevance of the assistance provided can be illustrated by the PTCCB ability to analyze a chemical proposed for importation by the sugar industry and determine that it does not satisfy the performance claim touted by the manufacturers. This saved Guyana Sugar Corporation from wasteful spending. Another such example was the analysis of a pesticide being used by the rice industry that indicated improper application by the farmers. This resulted in the delivery of training courses to the farmers on proper use of the chemicals.

121 **Effectiveness:** In addition to the practical application of the analytical skills it acquired, the PTCCB demonstrated a strong advocacy function at various levels in Guyana. At the policy level a symposium was held for government officials in 2014 in which there was participation from Ministers of Government, Permanent Secretaries and senior officials, among others. Also, sensitization programmes are delivered to farming communities, including all members of the households as well as secondary schools across the country. Furthermore, the PTCCB served as an important resource at a regional workshop convened at the CARICOM Secretariat focused on capacity building related to the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements in the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries. The PTCCB presented on the Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions.

122 **Sustainability:** The degree of dedication with which the PTCCB has pursued its mandate is indicative of the sustainability of the delivery of its functions in Guyana. The agency also demonstrated its keenness in providing South-South technical assistance to other CARICOM countries.

**Finding 12:** FAO contributed to improved capacities and curriculum development in agro-processing and marketing strategies.

123 There is scope for additional support to strengthen and expand agricultural extension systems as a vehicle for improving techniques and practices in the field. Efforts supporting the extension component will reinforce FAO’s work in a variety of technical areas.

124 The challenge is to advance strategies aimed at regulating small ruminant production, as well as the implementation of safety measures in order to qualify for export markets.

**Finding 13:** FAO conducted a State of Food and Agriculture (SOFA) assessment in the Rupununi Region 9, Southern Guyana. This was the first assessment of its kind at the subregional level.

125 **Relevance:** The project was undertaken by FAO on behalf of Conservation International, as part of a larger Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)-funded project titled *Leveraging Natural Capital in Guyana’s Rupununi Region*, also conducted by Conservation International.

126 **Effectiveness:** The SOFA assessment was valuable in providing critical and current information that was then used to draft an Agriculture Strategy and Action Plan for the Rupununi Region. The Ministry of Agriculture considered the report valuable to Guyana’s policy for agriculture, which would inform implementation of its national plan for agriculture development. Activities associated with the study were supported by an FAO-IICA project to establish a shade house at the Bina Hill Institute, Annai, Rupununi, in the Region 9.

127 **Efficiency:** The unique collaboration with Conservation International under this project utilized FAO’s technical capabilities to conduct the study in Southern Guyana, an area where Conservation International had a comparative advantage regarding accessibility and working relationships. This partnership resulted in a comprehensive report on the status of critical livelihood issues for thousands of indigenous people who inhabit the largest (and very remote) region of Guyana.

128 **Sustainability:** This was the first assessment on the State of Food and Agriculture (SOFA) conducted by an FAO programme at the sub-national level. Its mode of implementation is
a model that could be replicated to develop more SOFAs and other activities across all the regions of Guyana and beyond.

**Challenges:** Replication of SOFA studies in other regions may be constrained by inaccessibility and high transportation costs. These need to be carefully estimated in the planning stages based on information from the Ministries of Agriculture and Indigenous Peoples.

### 3.5 Crosscutting themes

The following two topics should be taken into account in the CPF to be implemented in the next biennium: i) the development of partnerships; and ii) gender issues in agriculture.

#### 3.5.1 Partnerships

At the time this evaluation took place, the FAO office played an active role in the newly organized donor platform at the country level. The establishment of this new platform is central to the coordination of efforts to look for funding channels in various sectors, such as agriculture, environment, infrastructure and health. FAO’s well known technical capacity will be an important reference for any proposed funding source that Guyana pursues in the agricultural arena. Special mention should be made regarding FAO’s collaboration with Conservation International, resulting the *State of Food and Agriculture* in Administrative Region 9. As stated previously, this partnership enabled the first assessment by any sub-national programme.

Collaboration should also be encouraged with the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA), considering the common goals between IICA and FAO, and to strengthen a collaboration evidenced in previous years. Finally, there is scope for improved (and new) collaboration with sister UN agencies and other organizations (e.g. NGOs, CBOs) on common goals.

