

October 2013



منظمة الأغذية  
والزراعة للأمم  
المتحدة

联合国  
粮食及  
农业组织

Food and  
Agriculture  
Organization  
of the  
United Nations

Organisation des  
Nations Unies  
pour  
l'alimentation  
et l'agriculture

Продовольственная и  
сельскохозяйственная  
организация  
Объединенных  
Наций

Organización  
de las  
Naciones Unidas  
para la  
Alimentación y la  
Agricultura

E

## PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

**Hundred and Fourteenth Session**

**Rome, 11 - 15 November 2013**

**Follow-up to the Evaluation of FAO's role and work in nutrition**

**VALIDATION REPORT**

**Queries on the substantive content of this document may be addressed to:**

Mr Daniel Gustafson  
Deputy Director-General (Operations)  
Officer-in-Charge, Office of Evaluation  
Tel. (06) 570-56320

*This document can be accessed using the Quick Response Code on this page;  
a FAO initiative to minimize its environmental impact and promote greener communications.  
Other documents can be consulted at [www.fao.org](http://www.fao.org)*



mi 584e



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the United  
Nations

## Office of Evaluation

# Validation of the Follow-up Report to the Management Response to the Evaluation of FAO's role and work in Nutrition

*Final report*

# Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

## Office of Evaluation (OED)

This report is available in electronic format at: <http://www.fao.org/evaluation>

*The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.*

*The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.*

© FAO 2013

*FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO's endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way.*

*All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via [www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request](http://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request) or addressed to [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org).*

For further information on this report, please contact:

Director, OED  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 1, 00153  
Rome, Italy  
Email: [evaluation@fao.org](mailto:evaluation@fao.org)

## **Table of Contents**

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Process and methodology .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Recommendations selected for validation .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Assessment .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusions.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Annex 1.</b>	<b>List of people met .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Annex 2.</b>	<b>Questionnaire .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Annex 3.</b>	<b>Annotated Recommendation Matrix.....</b>	<b>18</b>

## **1 Introduction**

1. FAO evaluation policy requires a Management Response (MR) to all evaluations, as well as a Follow up Report (FR) two years after the MR for all thematic evaluations. The Programme Committee (PC), which is the Governing Body that directly deals with evaluation in FAO, has further requested that FRs describe the impacts of implemented evaluation recommendations on corporate policies and procedures. In 2012 the PC appreciated the process presented by the FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) for validating FRs related to thematic and strategy evaluations and endorsed the methodology for future major evaluations. The PC also urged that these FR validations concentrate on recommendations at the strategic level.

2. The Evaluation of FAO's Role and Work related to Nutrition was presented at the 108th session of the PC in October 2011. Its main conclusion was that FAO lacked the vision and corporate commitment accorded to nutrition in its original mandate, and that defining and developing FAO's potential comparative advantage on nutrition-sensitive agriculture was fundamental for the Organization. To achieve this required a shift in emphasis in policy, overall approach, measurement and programming to accommodate dietary quality alongside agricultural productivity, processing and marketing. To this end the Nutrition Evaluation made 14 major recommendations.

3. The MR recognized the importance and value of the Nutrition Evaluation and welcomed almost all of the recommendations. Ten recommendations were accepted with some minor qualifications, and one sub-component of recommendation 5 was only partially accepted, and the four recommendations on institutional arrangements (9-12) were deferred pending further review. The PC appreciated the Nutrition Evaluation and its methodology and found that the recommendations were founded on a sound evidence base. The PC requested more detailed information on financial implications and prioritization, and reiterated that nutrition was both an important cross-cutting issue requiring mainstreaming, as well as a strong hub to ensure visibility and leadership of FAO in the field of nutrition.

4. In early 2013, OED agreed with concerned parties that the importance of nutrition in the work of FAO warranted a validation process of the Follow-up Report (FR) to the nutrition evaluation, to be presented to the PC at its November 2013 session. The purpose of this validation process includes two parallel assessments: 1) progress made in the implementation of the accepted evaluation recommendations and of any constraints and related causes: 2) clarity, realism and "implementability" of the accepted evaluation recommendations.

## **2 Process and methodology**

5. The validation process took place during the period August-October 2013, and was carried out by an external consultant, who had not been involved in the evaluation process or in the implementation of the recommendations. Steps included:

- i. Review of the official documentation provided by FAO, including the evaluation report, the Management response and the Follow-up Report and all other supporting evidence on progress and constraints in implementing recommendations; among

others, this included a review of the scientific literature published on “Nutrition Sensitive Agriculture” since the Nutrition Evaluation was realized;

- ii. Identification of key recommendations from among those accepted by Management;
- iii. Round of interviews with key officials from within FAO as well as those key respondents identified in other institutions involved in nutrition at the global level;<sup>1</sup>
- iv. Preparation of a draft report, circulation to stakeholders for comments and finalization.

