



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the United  
Nations

## Office of Evaluation

### **Mid-Term Evaluation of “Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme” (FSPS) – GCP /SUD/038/EC**

#### **Evaluation report**

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 2015

*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)

## **Acknowledgements**

The evaluation team would like to sincerely thank all those who generously gave us their time and shared their insights with us, without which this mid-term evaluation would not have been possible. We wish to thank functionaries of all the stakeholders we met, including the staff of several line ministries of the Government of Sudan, the European Union, WFP, FEWS NET, and representatives of Non-State Actors for their time. In particular, we would like to thank the Project Team – the Programme Support Unit and the Technical Support Units – and, in particular Mr. Charles Agobia the Chief Technical Adviser, for their generosity with their time, their responsiveness to our requests and for the frankness with which they responded to our many questions. A special word of thanks also goes to FAO technical staff in Headquarters who provided background information prior to fielding the mission. The support and comments of Ms. Luisa Belli, the Evaluation Manager during the course of the evaluation exercise were much appreciated. Finally, but by no means least, we are grateful to the General Service Staff both at HQ and in Khartoum who made the practical arrangements for our mission and field trips and resolved logistical issues, usually at short notice.

## **Composition of the Evaluation Team**

### ***Evaluation team***

Rima Al-Azar, Team Leader  
Hassan Abdel Ati, Team Member

### ***FAO Office of Evaluation***

Luisa Belli, Evaluation Manager, FAO Office of Evaluation (OED)

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	iii
Acronyms.....	v
Executive Summary.....	vi
<b>1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>15</b>
1.1 Background and purposes of the evaluation.....	15
1.2 Methodology of the evaluation.....	15
<b>2 Context of the project as outlined in the Project Document.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>3 Analysis of project concept and design.....</b>	<b>20</b>
3.1 Project’s concept and theory of change.....	20
3.2 Project Design.....	22
<b>4 Analysis of the implementation process.....</b>	<b>24</b>
4.1 Project Management.....	24
4.2 Financial resources management.....	28
4.3 Efficiency and effectiveness of the institutional arrangements including Government’s participation.....	30
<b>5 Analysis of results and contribution to stated objectives.....</b>	<b>32</b>
5.1 Achievements at Outputs level.....	32
5.2 Achievements at Outcome level.....	39
5.3 Gender equality.....	41
5.4 Capacity Development.....	42
5.5 Human-Rights Based Approach.....	43
5.6 Partnerships and Alliances.....	43
<b>6 Analysis by evaluation criteria.....</b>	<b>45</b>
6.1 Relevance.....	45
6.2 Efficiency.....	47
6.3 Effectiveness.....	48
6.4 Exit Strategy and Sustainability.....	50
6.5 Impact.....	51
<b>7 Conclusions and Recommendations.....</b>	<b>53</b>
7.1 Conclusions.....	53
7.2 Recommendations.....	55
<b>Annex 1 Terms of Reference.....</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Annex 2 Brief profile of evaluation team members.....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Annex 3 List of documents reviewed.....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Annex 4 List of institutions and stakeholders met/contacted during the evaluation ...</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>Annex 5 Project Logframes.....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>Annex 6 Trainings Held in 2013 and 2014.....</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>Annex 7 Checklists on Gender Mainstreaming in FSPS Programme.....</b>	<b>85</b>

## Acronyms

CPF	Country Programming Framework
CNA	Capacity Need Assessment
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DG	Director General
EC	European Commission
ERCU	Emergency and Rehabilitation Coordination Unit
ESA	Agricultural Development Economics Division (FAO)
ET	Evaluation Team
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FAO(R)	FAO Representative
FEWSNET	Famine Early Warning Systems Network
FFSTS	Federal Food Security Technical Secretariat
FS	Food Security
FSN	Food Security and Nutrition
FSNTWG	Food Security and Nutrition Technical Working Group
FSPS	Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme
FSTP	Food Security Thematic Programme
FSTS	Food Security Technical Secretariat
GAM	Global Acute Malnutrition
GOE	General Operating Expense
GoS	Government of Sudan
HQ	Headquarters
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approaches
LOA	Letter of Agreement
LTU	Lead Technical Unit
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MoH	Ministry of Health
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTDF	Multi-Donor Trust Fund
MTE	Mid Term Evaluation
NHBS	National Household Baseline Survey
NGO	Non-Governmental Organizations
NSA	Non-State Actor
OED	FAO Office of Evaluation
OPC	Office for Partnerships, Advocacy and Capacity Development (FAO)
PAC	Project Advisory Committee
PTC	Project Technical Committee
RO	Reporting Officer
SAM	Severe Acute Malnutrition
SFSTS	State Food Security Technical Secretariat
SIFSIA	Sudan Institutional Capacity Programme: Food Security Information for Action
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
TSS	Technical Support Services
TSU	Technical Support Unit
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
USD	United States Dollar
WFP	World Food Program