#### 3.5.2 Gender

The adoption of a gender policy at FAO is a central element to ensuring fair and equitable treatment of both men and women in the rural sector. In 2012 FAO adopted its Policy for Gender Equality, which informed the gender perspective in interventions, at the organizational level, and in technical cooperation programs. Gender, along with governance, are considered crosscutting themes and should be mainstreamed through FAO’s five Strategic Objectives, and across all organizational priorities and interventions.

During the country evaluation mission in Guyana, the evaluation team observed that gender is mentioned in most ongoing projects; however, there is a lack of data to show how gender has been mainstreamed. There is no specific budget allocated to gender needs and there is a tendency to equate “women” with “gender.” There are two dimensions to take into account when analyzing gender, namely:

- Gender relations and policy within the FAO office;
- Gender across technical/thematic boundaries in project interventions in Guyana.

FAO Guyana has a designated gender focal point. This role is presently performed by the Assistant FAO Representative for Programming, which implies that gender is an “add on” responsibility to a multiplicity of tasks to run the country programme. While FAO supports this new gender work by funding up to a 20 percent of the officer’s salary, the gender work must be done in addition to the office’s regular programme. Monitoring gender at the programme and project level requires training in gender analysis, while access to an adequate budget is needed to conduct gender-related tasks such as implementing policy recommendations at the organizational level. The current focal point performs this function with very limited resources and little or no specific knowledge of the subject matter.
To support the gender focal points, the FAO Regional Office has undertaken some specific tasks, namely: recruiting a Gender Officer based in Santiago and coordinating monthly gender webinars, as well as a number of other events. However, most of the information circulated through this network is in Spanish, which is a barrier for accessing these meetings and making use of materials circulated (e.g. case studies, reports). At the present time, there is no such thing as a “Caribbean Gender Network” coordinated from the Subregional Office in Barbados. It would be desirable to establish this network and to appoint a full-time officer paying particular attention to the specific needs of countries in the sub region, including Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana, Jamaica, Barbados, Belize and the OECS countries.

There is a need to assist the local gender focal point in the development of projects and programmes with a gender perspective, as well as promotion and awareness, and using gender analysis as a development tool. There is also need for greater collaboration with UN Women to assist with some of the gender work both at national and subregional levels, and with UNFPA to focus on reproductive health issues.

Gender across Thematic Boundaries in Guyana

There is a broad scope of gender issues identified in Guyana to include men and women farmers and the country’s indigenous peoples (Amerindians) in productive activities, such as the development of value chain schemes, livestock and small ruminants’ production, inland fisheries and other strategic opportunities for local development and to achieve food security.

In Guyana, the evaluation team observed that women and men perform very specific roles at the household and farm level, which is important to take into account when pursuing sound strategies for local development, as well as access to markets and capacity development opportunities. The following is a summary of gender-related issues across various scenarios in Guyana:

- In the Fisheries Sector, there are cultural barriers that prevent women from going out to sea on fishing boats or being part of a fishing crew. However, the women tend to own the boats and hire men to do the work. Men fish in the sea and women fish from shore; while men are mainly in charge of the catch, women process the catch and sell fish in the markets. There are well defined gender lines in fisheries, hence, the understanding of these dynamics is essential to engaging people in training and educational campaigns, which enable them to pursue new opportunities such as those offered through inland fisheries or aquaculture.

- In the Livestock Sector, women play an important role in rearing small animals in backyards and pens, which are usually attached to their households. They raise goats, sheep, rabbits and chickens; some are also involved in aquaculture (ponds) and selling the bounty at the local market, after satisfying the family’s food needs. On the other hand, men tend to concentrate on larger animal breeds for meat or dairy production. Their focus does not necessarily contribute to the household diet as it is normally destined for the market. This pattern is not unique to Guyana, but nonetheless it calls for attention to gender roles in livestock rearing when developing strategies to enhance this strategic sector. The Guyana Livestock Development Authority (GLDA) stated that they recognized the importance of including gender considerations in project implementation since many women are involved in the small ruminant sector as a livelihood strategy. These considerations would be included in their work, and any new strategic plans to improve the national herd.

