



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the United
Nations

Support to the EU Programme on Linking Information and Decision-Making to Improve Food Security for Selected Greater Mekong Sub- Regional Countries - GCP /RAS/247/EC

Follow-up report to the evaluation and management response

February 2015

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 or addressed to 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

Follow-up report of the Management response to the Evaluation of the Support to the EU Programme on Linking Information and Decision-Making to Improve Food Security for Selected Greater Mekong Sub-Regional Countries - GCP /RAS/247/EC

Overall information

The final evaluation report was received after the project closure, making it difficult to take action on some points. Nevertheless, a number of actions were taken, in particular the recommended management actions related to the project itself. Also, some evidence about the implementation of recommendations was canvassed from RAP and the country offices concerned, included in the matrix below.

Follow-up Matrix

Follow-up report of the Management response to the Evaluation of the Support to the EU Programme on Linking Information and Decision-Making to Improve Food Security for Selected Greater Mekong Sub-Regional Countries - GCP /RAS/247/EC				
Accepted evaluation recommendations	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	MAR score (see below) ¹
Recommendations to the EC-FAO Project Management				
<p>Recommendation 1</p> <p>Before the end of the project the management should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complete all outstanding reports - Ensure all key reports are translated into local languages - Disseminate results, and interpret policy implications, or make arrangements with the FAORs to do so after the completion of the project - Ensure all project documents are archived and available for reference - Develop detailed exit plans for the key processes that the project aims to institutionalize (including Monsoon 	<p>The final evaluation report should be shared according to normal FAO practices</p>	<p>Before the end of the project, the following actions were taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All outstanding reports were completed – Key reports planned for translation into local languages were translated – Results were disseminated and policy implications interpreted through the Terminal Report – All project documents were archived, sent to 30+ key stakeholders in each country and at regional level, and have been handed to RAP for archiving on the regional website – Exit plans were completed with recommendations included in the Terminal Report 	<p>Difficult to determine.</p> <p>Monsoon Forums, price data flows, the analysis of household income and expenditure surveys, IPC pilots have continued as per exit strategy plan.</p>	<p>4</p>

¹ **1 - None:** no action was taken to implement the recommendation; **2 - Poor:** plan and actions for implementation of the recommendation are at a very preliminary stage; **3 - Inadequate:** implementation of the recommendation is uneven and partial; **4 - Adequate:** implementation of the recommendation has progressed; there is no evidence yet of its results on the intended target; **5 - Good:** the recommendation has been fully implemented and there is some initial evidence of its impact on the intended target; **6 – Excellent:** there is proven evidence that the recommendation has had a positive impact on its intended target.

Follow-up report of the Management response to the Evaluation of the Support to the EU Programme on Linking Information and Decision-Making to Improve Food Security for Selected Greater Mekong Sub-Regional Countries - GCP /RAS/247/EC				
Accepted evaluation recommendations	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	MAR score (see below) ¹
Forums, price data flows, the analysis of household income and expenditure surveys, IPC pilots) and negotiate responsibilities for handover - Avoid taking on additional new activities				
Recommendations to FAO RAP and FAORs in Lao PDR, Cambodia and Myanmar				
Recommendation 2 The on-going revision of CPFs should draw on lessons and expertise of the EC FAO programme to strengthen the framework for programming of future FAO policy support for hunger reduction and food security. Specifically the input of the outgoing CTA should be sought on the draft CPFs.	As the project has closed, it is not possible for the CTA to provide substantive input to the draft CPFs of the project countries. As an alternative, the draft Terminal Report, which includes recommendations for each country, should be shared with the FAO Representatives to contribute to the revision of CPFs.	The Terminal Report includes recommendations for each country, which have been shared with the FAO Representatives to contribute to the revision of CPFs. Myanmar CPF will review in 2015 and it will be reflected. The recommendations for Lao PDR were taken into consideration during the preparation of the CPF covering the period 2013-2015, which was approved by government in 2014	The CPF for Lao PDR approved in 2014 included an output on “National Food and Nutrition Security Strategy, Policy, Investment Plan and its governance framework developed	4
Recommendation 3 Consideration should be given to formulate programmes, in conjunction with Ministries of Agriculture (and closely associated Ministries of Livestock, Forestry, etc.), on food security policy and programme formulation, dissemination, monitoring and review processes. Specifically, this should focus on mainstreaming nutritional and resilience building approaches into agricultural policy.	To the extent food security information is being produced to support longer term policy and programme formulation, the Bangladesh National Food Policy Capacity Strengthening Programme (NFPCSP) provides a good example in the region of such an approach. The FAO RAP ADG is well acquainted with the Bangladesh NFPCSP and plans to present this in Bangkok as a	No further comments from FAOMM. No further comments from FAOLA.		

