

Project Evaluation Series

Evaluation of the project “Strengthening Food Security Information and Early Warning System”

Project code: OSRO/YEM/902/EC

Management response

Evaluation of the project “Strengthening Food Security Information and Early Warning System” – Management response					04/23
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p>Recommendation 1.</p> <p>It is highly recommended that FAO employs its competitive advantages in a proactive, inventive and pioneering manner to initiate and lead a dialogue that aims to coordinate between international organizations engaged in food security, humanitarian aid and development in Yemen. The target ought to be more focused on coordination and integration, not only regarding information sharing but also in terms of coordinating interventions in a complementary way and, in the long-term, in the framework of multi-actor joint programming. This step has become more urgent in Yemen than ever before, in view of the continuation and exacerbation of the most severe humanitarian crisis in the world, which has worsened under the COVID-19 pandemic, in addition to the impact of climate change and natural disasters, to which Yemen has been and is still exposed. All of these factors place a responsibility on international organizations, obligating them to optimize the utilization of available resources targeting jointly accomplished impacts. This can only be reached through intensive coordination and integration.</p>	Accepted	<p>FAO already has a strong coordination and integration role as a co-lead agency of the Food Security and Agriculture Cluster (FSAC).</p> <p>Additionally, the role of the Food Security and Nutrition Information Systems (FSNIS) project in coordinating analysis and information remains a stronghold for FAO.</p>	Country Office, FSAC	Ongoing	Yes
<p>Recommendation 2.</p> <p>In line with the above-mentioned, FAO and donor organizations should consider multidonor financing for the FSIS Programme that allows it to expand and elaborate its processes and products to inform planning, decision and policymaking for a wider scope of interventions and thematic areas. When numerous organizations benefit from a programme, it stands to reason that not only one of them should be responsible for financing that programme.</p>	Accepted	This recommendation was adopted, and a subsequent FSNIS Phase IV project was formulated and funded. The FSNIS is formulated as a sector within the Country Office structure, allowing for multi-donor funding.	FSNIS Sector	Ongoing	Yes

Evaluation of the project "Strengthening Food Security Information and Early Warning System" – Management response					04/23
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
Recommendation 3. Interventions in Yemen should generally shift "from crises and relief to proactive resilience, development and peace building actions." This approach is partly adopted by FAO and other international organizations, but within a limited and sporadic framework that needs to be enlarged and conceptualized.	Accepted	The subsequent FSNIS Phase IV project is focused on providing baseline information to support resilience efforts. FAO country office new Plan of Action (POA 2022-24) has also been formulated to focus on resilience actions.	Country Office, FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes
Recommendation 4. The complexity and fluidity of the country context and the difficulty to predict frequent changes make it very difficult and perhaps unreasonable for FAO and to develop a Country Programming Framework for Yemen for the time being. However, it is recommended to swiftly start developing a new mid-term Country Action Plan (CAP), in consultation with relevant partners and donors. Such a framework is necessary to integrate and coordinate FAO interventions and actions and conceptualize the role of the FSEWS in informing its other interventions and/or benefiting from them. In the political situation were to hinder the officialization of the Country Action Plan, it could be used as an internal guiding document.	Accepted	A new Plan of Action (POA 2022-24) has been formulated and is in operation. Information Systems is an essential and integral part of the POA.	Country Office	Ongoing	Yes
Recommendation 5. The CAP should include short-term interventions and flexible packages of actions that allow for adaptation to unexpected changes or switching to alternatives in anticipation of such changes (medium-term planning, short-term interventions). This constellation can capitalize on the outputs of the FSIS programme in timely/early actions, following the concept of the Sudan Institutional Capacity Programme: Food Security Information for Action (SIFSIA). In this regard, the flexible "twin-	Accepted	The subsequent FSNIS Phase IV project is focused on providing baseline information through livelihoods profiling, supporting medium to long-term programming of interventions. The new POA (2022-24) capitalizes on this information to further resilience efforts.	FSNIS, Country Office	Ongoing	Yes