6. A total of 30 people were interviewed, including 15 FAO staff and 15 outsiders. Interviewees had been identified by OED with FAO stakeholders and were those individuals considered to be the best authority or nutrition person concerned in the various institutions and/or sections of those institutions. All interviewees were provided with an explanation of the purpose of the interview as well as assurances that their responses would be treated as confidential as explained in the questionnaire used to guide the discussion.<sup>2</sup> Only 26 interviews followed the questionnaire and were used in this analysis.

### 3 Recommendations selected for validation

7. For the purpose of this validation process, the recommendations are classified as being of three types: those that are “strategic”; those that are “operational”, and those that are “operationally strategic”. Six recommendations, namely number 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, and 14, were selected for validation because they are either strategic and/or operationally strategic. Recommendations 1, 2, 8 and 14 were selected for validation because most eminently “strategic”. Other two recommendations (9, 10,) regarding institutional arrangements in HQ, were also chosen for validation since although eminently “operational”, they were also of strategic importance, and not realizing them would threaten all others. Although the MR left recommendations 9 and 10 pending further review the FR reported on the follow up actions taken in their regard. Box 1 synthesizes the selected recommendations and the respective Management Response. Annex 3 contains also the actions taken and respective observations.

#### Box 1. Selected recommendations for validation and assessment of their current status

Recommendation Number	Recommendation text (synthesis)	Management response (synthesis)
1	Senior management in FAO has to commit to a strong focus on nutrition across the Organization requisite to its mandate. This commitment should be “championed” by the Deputy Director General Knowledge (DDK). There are six principal areas which require the urgent attention of senior management	Accepted; An inter-divisional Steering Committee was to be established, that would direct an Inter-divisional Task Team under the direction of the Steering Committee; to formulate a corporate vision and strategy on a nutrition-sensitive food systems approach with the goal of mainstreaming nutrition throughout FAO’s programme of work
2	A Vision and Strategy for nutrition-sensitive agricultural development should be drawn up and articulated reflecting FAO’s commitment to address both under-nutrition and over-	Accepted, including all recommended elements

<sup>1</sup> See Annex 1

<sup>2</sup> See Annex 2

Recommendation Number	Recommendation text (synthesis)	Management response (synthesis)
	nutrition. Several elements recommended for the strategy	
8	Mainstream nutrition into the strategic framework and planning and programming documents	Accepted
14	FAO should be constructively engaged in nutrition-related networks at all levels and its visibility as an international partner in nutrition raised.	FAO will strengthen its engagement at all levels and with its partners to share FAO's corporate vision and approach and spell out its distinctive role in addressing nutrition insecurity through a nutrition-sensitive food systems approach.
9	The "nutrition" element (AGND) of the current Nutrition and Consumer Protection (AGN) to disengage from Food Safety and Codex (AGNC) and have a clearly defined institutional home with a staff dedicated to a multi-sectoral service function. The new nutrition entity must operate as a "service provider" offering technical assistance and normative guidance to other relevant services of the Organization (most notably all divisions within ES as well as AGA, AGP, TCS, TCI and TCE) in accordance with agreed strategic priorities. A move back to the Economic and Social Development Department (ES) would empower and strengthen links with information, assessments, statistics, policy and gender, which are most strategic to nutrition work.	The inter-divisional Steering Committee led by DDG-K (Rec. 1) was to review the recommendation and prepare a management response taking into account the corporate vision and strategy on nutrition-sensitive food systems approach
10	The technical composition of the new Nutrition Team to be determined according to the strategic priorities of the nutrition vision and strategy when it is developed. It will be headed by a strong, internationally recognised, Director of Nutrition. New job descriptions to be developed for the team with emphasis on staff having the requisite experience and knowledge to interact effectively with staff of other divisions in the Organization. Core competencies will be required in: (i) food composition, (ii) dietary measurement and assessment, (iii) nutrition information and statistics; and (iv) nutrition policy and advocacy.	As per above

8. The other six recommendations relating to the focal areas for nutrition (3, 4, 5, 6, 7), to institutional arrangements (11, 12) and collaboration and partnerships (13), were not included for validation because they largely relate to the operationalization of the vision and strategy for nutrition in FAO, be that at the regional and/or country level for assisting governments make their food systems nutrition sensitive, or in the collaborative development of normative work on nutrition sensitive agriculture at the global level.