## **Executive Summary**

### ***Background***

ES1. The mid-term evaluation (MTE) of the “Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme (FSPS), GCP/SUD/038/EC” was carried out from October 2014 to February 2015 by a team of independent consultants, under the management of FAO Office of Evaluation, OED.

ES2. The MTE is a forward looking evaluation aimed at identifying challenges and opportunities for improving the Project during the second half of its implementation. The evaluation may also provide lessons for any future expansion of the Project in other States of the Sudan. Finally, it serves at identifying good practices which can be used to support the design, implementation and scaling up of similar initiatives, implemented by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in Sudan and in other countries/regions.

ES3. The Project is a three-year programme funded by the European Union (EU) and is being implemented by FAO in collaboration with the Government of the Republic of the Sudan. The FSPS is designed to support the four targeted State governments of the Blue Nile, Gedaref, Kassala, and the Red Sea in addressing the capacity gaps related to: (a) food security inter-sectoral institutional coordination framework, food security policy and information system; and (b) the line ministries’ policy planning, budgeting, monitoring and implementation capacity.

ES4. The Contribution Agreement between FAO and the EU for the implementation of the FSPS was officially signed on 6 November 2012. However, the actual implementation of the Project started in March 2013 when the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) was recruited. The total budget of the Project is EUR 8.6 million. As of 28 November 2014, approximately EUR 3,477,871 (40.44% of the total budget) has been spent/committed.

### ***Methodology***

ES5. The evaluation adheres to the UNEG Norms and Standards. It responds to five overarching questions and several key questions inspired by the Programme’s Outcomes and by the internationally accepted evaluation criteria. The Evaluation Team (ET) adopted a consultative and transparent approach and made use of the following methods and tools: (i) a desk review of literature, including the documents detailed in Annex 3; (ii) preparation of an evaluation matrix with related evaluation questions; (iii) semi-structured interviews with key informants and stakeholders; (iv) direct observation during field visits to three States: Blue Nile, Kassala, and the Red Sea; and (v) de-briefing workshops in the three States and Khartoum to discuss and validate findings and propose possible recommendations.

### ***Key Findings***

ES6. The Project’s theory of change is well-conceived and is built on FAO’s Capacity Development Framework which addresses capacities at the policy, organizational and individual level. The Project was intentionally designed in a “light” way, to allow for fine-tuning during implementation. However, the Project Document could have provided greater guidance and examples on the different types of training and associated methodologies and on the communications activities that were implemented. In addition, the Project’s concept placed too much emphasis on the mid-level technical capacity development and did not focus sufficiently on the political level and on the localities’ level which is the basic building block for any information system.

ES7. Project management is well-conceived in the Project Document. The Project has an excellent monitoring system for the training activities it is undertaking at the input and output level. However, it is missing the opportunity to monitor the learning achieved and the outcomes realized. The Project has a two-level institutional setup which consists of multisectoral Food Security Technical Secretariats at both the Federal as well as the State level. The Project's expenditures, 40.44% of the total budget as of 28 November 2014, are showing high variations among the different budget lines with proportionally a lower expenditure rate for the five Outputs. This rate, for effectiveness purposes, will need to be enhanced and accelerated in the next phase of the Project.

ES8. The Project has achieved mixed results at the output level, with Outputs 1, 3 and 5 being satisfactory and Outputs 2 and 4 unsatisfactory. At the outcome level, the stated outcome is already being achieved in three out of the four States, where the policy briefs and/or policy bulletins produced by the FSTSEs have resulted in policy changes that improved the food security and nutrition situation.