Evaluation of the project “Strengthening Food Security Information and Early Warning System” – Management response					04/23
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
track approach” adopted in the last FAO Country Programming Framework (CPF) (2018–2020) is still appropriate (if not ideal) for the current and foreseeable future in Yemen. Based on updated/early information and warnings, the interventions should be tailored to livelihood profiles and food security IPC.					
Recommendation 6. The rationality of food security information projects is gathering and analysing data to support, planning, policymaking and operations; therefore there must be a clear cut between projects that produce information and those that use information. In other words, future FSI projects should not act as an information user project (e.g. supporting policymaking processes, distributing food or implementing livelihood creation actions).	Accepted	Following this recommendation, the subsequent FSNIS Phase IV project focuses only on information production (data and analysis).	FSNIS	Ongoing	No
Recommendation 7. It is highly recommended to extend the FSIS Programme since the programme was not only relevant and necessary when it started; rather, its relevance and importance have increased over time. This recommendation is based on the following factors: i. The humanitarian situation in Yemen has been constantly worsening due to the escalation and increasing complexity of political and armed conflicts and the resulting deterioration of the economy. In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic and related containment measures have exacerbated pre-existing drivers of the food system’s fragility and thus food insecurity. ii. Humanitarian and development actors (over 200 actors) as well as functioning national entities increasingly need clear, timely and reliable data and analyses to inform their planning processes and action. Most of these partners rely on FSIS products that cannot be produced or led by FAO’s	Accepted	A subsequent FSNIS Phase IV project was formulated and funded. The Country Office has also positioned FSNIS as a sector not simply a project to allow multi-donor funding.	FSNIS, Country Office	Ongoing	Yes

Evaluation of the project "Strengthening Food Security Information and Early Warning System" – Management response					04/23
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p>own resources without a financed project/programme (e.g. IPC reports).</p> <p>iii. The FSIS Programme proved able to effectively act and provide most of its products in spite of the country's extremely complicated and tough conditions.</p> <p>iv. There are tasks/activities that were started and important results that were only partly achieved, since their completion was hindered mainly by the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>v. There are other programme results that can be considered achieved according to the programme results matrix but are not yet optimally utilized to their full capacities. Based on a cost-benefit consideration.</p> <p>vi. In the larger picture of international interventions in Yemen, it is exceptionally efficient that a project whose budget is less than USD 7 million serves interventions amounting to USD billions. Such an efficient source of information should be maintained, strengthened and elaborated.</p> <p>vii. The programme successfully applied a conflict-sensitive approach, which enabled it to be one of very few interventions that have been able to work countrywide with both governing powers. This fact alone as well as the programmes practical contribution to technical diplomacy at the operational level (e.g. unifying used tools, terminologies, analysis, training, procedures and reporting on the entire country), represented a contribution to peacebuilding, even if it was not explicit and visible. This also paved the way not only for other interventions that followed the programmes example but also for post-conflict arrangements. Such unintended results are no less</p>					

Evaluation of the project “Strengthening Food Security Information and Early Warning System” – Management response					04/23
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p>important than the targeted results and should be capitalized and built on.</p> <p>viii. Finally, in case the above-mentioned framework recommendation is partly or entirely adopted, the acronym referring to the project (project label) should clearly reflect its components.</p>					
<p>Recommendation 8.</p> <p>The recommended extension of the FSIS Programme should be planned for a minimum of a three-year project. The constraining country conditions, the very demanding and time-consuming operational and financial procedures at FAO, the procedural and reporting requirements of the donor organization(s), the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, which slow down most operational steps, all render a shorter duration unrealistic and would likely lead to extending the original duration which negatively affects planning, budgeting and staff availability at the expense of effectiveness and efficiency.</p>	Accepted	As stated above, Phase IV of the project is ongoing.		Ongoing	Yes
<p>Recommendation 9.</p> <p>The policy component of the FSIS Programme should not be included in future phases. This is based on three factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. the framework recommendation regarding the separation of providing and using information at project level; ii. the complicated and unstable political situation in Yemen which makes working at policy level less reasonable; iii. the fact that throughout all FSIS Programme phases over seven years, this component was the least successful and effective. 	Accepted	As stated above, the FSNIS Phase IV only focuses on information systems. This recommendation was adopted.	FSNIS	Completed	No