#### 4 Assessment

9. The results of the assessments are summarized in Box 2 below, which shows that overall five of the six recommendations were considered valid by all respondents. The only recommendation not considered valid by all respondents concerns the separation of the nutrition unit from that of food safety, with a quarter not sure about this. The adequacy of follow up was less unanimous, with Recommendation 14 concerning the networking of FAO showing the least agreement. The large number of “not sure” responses is because many of the external stakeholders are not familiar with the FAO internal processes. The assessment of each recommendation is discussed in greater detail below.

**Box 2. Assessment of validity and follow up on evaluation recommendations**

Recommendation	Valid						Follow up Adequate					
	yes		no		Not sure		yes		no		Not sure	
	FAO	Non FAO	FAO	Non FAO	FAO	Non FAO	FAO	Non FAO	FAO	Non FAO	FAO	Non FAO
<b>1</b>	12	14	0	0	0	0	12	9	0	2	0	3
<b>2</b>	12	14	0	0	0	0	8	4	0	1	4	9
<b>8</b>	12	14	0	0	0	0	8	0	4	0	0	14
<b>9</b>	10	7	1	1	1	6	12	6	0	0	0	8
<b>10</b>	12	13	0	0	0	1	7	3	2	0	3	11
<b>14</b>	12	14	0	0	0	0	11	7	1	4	0	3

10. The validity of Recommendation 1 to mainstream nutrition was recognized by all those interviewed and the large majority considered that the follow up was adequate as reported. Overall consideration of the six elements of recommendation 1 suggests that nutrition has certainly been taken on board by the management, and a major effort made to answer the concerns of the Nutrition Evaluation. Even though capacity is still limited there is a much stronger focus on nutrition now than 2 years ago. All agreed that FAO publications, and especially the latest SOFA, have begun to address the nutrition issues of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, although some (3 people) felt that the nutrition concepts are still not fully developed and/or consistently applied throughout. Although all agree that FAO has begun to re-establish its international presence and reputation through its presence in REACH and the SUN movement, four external stakeholders felt it was still a very slow process.

11. Although all respondents agreed that Recommendation 2 concerning the FAO nutrition vision and strategy was a valid one, only a minority (46%) agreed that the follow up had been adequate as reported. The large number, i.e. half of “not sure” replies is because many of the external stakeholders were not familiar with the strategy. Among those inside FAO, a third considered that although a strategy was developed and delivered to the PC in 2012 as reported, the process of developing it didn’t ensure buy in across the organization. Only a minority of those interviewed (four people) considered that the strategy contained an agreed conceptual framework as recommended. Although recommendation 2 concerns a vision and a strategy for both under-nutrition and over-nutrition, the latter doesn’t feature in the strategy at all. The lack of a common understanding of nutrition issues across FAO was considered serious by several (3 people) external stakeholders. Very few respondents (2 people) felt that communication and advocacy strategies had been developed as recommended, and several respondents (three people) suggested this should become a

corporate responsibility and priority, not something the nutrition section alone should develop. There is not a shared definition among FAO staff of the term “malnutrition”, i.e. both undernutrition and overnutrition and how these relate across the life-course.

12. With regard to recommendation 8 concerning the mainstreaming of nutrition into the Strategic Framework, all considered this a valid recommendation. However few if any of the external stakeholders were familiar with the internal working processes of FAO and so were not sure whether follow up was adequate as reported. Among FAO staff, the majority – three quarters- considered the Follow Up report to be accurate in that nutrition has been mainstreamed and is explicit and implicit in all Strategic Objectives (SOs) and is visible in the Medium Term Plan (MTP) and Programme of Work and Budget (PWB). There was some concern about the way the strategy and vision had been mainstreamed into the strategic framework, with slightly less than half of FAO stakeholders saying this had been done adequately. Others (4 people) thought the two were developed in parallel and/or poorly linked and suggested that Interdivisional Task Team needs to be reinvigorated and its position consolidated in the management structure. A rapid analysis of the Strategic Objectives Work Plans reveals that the sort of nutrition emphasized is still very hunger biased, with the words “obesity” and “over-nutrition” only appearing once each in the sixty five page document. The term “micronutrient deficiencies” is mentioned just three times, and “diet quality” not at all. Obviously this is still a challenging area for management with lots of disconnects that hopefully will be corrected as the work plans get more detailed.