- In the Forestry Sector, women are involved throughout the value chain in small logging operations, but are concentrated in the processing sections in large concessions. In addition, women in communities also produce handicrafts and other products made from resources gathered in the forest (non-timber forest products) and sell them in the markets. There are a growing number of places where ecotourism services are offered, and women and youth are involved in all stages of the value chain. It is estimated that over 45 percent of women and 60 percent youth are actively involved in community forestry as a livelihood strategy. GFC considers this a great development, since this upsurge has resulted in new ideas and greater uptake of training courses, provided by the commission and other agencies.
In Value Chains, men and women play very specific roles along the value chain of agricultural products. Value chains are context and commodity specific, and the roles played along the various niches of a value chain determine participation, gains or exclusion from the market. In the Caribbean, the most promising value chain at present is that of cassava and other root products. Through the project **Cassava Rapid Multiplication and Best Practices in Production**, which was developed in the framework of the FAO regional project **Integrated Development of Cassava in the Caribbean**, much attention was given to the development of new products. Cassava is used in a variety of dishes for baking goods, including flavored cassava bread (e.g. spices, ginger) and snacks. Most recently, cassava flour or cassava mash is being used for baking purposes, substituting wheat flour, even though cassava flour tends to be more expensive. While this value chain has had uneven success in various countries in the region, there is a consistent pattern of women playing a central role in cassava production and transformation (e.g. cut, peel, grate or cube, baking). Conversely, men play a role in planting, harvesting and transporting the roots to the markets. FAO can include a gender analysis component in the aforementioned project, considering the indicators of economic empowerment along the value chain and possible interventions to help rural producers, transformers and market sellers to improve their participation.

Regarding post-harvest losses and other interventions, through the implementation of the project **Reduction of Post-Harvest Losses along the Food Chain in the CARICOM Sub-region (TCP/SLC/3404)** in Guyana, there was good female participation in the training sessions for the post-harvest loss reduction strategy, which is expected to trickle down in better food management at the community level. Many of the in-country coordinators and focal point persons associated with the project are female, and in some other Caribbean countries (e.g. St. Lucia) youth play an important role as well. Moreover, the participation of women and youth was significant in other projects, such as the **Shade House Project** in Region 9, which demonstrated opportunities and examples for improved farming systems, and ways to address food and nutrition security.

This analysis demonstrates that women play an important role in farming, transformation and marketing of agricultural products at the country and the regional levels. Women are the decision-makers, manage household finances, and are present in the market; as such, they need to be engaged in capacity building efforts, particularly in topics such as financial literacy. Extension services are central to spreading sound and culturally appropriate gender work, with the engagement of more female extension agents when possible.

At the regional level, women tend to be more educated than men and hold positions in government offices and the public sector. All of these considerations show the conspicuous differences between women in the Caribbean sub-region and their counterparts in Latin America; hence, there is a need to pay attention to these differences to support FAO country offices in the Caribbean with appropriate strategies and reasonable funding. Finally, the evaluators detected a lack of youth participation in agricultural initiatives as a whole. This is in part a consequence of the elimination of agriculture from the school curricula in early 2000. Nonetheless, the agricultural field has much to offer young entrepreneurs, male and female, such as processing opportunities and the development of new products. This makes particular reference to the Guyana School of Agriculture’s new agri-processing curriculum, developed with FAO support, which had an overwhelming presence of young people for the second consecutive year since instruction started.

Overall, most stakeholders expressed satisfaction about FAO’s response to their specific requests for technical support. They also commended the new strategy to include local partners in the design of the CPF through consultation, as well as the revised Strategic Objectives, which reflect the priority areas to focus on and the way forward for the organization. The following section presents the conclusions of the evaluation exercise and a number of areas to consider when developing the new biannual strategy for the implementation of the CPF.
4. Conclusions

Conclusion 1: FAO is considered a key development partner by stakeholders in Guyana. Its interventions were complementary and supportive to the country’s needs, and within the scope of the CPF as agreed with the Government of Guyana.

Furthermore, the support detailed under the country’s priority areas were appropriately selected and aligned with FAO’s global objectives, Guyana’s national aims and CARICOM’s regional goals.

Conclusion 2: Despite a relatively small staff with limited resources, the country office contributed meaningfully in key and strategic areas through the CPF. FAO’s support for the revision of outdated legislation (e.g. for pesticide and toxic chemical management) and the development of new policies, regulations, guidelines and strategies were commended.