ES9. Gender is considered in both the implementation and monitoring of this Project. The Project has developed Gender Mainstreaming Guidelines for each of its outputs and it is important to ensure that the guidelines are implemented.

ES10. The Project is already collaborating with a few partners, yet there are several opportunities that are being missed and the Project could expand its collaboration and coordination with other development organizations, such as UNICEF, UNDP and international NGOs.

ES11. The Project is relevant to FAO's Strategic Objective H "Improved food security and better nutrition" which was in effect during Project preparation, as well as to FAO's current Strategic Objectives 1 and 5. In addition, the Project is relevant to Sudan's Country Programming Framework (CPF). Equally, it is relevant to the Government of Sudan's development plans, in general, and more specifically to the needs and priorities of the four targeted States.

ES12. The Project's implementation has been negatively affected by delays caused by several security, logistical and management issues and there are several actions that the Project could take in the second half of its implementation to improve its efficiency. The Project has nevertheless, attained several important outcome level achievements.

ES13. Overall, the Project has been moderately satisfactory in meeting its immediate objective in a relatively short implementation period. However, there are certain Outputs (2 and 4) that are lagging behind in implementation and, therefore, have limited if any effectiveness.

ES14. It is too soon to comment on the Project's sustainability. However, discussions have been initiated to implement an exit strategy and ensure sustainability. These include the legal and institutional set up of the FSTS, its financial sustainability and its staffing with multi-sectoral technically capable staff.

ES15. Project impact is promising. There are preliminary indications that the Project may contribute to improving Food Security and Nutrition in the four States. This may occur through the different usage of the information and analysis generated by the Project by governmental institutions, UN agencies and other development partners such as NGOs.

ES16. Based on the evidence collected throughout the evaluation process, the MTE drew a number of conclusions, which can be organized around the five key evaluation questions as follows.

ES17. *To what extent an effective cross-sectoral Food Security institutional framework was established and linked to the National institutional framework?*

ES18. Overall, the Project has succeeded in the four targeted States – the Blue Nile, Gedaref, Kassala, and the Red Sea – in bringing together different line ministries and some Non-State Actors to carry out multi-sectoral food security analysis with a unified understanding of the food security concept. Multi-sectoral Food Security Committees (FSC) and Food Security Technical Secretariats (FSTS) have been established in the four targeted States. The FSTSes are currently attached to the Ministry of Agriculture, have strong horizontal linkages within the States through different coordination mechanisms and working groups. However, the vertical linkages - upward with the Federal FSTS and downward with the localities - are weak. Furthermore, linkages and collaboration and information exchange among the four States is also poor to non-existent. Finally, the SFSTS have not yet been incorporated in the institutional structure of the State Government nor in its budget which could have an impact on the Project's sustainability. Discussions have been initiated at the State level to ensure that an appropriate exit strategy is put in place prior to the end of the Project.

ES19. At the Federal level, the FSTS was established by SIFSIA, a precursor FAO project. However, there is no institution corresponding to the FSC at the Federal level. The Higher Council on Food Security and Nutrition has yet to be established though it was one the recommendations of the SIFSIA evaluation in 2012. This continued delay in establishing the highest level inter-ministerial decision-making body may be a reflection of weak political will and both FAO and the EU in Khartoum need to continue lobbying for the issuance of the Presidential Decree which would allow the establishment of the Higher Council.

ES20. *To what extent the capacity to review, plan, budget and monitor Food Security (FS) policies and to develop strategies was enhanced, resulting in more effective public action for food security and nutrition?*

ES21. The Project has attempted to strengthen the capacities to develop policies and strategies for improving food security and nutrition. A two-week visit to Namibia and a training on sector policy analysis and design were implemented. However, they are insufficient to reach the level of capacity desired for policy planning, budgeting and monitoring. The approach to be followed in developing such capacities must be different from that of training for specific technical capacities. It is also important to ensure that those selected to participate in this training are at a sufficient senior level in their respective institutions and are in a position to influence policy-making.

ES22. Furthermore, policy-making goes hand-in-hand with an effective communications strategy. The Project did not envisage the design and implementation of a communication strategy that would (i) assist the FSTSes in having wider dissemination of its reports and analyses, (ii) develop the capacities of stakeholders to lobby and advocate for specific food security and nutrition activities; and (iii) build the capacities of media professionals to report and monitor food security and nutrition in their respective States.