13. Recommendations 9 and 10 concerning the location of the nutrition unit, and its structure were considered valid by the majority of respondents (65% and 100% respectively). More than half of the respondents considered the follow up report response for recommendation 9 to be adequate; however, among the non-FAO stakeholders, most were unaware of the FAO internal structure and therefore unsure about the adequacy of the response. Several expressed their uncertainty about the soundness of separating of nutrition and food safety groups, but others considered that both structures could be justified, and the real issue was how these topics were managed in the development of the work plans. Most non-FAO stakeholders were unsure about the adequacy of follow up response to Recommendation 10 due to unfamiliarity with FAO internal structures, and among FAO insiders, more than half were also unconvinced. An overall concern expressed by several internal and external actors was of the need for a stronger unit, and that too much down grading of posts could undermine this. Who deals with the external decentralised country demands, as well as the global level normative work and how this is balanced with internal advocacy and administrative functions across the SO task forces is the management challenge that needs to be met. But it will take time to reorient staff and develop new ways of working and building such a team is the priority task. Several (3 people) felt that the focus should be on roles and functions and not just on posts. Several external actors (3) also thought the slowness of the process of change was a problem. Although progress has been made thanks to the commitment of current staff, now that a new Director has been appointed the rhythm of this transformation will hopefully pick up.

14. Recommendation 14 concerning the importance of FAO networking was considered valid by all respondents. The majority, i.e. virtually all of FAO insiders and half of outsiders thought that the FR response was adequate. FAOs growing interest and participation in REACH, UNSCN, and SUN at the corporate level is obviously a positive development. However even among those that thought the FR response was adequate, most (13 people) thought the networking was still either too weak, too slow or could be much better somehow.

Among the concerns raised in this regard was the passivity of the FAO response, coupled with the lack of technical substance behind the evident political commitment. FAO must have its own agenda in these networks and not just follow the movement. Half of the external stakeholders considered that ICN2 was extremely important and given undue emphasis not only in the FR and in the on-going work of FAO. Two people among the civil society and non-government stakeholders felt that ICN2 process should be more closely linked to and promoted within the CFS. Networking around nutrition in the CFS, where nutrition is thought to be poorly supported, should be an important arena for further development of ICN2.

## **5 Conclusions**

15. Overall the respondents felt that the recommendations formulated by the Nutrition Evaluation were all still valid and that the Follow Up Report on the Management Response was largely adequate and accurate. Nutrition has a much stronger focus in FAO now than three years ago. Further improvement in the nutrition dimensions of FAO's work will hopefully materialize as the new Director takes charge of the nutrition team. In the meantime there are a number of areas of concern that the management should consider an immediate priority.

16. The first area of concern is the lack of a common understanding of nutrition concepts across FAO. The development of an FAO communication strategy for nutrition as in recommendation 2, should be seen as an urgent corporate priority. Unless more people in FAO have the same understanding of nutrition concepts it will be difficult to ensure a common vision about how agriculture and food systems are to become more nutrition-sensitive.

17. The second area of concern is with the successful development of ICN2, which most stakeholders see as crucial. Guaranteeing the soundness of preparatory technical meeting to be held in Rome in November 2013 will be critical for ensuring a successful outcome for ICN2 in 2014. Recognising that much work has already gone into developing ICN2, every effort should now be made to ensure that the FAO vision and strategy for nutrition will be consistently reflected in the ICN2 outcomes.

18. The third area of concern is lack of attention to diet quality in the FAO work plans. Further development of the work plans for the five Strategic Objectives, is currently in progress. Hopefully each of the SO teams and their coordinators will be able to further strengthen the nutrition content as they develop the more detailed work plans.

19. The fourth area of concern is the need for continued strengthening of the nutrition capacity in FAO. Ensuring that nutrition is mainstreamed into all of the Strategic Objectives as well as properly reflected in ICN2 outcomes, and eventually incorporated into nutrition sensitive agriculture and food systems at country level, will largely depend on the strength of the nutrition section advocates.

20. Last, several respondents, including the author of this report, considered that the period of two years was too short to expect much more progress, and that the situation should be revisited again in a further two years.