The organization’s more normative and traditional ways of working with policymakers are still valuable, as was evident in examples such as i) the formation of the Pesticide and Toxic Chemicals Control Board and the upgrade of its human and infrastructural resources capacity; ii) the enhancement of market information systems in the New Guyana Marketing Corporation; iii) the development of a national Food and Nutrition Policy; and iv) the periodic report on Forest Resources Assessment (State of the World's Forests). However, there is much potential to expand and advance FAO’s work in Guyana, particularly with respect to the country’s development path which is heavily dependent upon its agriculture and natural resources sectors.

Conclusion 3: Guyana’s progress in the EU FLEGT VPA process gained much impetus as a result of FAO’s support to the development of a road map to guide the process.

This included drafting a communication strategy for the negotiations, and support to stakeholder engagement which boosted the country’s readiness to participate in the cooperation agreement on trade in forest products with the European Union.

Conclusion 4: FAO Guyana has strengthened the partnership with the government and undertaken important new avenues of collaboration with other organizations.

The evaluation mission observed that there is a high level of partnership between FAO and the Government that has been strengthened since the establishment of a country office in Georgetown. Considerable appreciation was expressed for FAO’s technical and financial support, as well as the guidance provided to senior Government officials, administrators, technicians, farmers, partner agencies and other stakeholders.

The FAO-sponsored Annual Accountability Seminars provided a review and update on the activities implemented during the previous year, and were considered critical to the successful project execution. These seminars provided the Government of Guyana and other development partners an opportunity to exchange updates with all partners regarding actions undertaken and issues that need to be addressed. Furthermore, these seminars encouraged discourse between CPF development periods, and ensured the continued relevance and ownership of the work programme throughout the implementation phase.

Of particular significance, FAO Guyana has undertaken important new avenues of collaboration, such as the partnership with Conservation International to conduct an assessment of the state of food and agriculture in one of the ten administrative regions in Guyana. The resulting SOFA report on Rupununi in Region 9 was the first such assessment done by any sub-national programme under FAO. This report is being used to develop an agricultural strategy and action plan for that region, and will form part of the national Vision 2020 plan focused on advancing Guyana’s agricultural sector.
In light of the FAO's experience and its significant involvement in Guyana's development, as well as its multiple comparative advantages, the Guyana office and its portfolio should be expanded in the near future. The partnerships developed by FAO are noteworthy and indicate the potential for a significant impact. The continued pursuit of the Organization's current strategy is strongly recommended. FAO should build on its performance and maintain focus on its strategic objectives and overall mission in Guyana and the region.

**Conclusion 5: The following four areas of FAO's Guyana office operations should be improved: gender mainstreaming, forestry, livestock, and support to the national extension service and agricultural health.**

- The gender focal point role would be greatly enhanced through improved financial resources, as well as training and greater access to a subregional gender focal point.
- The positioning of a Forestry/Natural Resources Officer in the FAO Guyana office would provide timely support and technical backstopping to partners and stakeholders, particularly in view of the extensive work envisaged under the country's priorities for renewable natural resources and climate change, and the associated crosscutting issues.
- Artificial insemination courses should be provided to both extension personnel and farmers, as well as helping farmers develop feeding programmes with a higher content of local materials. In addition, producers should be encouraged to target their production to specific markets, whether local or export.
- Extension services should be improved in a variety of thematic areas: gender, value chain analysis, and the use of market information system strategies. Guyana's extension services would benefit from FAO's support and guidance, including backstopping from the FAO Extension Division in Rome and the extension network in RLC.
- The absence of an internationally accredited food safety system and infrastructure is perhaps the single most limiting factor in Guyana's ability to increase exports of primary and processed agricultural products.

**4.1 Lessons learned**

The evaluation team learned that many of FAO's current and potential beneficiaries and partners consider the Organization to be focused primarily on policy issues. This perception is partly influenced by FAO's input to a multitude of policies, plans, guidelines and other strategies to which the Organization has contributed. It is also because FAO is renowned as the repository of data and information on key sub-sectors of agriculture and related issues. The perception is also based on the impression that FAO seems only to work at the Government level. While each of these perceptions are well founded, it is apparent that the local office would benefit from more visibility and promotion of its work with other partner organizations.

FAO Guyana has a very good working relationship with Government partners and other stakeholders. The evaluators were impressed with the degree of trust and camaraderie evident between senior officials of the Ministry of Agriculture, various public sector agencies and their counterparts at the country office. This forecasts a positive outcome for the overall CPF and strategic alliances among the partners.