Follow-up report of the Management response to the Evaluation of the Support to the EU Programme on Linking Information and Decision-Making to Improve Food Security for Selected Greater Mekong Sub-Regional Countries - GCP /RAS/247/EC				
Accepted evaluation recommendations	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	MAR score (see below) ¹
	<p>model to RAP professional staff. It was suggested that select FAORs also be invited to this presentation.</p> <p>The same approach was proposed by the project through the market information project proposals prepared for Lao PDR and Myanmar, in which the collection, analysis and reporting of market information was directly linked to policy and programme support.</p> <p>Food security related information for other purposes, such as to enhance market transparency, ensure emergency preparedness and manage climate risks will require a different approach.</p>			
Recommendations to FAO RAP				
<p>Recommendation 4 FAO should consolidate the budding relationship with ASEAN on food security analysis. Collaboration with ASEAN should focus on appropriate regional activities, such as information exchange, lesson learning, training and policy harmonization. Careful consideration is needed of which</p>	<p>Three actions were suggested.</p> <p>1. ESA should pro-actively follow-up with ASEAN, AFSIS and potential resource partners on the project proposal prepared by the project to support the three year AFSIS transition</p>	<p>1. The proposed three year project proposal to provide further support ASEAN/AFSIS during the AFSIS transition phase was given to the new consultant supporting FAO partnerships to try to identify an interested resource partner.</p>		3

Follow-up report of the Management response to the Evaluation of the Support to the EU Programme on Linking Information and Decision-Making to Improve Food Security for Selected Greater Mekong Sub-Regional Countries - GCP /RAS/247/EC				
Accepted evaluation recommendations	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	MAR score (see below) ¹
division(s) in ASEAN should be capacitated.	phase. 2. The recommended actions should be part of the job of the incoming RAP Senior Food Security Officer (already advertised). 3. FAO should seek to have an observer seat at the regular SOMAMAF meetings (ASEAN).			
Recommendations to FAO RAP and FAO OEK				
Recommendation 5 FAO should continue and expand on its basic food security training courses in the region. This includes the work of OEK in conjunction with ASEAN. Linkages with relevant national agricultural Universities should be further explored, in an effort to institutionalize courses in food security within regional tertiary education facilities.	1. As the two year FAO-AFSIS Food Security Learning Programme draws to end, OEKC should consider additional requirements, and discuss a next phase with ASEAN and the donor. 2. The EU FAO Programme for Global Governance and Hunger Reduction should be approached for additional resources for capacity development, which could include a module on food security governance. 3. The project proposal to support the three year AFSIS transition phase has a strong capacity development component, and further efforts should be built into	Agreed action 1: no follow-up Agreed action 2. The EU FAO Programme for Global Governance and Hunger Reduction provided an additional learning programme delivered in collaboration with AFSIS entitled “AFSIS Communication and Knowledge Sharing Learning Programme”. The Learning Programme was designed to build the knowledge sharing and communication skills of food security professionals in ASEAN member states. It consisted of a one week online workshop from 28 October to 1 November 2013, followed by a two week face to face workshop at AFSIS in Bangkok from 5 to 14 November 2013. Agreed actions 3 and 4: see comments to Recommendation 4	Agreed action 2. The “AFSIS Communication and Knowledge Sharing Learning Programme” was designed and delivered in response to the training needs determined at a “Training Needs Assessment (TNA) Workshop” on 20 January 2011 which was organized as part of the Ninth Focal Point Meeting (FPM) of the ASEAN Food Security Information System Project. This was the third learning programme offered based on the TNA and followed Learning Programmes for ASEAN Food Security Professionals offered in 2011 and again in 2012. The 2011 and 2012 programmes were primarily funded by TF	4