**Annex 1. List of people met**

<b>N.</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>
<i>1</i>	<i>FAO</i>	Leslie Amoroso	Programme officer, ESN
<i>2</i>	<i>FAO</i>	Juliet Aphane	Nutrition officer, ESN
<i>3</i>	<i>FAO</i>	Barbara Burlingame	Deputy Director, ESN
<i>4</i>	<i>FAO</i>	Karel Callens	Senior Food Security officer, ESD
<i>5</i>	<i>FAO</i>	Clayton Campanhola	Division Director, AGP
<i>6</i>	<i>FAO</i>	Renata Clarke	Senior officer, AGDF
<i>7</i>	<i>FAO</i>	Charlotte Dufour	Technical officer, ESN
<i>8</i>	<i>FAO</i>	Johanna Jelensperger	Programme officer, ESA
<i>9</i>	<i>FAO</i>	Ellen Muelhlhoff	Senior nutrition officer, ESN
<i>10</i>	<i>FAO</i>	Martina Park	Associate Professional Officer, ESN
<i>11</i>	<i>FAO</i>	Luca Russo	Programme Coordinator, ESA
<i>12</i>	<i>FAO</i>	Mark Smulders	Senior economist, ESA
<i>13</i>	<i>FAO</i>	Jomo Sundaram	ADG, ES
<i>14</i>	<i>FAO</i>	Brian Thompson	Senior nutrition officer, ESN
<i>15</i>	<i>FAO</i>	Rob Vos	Division Director, ESW
<i>16</i>	<i>PHSL</i>	Steven Atwood	
<i>17</i>	<i>WFP</i>	Martin Bloem	
<i>18</i>	<i>WHO</i>	Francesco Branca	
<i>19</i>	<i>Bioversity</i>	Bruce Cogil	
<i>20</i>	<i>USAID</i>	Diane De Bernado	
<i>21</i>	<i>World Bank</i>	Leslie Elder	
<i>22</i>	<i>IDS</i>	Lawrence Haddad	
<i>23</i>	<i>GIZ</i>	Herwig Hahn	
<i>24</i>	<i>German Ministry of Agriculture</i>	Astrid Jakobs	
<i>25</i>	<i>UNSCN</i>	Lina Mahy	
<i>26</i>	<i>UN</i>	David Nabarro	
<i>27</i>	<i>ICCO</i>	Stineke Oenema	
<i>28</i>	<i>ACF</i>	Etienne du Vachat	
<i>29</i>		Nigel Nicholson	
<i>30</i>	<i>FIAN</i>	Flavio Valente	

## Annex 2. Questionnaire

### Introduction

FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) is seeking to validate what follow up there has been to the Nutrition Evaluation carried out in 2011. My role as an independent observer is to ascertain on behalf of OED if the recommendations of the evaluation are still considered to be valid, and whether the reported management response has happened, and if not why not, and/or how it might be improved. You and your organization are considered to be among the key actors and stakeholders of FAO's work in the nutrition sector and for that reason your answers are especially important for this purpose. Your views will form the principal source of information for determining the validity of the Follow Up Report prepared by the FAO management. The Evaluation team thanks you warmly in advance for your attention, time and precious collaboration.

### Instructions/explanation for completing the survey

Interviews are being conducted with those individuals considered to be the best authority or nutrition person concerned in the various sections of FAO and other stakeholder institutions that are active in nutrition and food security. All will be provided with an explanation of the purpose of the interview and provided with assurances that their responses will be treated as confidential. All interviews will be conducted one on one, and whenever possible face to face. Alternatively interviews will be conducted by Skype or telephone.

There are 14 questions specific to the 6 recommendations selected for validation (1, 2, 8, 9, 10, and 14) as being of most strategic importance. The questions are mostly yes/no ones, requesting explanations as appropriate. Each interview shouldn't take longer than an hour, and hopefully be nearer half an hour, as many of the recommendations are overlapping.

### Identification:

Questionnaire Number \_\_\_\_\_ Date of completion \_\_\_\_\_  
Name \_\_\_\_\_ Institution/Section \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_

### Questions:

**Recommendation 1.** The Nutrition Evaluation recommended that senior management to commit to a strong focus on nutrition across the organization requisite to its mandate.

1. a. Do you consider this was a valid recommendation?

- Yes
  - No
  - Not sure/indifferent
- If not then why not?

1. b. Do you consider the Management Response as stated in the FR to be adequate?

- Yes
  - No
  - Not sure
- If not then why not and how could it have been better?

1. c. Of the six principal areas for urgent attention which have been adequately accomplished?

1.1 and 1.2. Establish an interdivisional Steering Committee and Task Team

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

If not then why not and/or how could it have been done better?

1.3. Key nutrition issues in the 21st Century addressed in key publications

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

If not then why not and/or how could it have been done better?