The Guyana office’s engagement of all partners at the annual accountability seminars proved to be a worthwhile and valuable tool for sharing information, building ownership and allowing for adjustments to work plans where necessitated by policy shifts. This is a desirable practice that boosts programme efficiency and effectiveness; improves information and cost sharing; ensures continued relevance; and enhances the responsiveness and impact of project actions. It will also strengthen FAO’s collaboration with beneficiaries and development partners.

Interviews with FAO Country and Subregional staff suggested the need for an additional gender focus in all aspects of the work programme. This has been taken on board and is being implemented. However, there are some limitations to the full functionality of the gender focal point(s) due to a lack of funding to pursue gender work, as well as...
language barriers between the national gender focal points in the Caribbean and the work conducted from the RLC Office in Santiago. The discharge of this role is also constrained by the unavailability of dedicated funding to adequately address these considerations and issues in programme activities.

154 Several innovative activities demonstrated the benefits of engaging new partners (e.g. from non-government organizations, the private sector, community-based organizations or the international community) based on shared goals and objectives. One such example is the collaboration among FAO headquarters, the Guyana office and Conservation International that produced the first SOFA done by any sub-national office. This initiative was brought to fruition thanks to strong leadership, and could be replicated for different purposes and beneficiaries.

155 The evaluators learned that there is a donor platform where donor and development partners will share information on available resources and opportunities, as well as projects being implemented by various partners. This is expected to engender greater collaboration on common goals, enhance the relevance of activities, and improve cost sharing and efficiency. It will also widen the impact of programmes on the targeted beneficiaries. In addition, the platform will provide a forum to address gaps, overcome constraints and make optimum use of the benefits and comparative advantages of the different partners in the group.
5. Recommendations

The recommendations are organized by the following five themes: institutional capacity development; agriculture and rural development; natural resources and climate change; agricultural health and food safety; and food and nutrition security. While it is useful to consider the recommendations within a stated theme, it is important to realize that all themes are integrated and contribute to the overall goal of improved production and productivity of Guyana’s agricultural sector. As such, an activity proposed to strengthen gender involvement in forestry communities may also lead to improvements in household incomes, as well as improvements in food and nutrition security. Similarly, actions suggested to enhance the role of youth in marketing, for example, may also have positive impacts on the sector and the community at large.

Recommendation 1: Enhance the FAO Guyana country office’s capacities in the development and management of the country’s forestry resources.

- Considering the extent of Guyana’s forestry resources, FAO’s interventions in forestry are critical to Guyana, although limited so far to the EU FLEGT. With the placement of a forestry officer in the Guyana office, much more could be done by FAO in the areas of REDD and LCDS. It is envisaged that this expert would also be available to provide assistance to Belize and Suriname, two other CARICOM countries with substantial forest resources.

Recommendation 2: Continue to focus on agricultural and rural development

- Augment genetic improvements in small ruminants through an expanded extension service (e.g. farmer field schools), in collaboration with National Agriculture Research and Extension Institute (NAREI) and Guyana Livestock Development Authority (GLDA), as appropriate.
- Improve access to export markets, as Guyana is currently self-sufficient in fresh bovine meat.
- An agricultural census is strongly recommended to provide baseline data for informed developmental planning, drawing on FAO’s previous census experience in the sub-region. Conducting sub-national state of food and agriculture (SOFA) studies for other hinterland regions (1, 7 and 8) would greatly facilitate planning for the development of those areas.
- Enter recommendation text here. This paragraph uses the Body text style

Recommendation 3: Improve the management of natural resources, and improve resilience to climate change

- Continue support for Guyana’s FLEGT process, as well as the development of a planning database based on an inventory of the country’s forest resources.
- Implement the current DRM plan and ensure that key individuals understand the immediate steps that should be taken in response to actual or impending disasters. As appropriate, conduct additional mock exercises simulating likely disasters, based on historical experience.
- Continue to develop additional inland fisheries actions and management plans.

Recommendation 4: Improve agricultural health and food safety systems and infrastructure

- Strengthen capacities for a rapid response to food safety events by improving food traceability and recall legislation and systems, including the revision and enactment of legislation pertaining to all aspects of agricultural health and food safety (this is unlikely to include legislation for pesticides and toxic chemicals, which the evaluation team understands is up-to-date). The absence of an internationally accredited food safety
system and infrastructure is perhaps the single most limiting factor in Guyana's ability to increase exports of primary and processed agricultural products.

