



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the United
Nations

Office of Evaluation

Supporting Food Security and Reducing Poverty in Kenya and the United Republic of Tanzania through Dynamic Conservation of Globally Important Agricultural Heritage System (GIAHS)- GCP/GLO/198/GER

Management response to the evaluation 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>

Permission to make copy, download or print copies of part or all of this work for private study and limited classroom use is hereby granted, free of charge, provided that an accurate citation and suitable acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright owner is given. Where copyright holders other than FAO are indicated, please refer to the original copyright holder for terms and conditions of reuse. All requests for systematic copying and electronic distribution, including to list servers, translation rights and commercial reuse should be addressed to copyright@fao.org.

For further information, please contact:

Director, OED
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 1, 00153
Rome, Italy
Email: evaluation@fao.org

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 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.

**Independent evaluation of the project GCP/GLO/198/GER
Supporting Food Security and Reducing Poverty in Kenya and the United
Republic of Tanzania through Dynamic Conservation of Globally Important
Agricultural Heritage System (GIAHS)**

Final Evaluation Report

Management Response

12 June 2012

A. Overall response to the evaluation

- The evaluation is very positive in assessing GIAHS as a "concept that provides a novel, cross-cutting approach to conserving, documenting and exploiting indigenous agricultural systems, which builds on the human and natural resource base in order to make meaningful contributions to development, livelihood improvement and processes of poverty reduction", and as a highly appropriate initiative for FAO to be engaged in (ES5-9, ES12, ES19, ES24, ES27).
- Project management fully endorses the project concept of combining indigenous agricultural practices that build on knowledge, understanding, sustainable use and conservation of natural resources, with broader issues such as genetic conservation and promotion of community livelihoods. In line with the evaluation report's recommendation, Management feels that there is need to engage the FAO representations in both countries and review the implementation strategies and institutional mandates with additional human resources during the proposed extension so that the project can be successful in mainstreaming the GIAHS concepts in national policies and plans.
- In assessing project's performance, the evaluation gives the impression that the project fell short of some expectations due to: an over-ambitious project design (including unrealistic indicators/targets); unrealistic work plans/time horizons; shortfalls in proposed partnerships, and complex project management and coordination arrangements.
- While it is admitted that there was insufficient prior consultation with the two partner countries, the project document tried to offset this by stipulating an inception period dedicated to in-country consultation, participatory preparation of action plans, and identification of GIAHS sites. In retrospect this period proved to be too short, and moreover the project's Inception Workshop did not come up with budgeted action plans; this left several stakeholders unclear about the scope of the project.
- However, in the recent past the project has tackled most implementation constraints, and seems to be on track regarding the delivery of results at the field level, albeit with

considerable delay. One key area that remains to be seriously addressed is policy mainstreaming of the GIAHS concept.

- On this point, Management agrees with the recommendations of the evaluation team that the extension phase should give more emphasis to policy work. In this context, we would emphasize the need for more involvement of the FAO Representations who are the main channels of FAO communication to governments for these project concepts to be mainstreamed and integrated in the national plans as mentioned in Recommendation 3. This would help to ensure a high degree of sustainability and mainstreaming that should be a key outcome of the project.

B. Response by recommendations

Management response to the project GCP/GLO/198/GER Supporting Food Security and Reducing Poverty in Kenya and the United Republic of Tanzania through Dynamic Conservation of Globally Important Agricultural Heritage System (GIAHS)					Date
Evaluation Recommendation	Management response Accepted, partially accepted or rejected and comment on the Recommendation	Management plan			
		Action to be taken	Responsible unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p>Recommendation 1</p> <p>It is recommended that the global principles of GIAHS be better defined and the criteria for system inclusion be more clearly articulated for easier adaptation to country-specific conditions. Particular attention should be given to explaining and presenting the concept of dynamic conservation, so that the balance between system preservation and system evolution targeted at livelihood improvement and poverty reduction is clear to stakeholders in participating countries.</p>	<p>Partially accepted</p> <p>The GIAHS concept is a reference for all twelve GIAHS participating countries (funded by GEF, BMELV, IFAD, self-funded) and the criteria have been set up by a Scientific Committee, endorsed by the GIAHS steering committee and accepted as framework by all pilot countries. Flexibility is given to adjust them to local-specific condition particularly in defining and shaping dynamic conservation activities to safeguard or revitalize the system through participatory action plans. There has been no problem in implementing these principles in other countries through the preparation of participatory action plans. An action plan was also prepared by all stakeholders in these two countries and if it was not implemented properly</p>	<p>More time will be devoted to adoption and tailoring the GIAHS principals into local conditions and the definitions and criteria shall be adjusted, if and necessary.</p>	<p>NRL-GIAHS Secretariat</p>	<p>Second phase of the project if any</p>	<p>Not for this phase</p>