1.4. Nutrition-sensitive approach to be strengthened in Strategic Framework

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

If not then why not and/or how could it have been done better?

1.5. FAO to endorse the SUN movement and actively participate in its structures

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

If not then why not and/or how could it have been better?

1.6. Guidelines to be developed on how to incorporate nutrition into the planning and budgeting frameworks

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

If not then why not and/or how could it have been better?

1.7. Nutrition-sensitive food systems to be integrated into the Impact Focus Areas framework

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

If not then why not and/or how could it have been better?

1.8. Create a separate nutrition unit during the process of developing an overall corporate vision and strategy for nutrition.

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

If not then why not and/or how could it have been better?

**Recommendation 2.** A Vision and Strategy for nutrition-sensitive agricultural development should be drawn up and articulated reflecting FAOs commitment to address both under-nutrition and over-nutrition.

2, a. Do you consider this was a valid recommendation?

- Yes

- No
- Not sure/indifferent

If not then why not?

2. b. Do you consider the Management Response as stated in the FR to be adequate?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

If not then why not and how could it have been better?

2.c. Were all of the following key elements of the strategy included as recommended, including especially:

2.2. An agreed conceptual framework for food and nutrition security

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

If not then why not and/or how could it have been better?

2.5. A communication strategy for the nutrition vision

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

If not then why not and/or how could it have been better?

2.6. An advocacy strategy for food security and nutrition linkages

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

If not then why not and/or how could it have been better?

**Recommendation 8.** Mainstream nutrition into the strategic framework and planning and programming documents

8. a. Do you consider this was a valid recommendation?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure/indifferent

If not then why not?

8. b. Do you consider the Management Response as stated in the FR to be adequate?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

If not then why not and how could it have been better?

8.c. Were all of the following key elements of the recommendation included as recommended, including especially:

8.2 Building on the new corporate vision and strategy (Rec. 1), nutrition will be mainstreamed in the Strategic Framework in collaboration with technical departments

- Yes
- No

- Not sure

If not then why not and how could it have been better?

8.3 Nutrition incorporated into the next MTP-PWB, building on lessons learned from the current MTP-PWB.

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

If not then why not and how could it have been better?

**Recommendation 9.** The “nutrition” element (AGND) of the current Nutrition and Consumer Protection (AGN) to disengage from Food Safety and Codex (AGNC) and have a clearly defined institutional home with a staff dedicated to a multi-sectoral service function.

9. a. Do you consider this was a valid recommendation?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure/indifferent

If not then why not?

9. b. Do you consider the Management Response as stated in the FR to be adequate?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

If not then why not and how could it have been better?

**Recommendation 10.** The technical composition of the new Nutrition Team to be determined according to the strategic priorities of the nutrition vision and strategy when it is developed

10. a. Do you consider this was a valid recommendation?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure/indifferent

If not then why not?

10. b. Do you consider the Management Response as stated in the FR to be adequate?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

If not then why not and how could it have been better?

**Recommendation 14.** FAO should be constructively engaged in nutrition-related networks at all levels and its visibility as an international partner in nutrition raised.

14. a. Do you consider this was a valid recommendation?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure/indifferent

If not then why not?

14. b. Do you consider the Management Response as stated in the FR to be adequate?

- Yes

- No
- Not sure

If not then why not and how could it have been better?

**FINAL QUESTION:** Are there any other issues you would like to raise and/or comments to make that have not been covered?

### Annex 3. Annotated Recommendation Matrix

Recommendation N. 1 from the Evaluation on FAO's Work Related to Nutrition		Actions agreed in Management Response (November 2011)		Action taken, comments and explanations (Follow Up Report September 2013)	
Senior management in FAO has to commit to a strong focus on nutrition across the Organization requisite to its mandate. This commitment should be "championed" by the Deputy Director General Knowledge (DDK). There are six principal areas which require the urgent attention of senior management.		Accepted. An inter-divisional Steering Committee was to be established, that would direct an Inter-divisional Task Team under the direction of the Steering Committee; to formulate a corporate vision and strategy on a nutrition-sensitive food systems approach with the goal of mainstreaming nutrition throughout FAO's programme of work.		The interdivisional Steering Committee was never formally established due to transformational changes and senior staff realignment during 2012-13.  The ITT was established in 2011 with specific terms of reference for the development of the nutrition strategy and ensuring mainstreaming of nutrition throughout the Organization; the ICN2 was a standing item on the agenda. The ITT continues to meet regularly related to mainstreaming nutrition into SOs, programmes and activities, and for exchange of information on the ICN2.	
Current validity of the recommendation	Achievements against management response (September 2013)	Evidence	Observations		
All those interviewed agree that the recommendation continues to be valid.	All agreed that FAO publications, and especially the latest SOFA, have begun to address the nutrition issues of the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century.	SOFA 2013 is about "Food systems for better nutrition"	Even though capacity is still limited there is a much stronger focus on nutrition now than 2 years ago.		