- Based on these increased capacities, provide support for a comprehensive national food safety system and infrastructure, which will ultimately serve to stimulate the country's export platform.

Recommendation 5: Continue to support ongoing programmes that enhance food and nutrition security, with a focus on gender.

- Continue collaborating with the relevant government ministries on school feeding programmes and dietary guidelines, with a strong focus on the utilization of food sourced locally.

- The focus on and promotion of the Cassava Value Chain should be reviewed and reconsidered. Using cassava as a substitute for wheat flour in the manufacture of composite flour products is import substitution in another guise. Import substitution as a developmental model failed several decades ago and is highly unlikely to make a successful resurgence in today's open global markets.

- In addition to promoting cassava production intended as a substitute for wheat flour in traditional wheat flour products, it is suggested that the Cassava Value Chain also work on other cassava-based products (e.g. cassava bread, farine, casareep) which are targeted to the requirements of specific markets (national or export). However, considerable product development and market access investigations must precede the attempts to stimulate cassava production. If producers are encouraged to increase cassava production before market access issues are resolved, it is likely that when the cassava is ready for harvest there will be no markets available in which it can be sold25. Such an outcome would be a terrible setback to any future attempts to stimulate cassava production.

- Continue supporting gender and youth focused projects which contribute to improved food and nutrition security (e.g. through increased household income or minimizing migration to urban areas). For example, the delivery of training in basic principles for operating a business will be of immense value to the Forestry Community Associations. Such training is likely to impact both women and youth, as about 30-40 percent of operators are women.

- Although the office has a gender focal point, few resources are available and limited technical support is provided to facilitate gender-related activities. Due to the current budget constraints, the Guyana country office is unable hire a full-time gender expert. It is advisable to establish and maintain a strong relationship with the appointed Gender Specialist at SLC, and to develop a subregional strategy for the Caribbean. Gender approaches in the Caribbean have different implications than those in Latin America, and this distinction should be taken into account.

---

25 In the mid 1970's Guyana sought to produce cassava flour in order to launch a cassava-wheat composite flour on to the local market. Four cassava flour mills were purchased from Brazil and farmers were encouraged to expand their production to feed the mills. The farmers responded promptly but the factories were not completed in time to receive the harvested cassava. The farmers suffered heavy losses and were reluctant to resume planting the crop.
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Partner organizations and beneficiaries, Guyana

23. Ms. Khadija Musa, UNDP Resident Coordinator, Guyana
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Evaluation of FAO’s contribution in Guyana

25 Dr. David Singh, CI, Conservation International
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27 Mr. Greg Bowman, Secretary, West Berbice Sheep and Goat Farmers’ Association
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49 Mr. Reuben Robertson, FAO Representative
50 Ms. Angela Alleyene, Assistant FAO Representative
## Appendix 3: Projects