	<p>then the problem lies in implementation modalities and not project design.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 2</p> <p>It is recommended that the current project be extended by 12 months. There has been initial discussion of, and agreement with, a 6-month extension; the evaluation considers that in the interests of the credibility of FAO, of the donor, and indeed of all concerned, the project should be extended for a full year to ensure that the goals of mainstreaming GIAHS, and completing the site-specific action plans, are achieved.</p> <p>As far as staffing is concerned, the evaluation team recommends that for continuity, to ensure that the conceptualisation and leadership of the project is not interrupted, and to maintain the established working relationships with Governments, staff and other stakeholders, the international staff position of Technical Officer is continued for 6 months of the extension phase, and that this is filled by the individual currently in post.</p> <p>The evaluation team also recommends, for the same reasons, that the national staff positions be maintained during the entire</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>For a 12-month extension. Considering the human and natural factors, the 6-month extension will not be enough to ensure the conceptualization and leadership of the project.</p> <p>Partially Accepted.</p> <p>The management has extended the technical officer for 4 month and his remaining or not will depend on his performance.</p> <p>Accepted.</p> <p>For the extension of national staff positions.</p>	<p>The management shall review all the details of the evaluation as well as the report of the recent donor mission. The Management shall then discuss with the two country offices and the donor, the best management strategy to be employed for the coming months.</p>	<p>NRL, FAOTZ, FAOKE, BMELV</p>	<p>By June 2012</p>	<p>Not for this Phase</p>

<p>duration of the recommended 12-month extension period to ensure the sustainability of both the project concept, and of the interventions introduced by the project.</p> <p>To fulfil the need for greater engagement at the Kenya Maasailand site, necessary to ensure completion of project activities, there is a need for greater on-site project staff time.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p>	<p>A technical backstopping mission was sent to both countries and prepared an action plan for the remaining period. Accordingly a full time national coordinator has been proposed for each country for the remaining period to expedite the implementation of the remaining activities to organize policy workshop and plan for alternative activities and preparation of a second phase.</p>			
<p>Recommendation 3</p> <p>It is recommended that particular attention be paid during the extension phase to the mainstreaming of GIAHS goals and principles into national policies in Kenya and Tanzania. To this end, it is recommended that additional funding be sought to fund a consultancy to the project which would ensure that the policy issues emerging from the project sites and other case studies are effectively debated with all the relevant stakeholders, and are then tabled at the national level.</p>	<p>Accepted. This recommendation is well taken.</p>	<p>The management will see if there would be additional funding, if not, within the remaining available resources.</p> <p>The extension phase shall also be worked out.</p>	<p>NRL, FAOTZ, FAOKE</p>		<p>Y</p>

<p>Recommendation 4</p> <p>As part of this process, it is recommended that independently facilitated multiple stakeholder policy workshops be held in both countries, in which a clear documentation of perceptions, policies and activities affecting the selected systems by different stakeholders are tabled and discussed, and from which clear recommendations and pathways for national recognition of GIAHS emerge.</p>	<p>Accepted. This recommendation is well taken.</p>	<p>Within the available resources, the policy stakeholder workshops in both countries shall be considered as one of the major activities before its ending in December of this year.</p>	<p>NRL, FAOTZ, FAOKE</p>	<p>Until Dec 2012</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Recommendation 5</p> <p>In order to contribute to the up scaling of the GIAHS concept, it is recommended that a structured review of pastoralist and agro-forestry systems in eastern Africa be carried out so that the globally important features identified by the project in Kenya and Tanzania can be placed in the broader context of the region.</p> <p>In addition, it is recommended that the project develops both spatially-explicit and feature-specific contextualisation of the selected sites which can be used to better describe and document the relevance, impacts and sustainability of GIAHS and the selected systems.</p>	<p>Partially Accepted. This recommendation is well taken, however, to put it in place in the broader context of the region, it will require additional resources.</p>	<p>The management shall review the remaining available funds and the activities for the implementation.</p>	<p>NRL, FAOTZ, FAOKE</p>	<p>Until Dec 2012</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Recommendation 6</p> <p>It is recommended to the GIAHS Secretariat that the generic site selection</p>	<p>Partially Accepted. Outside this project, revisiting the criteria does not seem necessary.</p>	<p>If and when necessary, the revisiting of the criteria and system selection shall be delegated to</p>	<p>NRL, FAOTZ, FAOKE, GIAHS- STC</p>	<p>Until Dec 2012</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>criteria be revisited with the aim of making the criteria less open to interpretation, more transparent and more quantitative in terms of scoring of candidate sites, by developing guidelines (and providing guidance, if necessary) on the adaptation to local conditions, including an indication of weighting factors. The guidelines should stress the inclusion of a wide range of relevant stakeholders in the site selection process.</p>	<p>However, this will be suggested to GIAHS STC and Steering Committees</p>	<p>prospective partners (country and lead institution).</p>	<p>and ST</p>		
<p>Recommendation 7 It is recommended that during the proposed 12-month extension, that much greater dialogue and experience sharing is undertaken between the Kenyan and Tanzanian sites with regard to the Maasai pastoralist system. While the selected sites neighbour each other, the broader issues relating to their viability differ considerably, as do the institutional partnerships; there is much to be learnt from greater cross fertilization between the two sites and their associated institutions.</p>	<p>Accepted. This recommendation is well taken.</p>	<p>The management shall review the remaining available budget and the activities to be implemented and where the project has comparative advantages or results to achieve.</p>	<p>NRL, FAOTZ, FAOKE</p>	<p>Until Dec 2012</p>	<p>N</p>