Recommendation N. 2 from the Evaluation on FAO's Work Related to Nutrition		Actions agreed in Management Response (November 2011)		Action taken, comments and explanations (Follow Up Report September 2013)	
A Vision and Strategy for nutrition-sensitive agricultural development should be drawn up and articulated reflecting FAO's commitment to address both under-nutrition and over-nutrition. Several elements recommended for the strategy		Accepted, including all recommended elements (a conceptual framework and a communication strategy)		Through a year-long consultative process, the Strategy and vision for FAO's work in nutrition was presented to the Programme Committee in November 2012. It reflects FAO's commitment to address both undernutrition and overnutrition, along with micronutrient nutrition.	
Current validity of the recommendation	Achievements against management response (September 2013)	Evidence	Observations		
All those interviewed agree that the recommendation continues to be valid.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The strategy was presented to the Programme Committee in November 2012</li> <li>No conceptual framework was included in the version of the strategy presented to the Programme Committee (Although the extended version did contain several).</li> <li>No communication or advocacy strategy have been developed for the strategy and vision</li> <li>The strategy is limited to under-nutrition.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Half of external respondents hadn't seen or heard of the strategy</li> <li>Five of FAO staff didn't think there was an agreed conceptual framework</li> <li>Ten of FAO staff said they were not aware of any communication strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several FAO respondents (2) felt the strategy should be part of the strategic framework</li> <li>Several external respondents (2) remarked on the lack of shared definition of nutrition concepts among higher echelons of FAO staff</li> </ul>		

Recommendation N. 8 from the Evaluation on FAO's Work Related to Nutrition		Actions agreed in Management Response (November 2011)	Action taken, comments and explanations (Follow Up Report September 2013)
Mainstream nutrition into the strategic framework and planning and programming documents		Building on the new corporate vision and strategy (Rec. 2), nutrition will be mainstreamed in the Strategic Framework in collaboration with technical departments.	Nutrition has been mainstreamed, explicitly and implicitly, in all the new SOs
Current validity of the recommendation	Achievements against management response (September 2013)	Evidence	Observations
All those interviewed agree that the recommendation continues to be valid.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None of the external stakeholders were familiar with the internal working processes of FAO and so were not sure whether follow up was adequate as reported.</li> <li>Among FAO staff, the majority (75%) considered the Follow Up report to be accurate in that nutrition has been mainstreamed and is explicit and implicit in all Strategic Objectives (SOs) and is visible in the Medium Term Plan (MTP) and Programme of Work and Budget (PWB).</li> <li>This author is concerned that the sort of "nutrition" being mainstreamed is still heavily focused on food energy (hunger and poverty) and little on diet quality (preventive nutrition). NCD prevention through consumption of fruits and vegetables doesn't seem to even be on the horizon</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A rapid analysis of the Strategic Objectives Work Plans reveals that the sort of nutrition emphasized is still very hunger biased, with the words "obesity" and "over-nutrition" only appearing once each in the sixty five page document. The term "micronutrient deficiencies" is mentioned just three times, and "diet quality" not at all.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Obviously this is still a challenging area for management with lots of disconnects that hopefully will be corrected as the work plans get more detailed.</li> <li>Only 42% of FAO stakeholders thought that the strategy (which is about undernutrition) and vision had been mainstreamed into the strategic framework adequately. Others (4 people) thought the two were developed in parallel and/or poorly linked and suggested that the Interdivisional Task Team needs to be reinvigorated and its position consolidated in the management structure.</li> </ul>