### Regional and sub-regional projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project symbol</th>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Actual EOD</th>
<th>Actual NTE</th>
<th>Total budget (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FMPP/GLO/001/MUL</td>
<td>FAO/Multi-donor Partnership Programme (FMPP) - Sustainable Rural Livelihoods and More Equitable Access to Resources</td>
<td>2009-01-01</td>
<td>2010-04-30</td>
<td>2,833,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/SLC/3503</td>
<td>Processing and Market Development of Cassava.</td>
<td>2014-12-01</td>
<td>2016-07-31</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/SLC/3501</td>
<td>To promote the strengthening of the small ruminant sector</td>
<td>2014-04-01</td>
<td>2016-01-31</td>
<td>498,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/RLA/3306</td>
<td>Technical assistance for surveillance of influenza A subtype H1N1 virus in swine populations in the Caribbean</td>
<td>2011-02-01</td>
<td>2012-10-31</td>
<td>483,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/RLA/3401</td>
<td>Asistencia técnica para la gestión regional del Huanglongbing (HBL) en Latinoamérica y el Caribe</td>
<td>2012-11-01</td>
<td>2015-06-30</td>
<td>474,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/SLC/3404</td>
<td>Reduction of Post-Harvest losses along the Food Chain in the CARICOM Sub-region</td>
<td>2013-07-01</td>
<td>2015-06-30</td>
<td>280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFA/SLC/002/UND</td>
<td>Desarrollo de un modelo para la lucha contra el hambre, la desnutrición y la pobreza basado en la experiencia chilena con pertinencia para la Región de ALC</td>
<td>2014-09-15</td>
<td>2015-10-30</td>
<td>165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/SLC/3402</td>
<td>Development of Integrated Programmes and Action Plans for Black Sigatoka Disease Management in five countries of the Caribbean - (Recoded from Entity no. 629445 from biennium of funding 2012-13 to 2010-11)</td>
<td>2012-06-01</td>
<td>2013-12-31</td>
<td>111,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCP/RLA/209/GER</td>
<td>Design and development of an online course Elements for formulation and implementation of national forestry policies</td>
<td>2015-01-09</td>
<td>2015-07-20</td>
<td>44,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/SLC/3402</td>
<td>Development of Integrated Programmes and Action Plans for Black Sigatoka Disease Management in five countries of the Caribbean - (Recoded to Entity no. 617422 from biennium of funding 2012-13 to 2010-11)</td>
<td>2012-06-01</td>
<td>2013-12-31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCP/SLC/005/IFA</td>
<td>Strengthening Decent Rural Employment Opportunities for Young Women and Men in the Caribbean</td>
<td>2015-01-01</td>
<td>2017-12-31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCP/SLC/205/GER</td>
<td>Ensuring long term productivity of lowland tropical forest in the Caribbean - Research on cost and benefits of investments in silvicultural treatments</td>
<td>2014-10-01</td>
<td>2017-09-30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