Evaluation of the project "Strengthening Food Security Information and Early Warning System" – Management response					04/23
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
Recommendation 10. For more visibility and a more accurate reflection of the FSIS Programme's role and objectives, the acronym used should be reconsidered, since the currently used acronym (FSIS) overlooks the important components of nutrition and early warning.	Accepted	The name was changed to FSNIS.		Completed	No
Recommendation 11. The key recommended changes in the project design are: i) excluding the third component (output 3) relating to policies; and ii) separating the EWS from the second component and upgrading it to become an independent component. Thus, the programme components would be: capacity building, food security information system and early warning system.	Partially accepted	Included in the new project, FSNIS Phase IV. The results framework of the new project was significantly revised. The use of components was changed to focus on outcomes, outputs and activities, not components. However, all sections stated in the recommendation are included in the new project.	FSNIS	Completed	No
Recommendation 12. In order to precisely measure achievements and track their progress, it is recommended to carry out a critical review of the project logframe indicators, whereby new developed indicators should strictly fulfil the SMART criteria.	Accepted	As indicated above, the results framework of the new project was significantly revised.	FSNIS	Completed	No
Recommendation 13. It is recommended to enhance and strengthen the planning, monitoring and documentation systems. The elaborated systems should be documented, illustrated in clear charts, and transformed into manuals and guidelines. The monitoring process should not be limited to data collection but should also include regular analysis across various time scopes and outputs. This would allow for a comparison of time periods and budget lines associated to respective areas and periods. More attention	Accepted	The new FSNIS Phase IV project includes documentation of capacity building strategy and development of manuals and guidelines from all existing materials.	FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes

Evaluation of the project "Strengthening Food Security Information and Early Warning System" – Management response					04/23
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
should be given to quantitative and qualitative documentation accumulated over the programme duration, building a solid and comprehensive institutional memory.					
Recommendation 14. More attention should be given to expertise exchange among programme units and staff with a particular focus on problems, obstacles and coping mechanisms.	Accepted	The new FSNIS Phase IV project includes study tours and exchange programmes as an activity following this recommendation.	FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes
Recommendation 15. There is an absolute necessity to address the factors that led to the frequented delay of administrative decisions and financial dues, in order to come up with fundamental solutions before starting a new phase of the programme.	Accepted	The Country Office has increased the capacity of the admin and finance unit to tackle issues of delays faced in the past years.	Country Office	Ongoing	No
Recommendation 16. In light of the political instability and sensitivity, it is recommended to disburden the FSIS Programme from structural bodies and partnerships of political nature or dimension. Outputs and activities should possibly not be contingent on higher level approvals or meetings that require a lot of time and effort to be organized.	Accepted	Understanding that this recommendation relates to high-level bodies such as the FS Council headed by the Prime Minister, the exclusion of the policy component in the new project separates the FSNIS project from such high-level bodies. Nonetheless, the project will continue to support FSTS in working with the existing FS structure and provide support in policy formulation.	FSNIS, FSTS	Ongoing	Yes
Recommendation 17. The following criteria should guide selecting and prioritizing programme partners:	Accepted	The new FSNIS Phase IV project has restructured partner engagement giving more mandate to CSO in data related activities including supervision and collection. In the	FSNIS	Completed	No

Evaluation of the project "Strengthening Food Security Information and Early Warning System" – Management response					04/23
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
i. institutions with clear technical nature that are not involved in the political situation; ii. institutions mandated with gathering and analysing data and producing information on food security dimensions and related context (e.g. technical divisions, sectors and entities affiliated to the CSO, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation and Ministry of Water and Environment); iii. institutions operating as a single institution at the national level/countrywide (e.g. CSO and CAMA); iv. institutions that are established by law with permanent employees and allocated governmental budgets		new structure, FSTS is more focused on providing decision support rather than data supervision.			
Recommendation 18. Partnerships with NGOs (particularly at district and community levels) as well as institutions representing the private sector should be more involved as contributors and users of the programme.	Accepted	The new FSNIS Phase IV project through FSAC is looking at pathways to partner with national NGOs following this recommendation. In addition to international NGOs such as FEWS NET and ACAPS, that FSNIS is actively partnering.	FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes
Recommendation 19. It is recommended to develop a comprehensive capacity building plan that covers the programme lifetime and determines all targeted groups, activities and expected results of each activity. That plan should address three levels: individual, institutional and enabling environment, and should do so by working on the following three pillars/subplans: i. Developing the capacities of the structural and already active units of the FSIEWS (such as the technical secretariat, governorate units and the early warning working group), while building on previously provided support. Training at	Accepted	The new FSNIS Phase IV project has included an activity for documenting a capacity building strategy following this recommendation that will guide capacity building in a systematic manner. In addition, training activities have also been restructured focusing on specialty training rather than blanket training for all members.	FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes

Evaluation of the project “Strengthening Food Security Information and Early Warning System” – Management response					04/23
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p>this juncture targets individuals from all units who have the same specialization or tasks. This pillar aims at ensuring the continuity of information flow and products in an efficient, accurate and timely manner.</p> <p>ii. Developing the institutional capacity of technical governmental bodies mandated with collecting and analysing data related to FSIEWS in an integrated manner that includes both physical and human capacities. This requires starting with assessing their current capacities and identifying gaps and needs by applying rapid assessments (similar to the example of the EWS needs assessment and tailored capacity development plan; e.g. the case of CAMA). This pillar aims to create institutions that, after achieving political stability, are capable of taking over the operation of the FSIEWS, in cooperation with, or through inclusion of, the secretariat and the GFUS over the long-term.</p> <p>iii. Providing basic training, awareness raising and advocacy targeting a wider range of stakeholders. This is the only pillar that should also include information users and response actors including decision and policymakers. This pillar aims at enhancing and improving the enabling environment.</p>					
<p>Recommendation 20.</p> <p>In order to develop and implement the suggested capacity development strategy, the budget allocated for capacity building and in particular for training, should be appropriately increased.</p>	<p>Partially accepted</p> <p>The new FSNIS Phase IV project structure considers the capacity building as an important strategy however, budget allocation is prioritized on deliverables</p>	<p>Considered in the new FSNIS Phase IV project.</p>	<p>FSNIS</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>No</p>

Evaluation of the project “Strengthening Food Security Information and Early Warning System” – Management response					04/23
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p>Recommendation 21.</p> <p>Gender aspects should be taken into consideration in capacity development planning with respect to all pillars and levels.</p>	Accepted	The new FSNIS Phase IV project has included gender-specific activities following this recommendation.	FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes
<p>Recommendation 22.</p> <p>The following measures are recommended to improve the effectiveness of training activities at large:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. applying different types of training that can be more effective for respective purposes and target groups such as training of trainers, distance, refresh, abroad, ongoing and on-job training; ii. engaging professional trainers alongside the programme subject matter specialists; iii. carefully selecting trainees in accordance with strict standards and criteria; iv. requesting more than one training candidate from each targeted institutions to allow the programme to choose among them; v. monitoring the impact of the training on the performance of the trainees; vi. making training materials (modules and hand overs) available to partners and stakeholders. 	Accepted	<p>The new FSNIS Phase IV project has adopted this recommendation as a strategy for training focusing on specialist training, including study tours. In the strategy, careful consideration will be taken when selecting training participants and relating it to their work deliverables.</p> <p>The new project includes the development of a capacity-building strategy as an activity to actualize this recommendation.</p>	FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes
<p>Recommendation 23.</p> <p>In order to capitalize the national capacities developed and to enhance the national ownership and the sustainability of the FSIS, the FSTS should be more involved in running the operations and developing the products of the FSIS. In this regard, the programme should return to applying the initial modality as included in its design and which was distributed by</p>	Partially accepted	As per the recommendation above, the role of FSTS will be focused on decision support and policy formulation rather than data collection and supervision, which is now the role of the CSO.	FSNIS, Country Office	Ongoing	Yes