Recommendation N. 9 from the Evaluation on FAO's Work Related to Nutrition		Actions agreed in Management Response (November 2011)	Action taken, comments and explanations (Follow Up Report September 2013)
The "nutrition" element (AGND) of the current Nutrition and Consumer Protection (AGN) to disengage from Food Safety and Codex (AGNC) and have a clearly defined institutional home with a staff dedicated to a multi-sectoral service function. The new nutrition entity must operate as a "service provider" offering technical assistance and normative guidance to other relevant services of the Organization (most notably all divisions within ES as well as AGA, AGP, TCS, TCI and TCE) in accordance with agreed strategic priorities. A move back to the Economic and Social Development Department (ES) would empower and strengthen links with information, assessments, statistics, policy and gender, which are most strategic to nutrition work.		The inter-divisional Steering Committee led by DDG-K (Rec. 1) will review the recommendation and prepare a management response taking into account the corporate vision and strategy on nutrition-sensitive food systems approach (Recs. 1 and 2).	As of 1 January 2013, nutrition has been disengaged from food safety and Codex, and ESN has a clearly-defined institutional home in the Economic and Social Development Department.
Current validity of the recommendation	Achievements against management response (September 2013)	Evidence	Observations
The majority of those interviewed agree that the recommendation continues to be valid.	The nutrition unit has been disengaged from food safety and codex and established in the ESD Department	Self-evident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are pros and cons to separating nutrition from food safety. Nutrient adequacy (i.e. quality) and safety all rely on food analysis (composition) and together form the basis for food labelling, food</li> </ul>

Recommendation N. 9 from the Evaluation on FAO's Work Related to Nutrition		Actions agreed in Management Response (November 2011)		Action taken, comments and explanations (Follow Up Report September 2013)
				regulation and nutrition education. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There may be no perfect solution here, and the answer probably lies in ensuring the two areas of work are properly meshed and supportive of each other in the SO work plans, i.e. a management issue</li> </ul>

Recommendation N. 10 from the Evaluation on FAO's Work Related to Nutrition		Actions agreed in Management Response (November 2011)		Action taken, comments and explanations (Follow Up Report September 2013)
The technical composition of the new Nutrition Team to be determined according to the strategic priorities of the nutrition vision and strategy when it is developed. It will be headed by a strong, internationally recognised, Director of Nutrition. New job descriptions to be developed for the team with emphasis on staff having the requisite experience and knowledge to interact effectively with staff of other divisions in the Organization. Core competencies will be required in: (i) food composition, (ii) dietary measurement and assessment, (iii) nutrition information and statistics; and (iv) nutrition policy and advocacy.		The inter-divisional Steering Committee led by DDG-K (Rec. 1) will review the recommendation and prepare a management response taking into account the corporate vision and strategy on nutrition-sensitive food systems approach		New job descriptions were developed for the Director's post, a dietary assessment P4 post. A P5 and a P4 post were downgraded to two P3s and a new P2 was created. One P3 post will have a policy, mainstreaming and advocacy function. The other P3 post was developed as nutrition education and communication. The new P2 post will be for nutrition anthropology.
Current validity of the recommendation	Achievements against management response (September 2013)	Evidence	Observations	
All those interviewed agree that the recommendation continues to be valid	A new director has been appointed	Self-evident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The management challenge that needs to be met is who deals with the external decentralized country demands, as well as the global level normative work and how this is balanced with internal advocacy and administrative functions across the SO task forces.</li> <li>• An overall concern expressed by several internal and external actors was the need for a stronger unit, and that too much down grading of posts could undermine this.</li> </ul>	

Recommendation N. 14 from the Evaluation on FAO's Work Related to Nutrition		Actions agreed in Management Response (November 2011)		Action taken, comments and explanations (Follow Up Report September 2013)
FAO should be constructively engaged in nutrition-related networks at all levels and its visibility as an international partner in nutrition raised.		FAO will strengthen its engagement at all levels and with its partners to share FAO's corporate vision and approach and spell out its distinctive role in addressing nutrition insecurity through a nutrition-sensitive food systems approach.		FAO is constructively engaged in many nutrition networks and has achieved higher visibility through several high-profile processes.
Current validity of the recommendation	Achievements against management response (September 2013)	Evidence		Observations
All those interviewed agree that the recommendation continues to be valid.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All agree that FAO has begun to re-establish its international presence and reputation through its presence in REACH and the SUN movement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Among the 18 people that thought the FR response was adequate, most (13) thought that networking was still either too weak, too slow or could be improved somehow.</li> <li>Half of the external stakeholders considered that ICN2 was extremely important and given undue emphasis in both the FR and the on-going work of FAO.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several (NGO/CSO) respondents consider the ICN2 process should be more linked to the CFS.</li> <li>Concerns were raised about the passivity of FAO's response, coupled with the lack of technical substance behind the evident political commitment. FAO must have its own agenda in these networks and not just follow the movement.</li> </ul>