Follow-up report of the Management response to the Evaluation of the Support to the EU Programme on Linking Information and Decision-Making to Improve Food Security for Selected Greater Mekong Sub-Regional Countries - GCP /RAS/247/EC				
Accepted evaluation recommendations	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	MAR score (see below) ¹
	<p>this project.</p> <p>4. The opportunity to identify and work with a national university to develop a regional centre of excellence on food security should be explored as part of the action.</p>		<p>Project GCP /GLO/279/GER “Improving the abilities of Regional Organizations to develop, implement and monitor food security training programmes” and funded by Germany.</p> <p>The Learning Programmes were developed to respond to new the ASEAN Integrated Food Security (AIFS) Framework and to the expanded activities envisioned for National AFSIS Centers</p>	
Recommendations to Resource Partners and FAO Senior Management				
<p>Recommendation 6 Resource partners should specifically consider supporting further work on the food security implications of the large scale land concessions and changes to land tenure rights in the region. FAO should bring this message to its governing bodies, and promote the use of its already considerable inhouse expertise on tenure issues.</p>	<p>The ongoing Lao PDR Food Security Risk and Vulnerability Survey (RVS) will identify the key determinants of food insecurity. The findings of the survey should be considered in the context of this recommendation, to get an initial understanding on the impact of large scale concessions on food security. On this basis, a proposal for further work to submit to resource partners could be prepared. The results of this could be submitted to the CFS.</p>	<p>The Lao PDR RVS was successfully completed, but no information was available about the follow-up to the agreed action</p>		<p>Not Applicable</p>

Follow-up report of the Management response to the Evaluation of the Support to the EU Programme on Linking Information and Decision-Making to Improve Food Security for Selected Greater Mekong Sub-Regional Countries - GCP /RAS/247/EC				
Accepted evaluation recommendations	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	MAR score (see below) ¹
Recommendations to FAO Senior Management				
<p>Recommendation 7 Project formulation guidance should be reviewed to assess the adequacy of: - Standards for involvement of host Governments in project formulation - Procedures for reviewing projects, before submission to resource partners</p>	<p>FAO RAP will ensure that the newly released Project Cycle Guidelines, developed by the Technical Cooperation Department, are implemented in projects for which they are responsible.</p>	<p>For the formulation of the new projects, the New project Cycle guidance specifically includes the involvement of the host Governments during the identification and formulation phase of a new project (see Guide to the Project Cycle, page 19). All projects, since 1994, before being approved by ADG-TC have to be revised by the PPRC (Projects and Programmes Review Committee). PPRC is still present.</p>	<p>Improved standards for involvement of host Governments in project formulation and procedures for reviewing projects before submission to resources partners.</p>	4
Recommendations to FAO Asia IPC Project				
<p>Recommendation 8 Within the limits of available resources the FAO-managed IPC Asia project should conduct further follow-up in country to explore national level interest in a pilot exercise in Cambodia. The relatively strong analytical and coordination systems present in Cambodia provide a fertile context for piloting the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification system (IPC).</p>	<p>The FAO-managed ICP Asia project added Cambodia as a country.</p>	<p>IPC level 1 Training and Acute Analysis were conducted in Cambodia for a core group of national analysts in November 2012, resulting in the production of an IPC report. An assessment was made to gauge the feasibility of further IPC project support to Cambodia.</p>	<p>The inter-stakeholder platform National Technical Working Group for Food Security and Nutrition has incorporated IPC in its 2013-2014 work plan – Further IPC action and development in Cambodia and inclusion in IPC Global Support Unit Strategic Programme 2014-2016 is dependent on access to longer term funding streams.</p>	5