Evaluation of the project “Strengthening Food Security Information and Early Warning System” – Management response					04/23
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
the COVID-19 pandemic. According to this modality, each expert of the FSTS should have a peer (technical counterpart) at the Programme Support Unit who delivers technical support to his/her peer at the FSTS. The respective peers should work together on the same tasks which represents ongoing on-the-job training and enhances learning by doing.	With this, since policy is no longer a component of the project, pairing FSTS staff to project staff is not feasible. However, support will be provided to FSTS in fulfilling their mandate.				
Recommendation 24. Strengthening the role of the secretariat does not mean that information products, which used to be issued as programme joined products, should be separately delivered by the FSTS, as long as the programme exists (in its future phase), as this sends a negative message which reduces stakeholders’ confidence in the product.	Partially accepted Similar to the above, as the role of FSTS is decision support, products between the project and FSTS may vary. As part of the technical support provided to FSTS, consultations and technical inputs for the products will be provided.	Provision of technical support to FSTS products to inform decision-making and policy formulation.	FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes
Recommendation 25. The programme should be involved in selecting and assessing the performance of the delegated FSTS and GFUs’ staff in accordance with reference standards and criteria. Terms of reference for each staff should be revised and refined in relation to the reference standards. These should be included in the future letters of agreement.	Partially accepted Given the amended role of the FSTS for decision support, the terms of reference will not be individualistic (each staff) but for the institution as a whole.	Under the new FSNIS Phase IV project, an activity is included to support FSTS in reviewing and revising their roles and responsibilities in relation to strategic decision support.	FSNIS	Ongoing	No
Recommendation 26. In the same framework, the relationship between the GFUs and the FSTS should be strengthened and activated, whereby the hubs should not act as an alternative to the FSTS in dealing with the GFUs, but in backstopping providing technical support to the GFUs, and facilitating communication between them and the	Rejected The roles of FSTS and GFU are distinct under the overall supervision of the FSNIS project. As such, this recommendation is	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Evaluation of the project “Strengthening Food Security Information and Early Warning System” – Management response					04/23
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
higher levels of the system, as well as with local authorities. This implicitly means that some of the hub’s tasks would be moved to the secretariat; therefore it may be reasonable, in the event that this recommendation is implemented, to rethink the distribution of human resources between the hubs and the central level.	not feasible under the new FSNIS Phase IV project.				
Recommendation 27. Nutrition aspect as an inseparable element of food security should be more elaborated in the FSIS. This requires intensive and regular coordination with national and international organizations that principally mandated with gathering nutrition-related data and using the FSIS structural units and human expertise to fill existing gaps.	Accepted	The new FSNIS Phase IV project emphasizes the importance of nutrition by establishing a sub-unit within the project focusing on nutrition with additional staff.	FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes
Recommendation 28. More capacity building measures should be directed to the GFUs to allow the achievement of: i. compatibility with the recommended expansion of the FSIS scope of work; ii. engaging the GFUs in the EWS and assigning them with regular and ad hock tasks within it, whether in terms of feeding information into the system or as a dissemination tool to mobilize and promote community based and end user responses for warnings; iii. engaging the GFUs in providing information to the IPC analysis; iv. considering the framework and the FSIS overall recommendations, the GFUs can be an effective tool for agricultural extension, serving resilience interventions in the framework of development work and emergency response.	Partially accepted As the role of the project is to focus on information systems as per the previous recommendation, the role of GFUs has been expanded but is limited to this mandate. Response, extension and resilience interventions are beyond the scope of the recommended mandate.	The new FSNIS Phase IV project is expanded to collect qualitative data through FGD in addition to the quantitative data previously collected by GFUs. The GFUs conduct the FGDs with the support of the hubs.	FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes

Evaluation of the project "Strengthening Food Security Information and Early Warning System" – Management response					04/23
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p>Recommendation 29.</p> <p>Given that main and related public infrastructure is available, the hard and soft facilities of the FSIS should be enhanced, as they represent the infrastructure of the entire information system. The priority should be given to providing servers and creating infrastructure to facilitate sharing, which links the GFUs to the higher levels of the system (the hubs, FSTS and Programme Support Unit). This would improve the results and speed of the processes, enable better quality control and protect data and files from being lost. Another priority area is providing the Programme Support Unit and the FSTS with updated software (programmes and tools for analysis) as well as user licenses to those available online. Other FAO products and interventions could also benefit from such upgrading.</p>	<p>Partially accepted</p> <p>The existing infrastructure is not fully utilized. The first step will be to evaluate what is there, how to efficiently improve utilization and the need to increase if any.</p>	Where there are needs, such as in CAMA for improved early warning systems, this recommendation will be considered in the new FSNIS Phase IV project.	FSNIS	Completed	Yes
<p>Recommendation 30.</p> <p>Based on the recommended expanded role of the FSIS, the parameters and indicators, should be filtered and prioritized, in order to minimize the collection of unused data while overlooking other more important data. In all cases, it is recommended that the indicators primarily cover the four elements of food security in a balanced manner. In case of expanding the role of the FSIS to cover more resilience and agricultural aspects, additional parameters will be added to the system.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	The new FSNIS Phase IV project focuses on additional indicators and data streams such as livelihoods, qualitative data through FGDs and outcome data through high-frequency monitoring (HFM).	FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes
<p>Recommendation 31.</p> <p>After cataloguing and filtering the indicators, a dialogue with partners and stakeholders should be conducted to determine which of the indicators can be taken over by another party in a systematic way to reduce the burden on the programme and to avoid duplication in collecting the same data. Both Food Security</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	Partner discussions will take place during the course of implementing the new FSNIS Phase IV, including: i. FSAC and CCY partners for market data;	FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes

Evaluation of the project "Strengthening Food Security Information and Early Warning System" – Management response					04/23
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
and Nutrition Clusters can play a significant role in this regard. The coordination efforts should include grassroots organizations active in related areas, such as NGOs concerned with humanitarian assistance, development and agriculture. The dialogue on collecting data should be expanded to explore the opportunity of issuing multiactor information products.		ii. ACAPS for food security indicators, including imports and exports; and iii. FSAC partners for qualitative information in the FGDs. Other partners will be engaged depending on the information required.			
Recommendation 32. More efforts should be put into ensuring the regularity of the IPC analysis. To address the dilemma of the extreme difficulties facing primary data collection on the one hand, and the increasing need for updated data due to the rapidly changing status on the other, compromising measures should be developed. Among potential compromises expanding the time frame for projections and/or issuing, a limited semi-annual update that addresses the most urgent issues and regions. It is also recommended to develop a simplified summary of each IPC update, targeting decision-makers and partners who do not have the time or ability to follow-up on the main release. Further, the definition of IPC and its importance, as well as an understanding of its implications should be taken into account in advocacy activities that target decision-makers.	Accepted	Efforts will be taken to ensure IPC projections cover a long period with a scheduled update during the projection to validate the analysis. Additionally, the HFM will be used to monitor the projection analysis and trigger updates or new analyses where necessary.	FSNIS, IPC GSU	Ongoing	Yes
Recommendation 33. It is recommended to continue producing the current products of the FSIS Programme and to direct more attention towards improving their quality, regularity and speed of releases, and expanding the scope of their dissemination. In this regard, it is recommended to continue issuing the market bulletin, which is considered an important and necessary product for	Accepted	The new FSNIS Phase IV focus on increasing the frequency and number of products and improving existing ones.	FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes

Evaluation of the project “Strengthening Food Security Information and Early Warning System” – Management response					04/23	
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan				
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)	
stakeholders. Further, the recently created dashboard and bulletins should not be considered substitutions for each other, as they both have their distinct users among partners. The bulletins are characterized by providing analysis and visualization of data, while the dashboard is characterized by the availability of more data and a wider scope of data.						
<p>Recommendation 34.</p> <p>The EWS should be strengthened and elaborated in potential future phase(s) of the FSIS Programme. This requires not only further budgets, but also an upgrade to a project main component, since early warning systems represent the most effective and cost-efficient tool for disaster risk reduction, which is extremely needed under the circumstances in Yemen and which can and should also be utilized for other purposes in both the humanitarian and resilience areas of response. In addition, the FSIS Programme investments and achievements in establishing the basis for a comprehensive EWS were very successful and should be capitalized and developed.</p>	Partially accepted	As indicated above, the results framework of the new FSNIS Phase IV does not include components. However, EWS is an integral part of the new project.	Partnership with EW institutions such as CAMA, NRWA and MAI is an essential aspect of the new FSNIS Phase IV with a focus on strengthening their capacity in early warning, including the development of technology to support EW.	FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes
<p>Recommendation 35.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the EWS should include more actors (as identified in the can) and involve them as contributors and/or as receivers and responders to the warnings, in light of available facilities at CAMA and most of the potential partners; the COVID-19 pandemic should not hinder expanding partnerships and cooperation.</p>	Accepted		Collaboration with other partners, such as AREA, YRSC, as well as international partners, will also be a focus in the new FSNIS Phase IV Additionally, the rehabilitation of available infrastructure and installation of new ones, which COVID hindered, is on track in the current project.	FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes

Evaluation of the project "Strengthening Food Security Information and Early Warning System" – Management response					04/23
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p>Recommendation 36.</p> <p>Although the facts created on the ground are sustainable (e.g. letters of agreement between official actors, capacity development, common products), the programme should work on creating a more solid and sustainable institutional set-up for the EWS. This should be decided in light of the development of the political situation, FAO programmatic decisions and in consultation with the involved actors.</p>	Accepted	In the current context, the new FSNIS Phase IV will focus on ensuring inter-institutional collaboration by strengthening the EW TWG to institutionalize it when the context permits.	FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes
<p>Recommendation 37.</p> <p>From a conceptual point of view, from the very beginning (the second programme phase EFRLP) the EWS has been widely seen and treated as a tool for disaster risk reduction, focusing on meteorological and hydrological parameters and consequently on actors that observe and monitor such parameters. Less recognized was the EWS as a tool for food insecurity and food crises risk reduction, which is the wider scope and the overall mandate of the programme and FAO. The grounded and operationalized EWS is a highly efficient and effective instrument that can be capitalized on to produce much more than weather and hazard alerts.</p>	Accepted	Linking EWS to food security information for action is an essential focus for the new FSNIS Phase IV, and many products in this regard are under production to be disseminated to decision-makers.	FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes
<p>Recommendation 38.</p> <p>Likewise, the FSIS and the EWS cannot carry or get deeply involved in response actions. However, it should also not be a standalone intervention. Therefore, the EWS should be part of a national risk management strategy (if one is developed in the foreseeable future) as well as part of a more strategic programmatic framework. The EWS should serve food security, nutrition, resilience and agriculture development interventions (including extension), operationalizing the concept of "early warning-early actions". This requires thematically expanding the</p>	Accepted	This recommendation is similar to the one above, and parameters related to and indicating the effect of climate hazards on food security and agriculture are under development to support early warning and anticipatory actions.	FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes

Evaluation of the project "Strengthening Food Security Information and Early Warning System" – Management response					04/23
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
parameters measured by the system to include more food security and agriculture parameters.					
<p>Recommendation 39.</p> <p>As mentioned under the FSIS, the GFUs and the FSTS should be more involved in the EWS; it is particularly important to utilize the GFUs as contributors and intermediary responders to warnings and extension messages.</p>	<p>Partially accepted</p> <p>Following previous recommendations of involving institutions with the proper mandate, the role of EWS is a better fit for CAMA, NRWA, AREA and MAI rather than GFUs and FSTS.</p>	To the extent of EW information, FSTS and GFUs will be involved in FGDs, which will include information on the impact of hazards on livelihoods and food security.	FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes
<p>Recommendation 40.</p> <p>As part of the capacity building component of the programme, high priority should be given to developing the physical, automate (software) and human capacities of the EWS actors. The capacity building measures should be strictly based on a cost-benefit principle (many stations are out of service due to the lack of very minor spare parts that are available in the domestic market). In this regard, the general exclusion of manual weather stations from maintenance plans should be reconsidered for the sake of wider area coverage until automatic stations are available overall.</p>	<p>Partially accepted</p> <p>With the limited resources, investment in rehabilitating the automatic system will be prioritized, followed by critical manual stations.</p>	As mentioned, the rehabilitation of weather stations has been prioritized in the new FSNIS Phase IV. Further rehabilitation will be considered as resources become available.	FSNIS	Ongoing	Yes
<p>Recommendation 41.</p> <p>Facilities and human capacities needed for installing, fixing, maintaining and rehabilitating weather stations should not be concentrated only in Sanaa. As a pragmatic step in this regard, CAMA engineers and technicians situated in Aden could be trained and assigned to carry out the technical work related to the weather stations in areas affiliated to Aden.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	In the new FSNIS Phase IV, an activity is included to review the distribution and location of weather stations with the aim of redistribution where possible and ensuring future investments are to fill gaps. This will eliminate concentrating stations in one area.	FSNIS	Completed	No

Office of Evaluation
E-mail: evaluation@fao.org
Web address: www.fao.org/evaluation

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Rome, Italy



Some rights reserved. This work is available under a CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO licence.