26 Source: FPMIS. As at May 2015.
### National/country level projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project symbol</th>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Actual EOD</th>
<th>Actual NTE</th>
<th>Total budget (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCP/GUY/3202</td>
<td>TCP Facility</td>
<td>2009-11-01</td>
<td>2010-12-31</td>
<td>60,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/GUY/3202 BABY01</td>
<td>Formulation of National Activities of the Second Phase of the project</td>
<td>2009-11-01</td>
<td>2010-12-31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/GUY/3202 BABY02</td>
<td>Development of a Coconut Water Processing Plant Market and Technical Feasibility</td>
<td>2009-11-01</td>
<td>2010-12-31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/GUY/3202 BABY03</td>
<td>Provision of technical assistance to address a disease in Musa species of crop in Guyana</td>
<td>2009-11-01</td>
<td>2010-12-31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/GUY/3301</td>
<td>TCP Facility</td>
<td>2010-08-02</td>
<td>2013-03-31</td>
<td>153,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/GUY/3301 BABY01</td>
<td>Development of a Policy and a Strategic Plan for Inland Fisheries in Guyana</td>
<td>2011-04-01</td>
<td>2013-03-31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/GUY/3301 BABY02</td>
<td>Finalization of Food and Nutrition Security Strategy and preparation of the Food and Nutrition Action Plan</td>
<td>2010-08-02</td>
<td>2012-06-30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/GUY/3301 BABY03</td>
<td>Assistance in support of design and management of, and provision of training in the operation of, beef finishing lots in Guyana</td>
<td>2010-08-02</td>
<td>2011-12-31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/GUY/3301 BABY04</td>
<td>Assistance in support of the establishment of a Market Information System for non-traditional agricultural products in Guyana.</td>
<td>2011-05-09</td>
<td>2011-07-31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/GUY/3401</td>
<td>TCP FACILITY</td>
<td>2012-09-01</td>
<td>2015-02-28</td>
<td>166,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/GUY/3401 BABY01</td>
<td>Development of a Disaster Risk Management Plan for the Agricultural Sector in Guyana</td>
<td>2012-06-06</td>
<td>2013-12-31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/GUY/3401 BABY02</td>
<td>Development of a National Livestock Development Policy and Strategic Plan for the Guyana Livestock Development Authority (GLDA) and Livestock Farmers’ Manuals Training Manual and Production Manual.</td>
<td>2012-11-01</td>
<td>2014-04-30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/GUY/3401 BABY03</td>
<td>Assistance in support of the management of drainage and irrigation systems in Guyana through the establishment of a Geographic Information Systems database.</td>
<td>2013-07-01</td>
<td>2013-10-31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/GUY/3401 BABY04</td>
<td>Assistance in support of Building Capacity in Agro-Processing and Upgrading of Fisheries Studies programme at the Guyana School of Agriculture.</td>
<td>2013-08-01</td>
<td>2014-04-30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/GUY/3402</td>
<td>Support for the enhancement of the National Agriculture Market Information System in Guyana.</td>
<td>2013-01-01</td>
<td>2015-02-28</td>
<td>121,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/GUY/3501</td>
<td>Promotion of Small Scale Aquaculture in Guyana for Food Security and Rural Development</td>
<td>2014-05-01</td>
<td>2015-10-31</td>
<td>122,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/GUY/3502</td>
<td>TCP Facility</td>
<td>2014-11-15</td>
<td>2015-12-31</td>
<td>119,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP/GUY/3502 BABY01</td>
<td>Assistance to the Government of Guyana for the strengthening of its agricultural statistical information system for evidence based decision making</td>
<td>2014-11-15</td>
<td>2015-10-14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFD-10/GUY/001</td>
<td>Improvement of the Livelihood of Women in Kwakwani</td>
<td>2011-05-04</td>
<td>2013-04-03</td>
<td>9,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFD-10/GUY/002</td>
<td>Supply of Agricultural Tools and Equipment to Secondary and Post-Secondary Institutions in Guyana</td>
<td>2011-08-12</td>
<td>2012-04-11</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFD-10/GUY/004</td>
<td>Poultry Rearing and Electricity Generation for Aliki Womens Handicraft and Development Association</td>
<td>2011-11-09</td>
<td>2013-06-30</td>
<td>9,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFD-11/GUY/001</td>
<td>Establishment of a vegetable garden at the Ptolemy Reid Rehabilitation Centre</td>
<td>2012-06-04</td>
<td>2013-03-05</td>
<td>3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFD-11/GUY/002</td>
<td>Expansion of Hydroponics Activities in Guyana</td>
<td>2012-06-04</td>
<td>2013-07-05</td>
<td>7,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFD-11/GUY/003</td>
<td>Support towards Moshabo Village in retrofitting the existing shade house with rainwater harvesting equipment and assistance in the establishment of a shade house facility for the primary school to assist with the school feeding programme</td>
<td>2013-01-31</td>
<td>2014-12-31</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 4: Technical assistance request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Date of request</th>
<th>Title of assistance requested</th>
<th>FAO response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>July 23</td>
<td>Development of a Policy and a Strategic Plan for Inland Fisheries in Guyana</td>
<td>TCP Facility developed and implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>July 27</td>
<td>Finalization of Food and Nutrition Security Strategy and preparation of the Food and Nutrition Action Plan</td>
<td>TCP Facility developed and implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>February 7</td>
<td>Support for the enhancement of the National Agriculture Market Information System in Guyana</td>
<td>TCP developed, currently being implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>April 10</td>
<td>Development of a Disaster Risk Management Plan for the Agricultural Sector in Guyana</td>
<td>TCP Facility developed and implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>October 12</td>
<td>Development of a National Livestock Development Policy and Strategic Plan for the Guyana Livestock Development Authority (GLDA) and Livestock Farmers’ Manuals – Training Manual and Production Manual.</td>
<td>TCP Facility developed and implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>April 12</td>
<td>Assistance in support of Building Capacity in Agro-Processing and Upgrading of Fisheries Studies programme at the Guyana School of Agriculture.</td>
<td>TCP Facility developed and implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>May 29</td>
<td>Assistance in support of the management of drainage and irrigation systems in Guyana through the establishment of a Geographic Information Systems database.</td>
<td>TCP Facility developed and implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>August 7</td>
<td>Promotion of Small Scale Aquaculture in Guyana for Food Security and Rural Development</td>
<td>TCP developed, currently being implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>April 24</td>
<td>Assistance to the Government of Guyana for the strengthening of its agricultural statistical information system for evidence based decision making</td>
<td>TCP Facility developed, currently being implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>May 8</td>
<td>Development of a National Integrated Management Programme and Action Plan for the Red Palm Mite Raoiella indica in Guyana</td>
<td>TCP Facility developed, currently being implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>September 11</td>
<td>Revision of the Food Based Dietary Guidelines for Guyana</td>
<td>TCP Facility developed, awaiting funding approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 From the Government of Guyana to FAO. Though some requests for technical assistance were made in 2010 and 2011, the project implementation extended into the 2012-2015 CPF period.
28 As at July 2015.