ES23. *To what extent the Regional level Food Security information systems were strengthened and support decision making?*

ES24. The Project has succeeded in training 302 staff from different governmental and non-governmental institutions on various topics related to food security and nutrition. The training offered covered both technical topics (e.g., data collection and analysis, GIS, food security and nutrition concepts) to soft skills (e.g., report writing). The vast majority of those

trained (approximately 80%) come from line ministries and there is room for expanding the participants to include representatives from outside the government.

ES25. As a result of the training received, the four FSTSEs are producing good quality food security and nutrition policy briefs and bulletins that are highly appreciated and being used by line ministries, UN agencies and NGOs. These analytical reports are already producing an impact at the States' level and have been used to introduce/modify policies related to food security and nutrition.

ES26. *To what extent the capacity of Food Security oriented Non-State Actors' was strengthened?*

ES27. The Project has included representatives of Non-State Actors (NSA) in most of the training it has offered. They were also invited to participate in the Capacity Needs Assessment workshops – albeit in small numbers. NSAs are also represented on the various Food Security and Nutrition technical working groups and coordination committees. However, the Project's approach to NSAs is limited to representatives of the various unions (farmers, fishermen, vegetables, etc.) and does not include NGOs, the private sector, the media, etc. A comprehensive mapping of NSAs and a capacity needs assessment and development have yet to be carried out. A focused effort in the second half of the Project needs to be done in order to meet the Project's objective of building the NSAs capacities and ensuring their greater involvement in improving the food security and nutrition situation at the State level.

ES28. *To what extent key food insecurity drivers are better understood and linked to decision making?*

ES29. The Project has signed a total of eight LOAs with four different universities, one research center and one NGO to carry out research on various topics related to food security and nutrition covering production, accessibility and utilization and covering several sectors (e.g., agriculture, fisheries, livestock, natural resource management). The research is still ongoing therefore it is early for the MTE to determine to what extent the results and recommendations of the research teams would be linked to decision-making. However, it is important to ensure the quality of the research and its wide dissemination. This should support decision-makers in the formulation of specific food security and nutrition policies and strategies in their States.

ES30. In conclusion, during the first half of its implementation, the FSPS has faced and overcome several challenges. Notwithstanding the difficulties, the FSPS has been able to achieve important results. As a direct consequence of the reports produced by the FSTSEs, several policy changes for improving food security and nutrition have been implemented in the targeted States. Looking forward, the FSPS, during the second half of the Project, should consolidate its achievements by further strengthening the institutional set up and by focusing its efforts on developing the capacities for policy formulation. It should equally place greater attention on reaching out and developing the capacities of a greater number of NSAs as well as expand its definition of NSAs. In addition, in this second half of the Project, efforts undertaken in mainstreaming gender equality in the FSPS should be capitalized and consolidated. This entails among others the implementation of the Gender Mainstreaming Guidelines and monitoring of progress made in mainstreaming gender equality. Finally, the Project team as well as the FSTSEs would need to immediately initiate discussions to ensure a smooth exit strategy and to guarantee the institutional, financial and technical sustainability of the Project.

## ***Recommendations***

ES31. The recommendations formulated by this mid-term evaluation are forward looking and aim at providing guidance for the better implementation of activities in the second half of the project.

### **Recommendation 1: To the PSU and TSU on improving Project management.**

The MTE recommends a no cost-extension and budget revision. In addition, the MTE recommends the improvement of Project management through different steps, including recruiting short term consultants, better monitoring of expenditure rates, and harmonization of M&E framework among other steps.

ES32. It is in the opinion of the MTE that the following actions would have a positive impact on Project implementation and therefore, the Project team may wish to take them into consideration:

- Monitor more closely expenditures to achieve a greater balance between project management expenditures and output-based expenditures;
- Invite the Ministry of Health to be represented in both the PAC and Project Technical Committee to ensure that nutrition issues are included, monitored and addressed by the project.
- Encourage the Ministry of Livestock to participate in the PAC;
- Organize an externally facilitated workshop for PSU and TSU in order to address staff morale, backstopping, communication, and implementation of activities at the State level issues;
- Increase PSU backstopping missions to the four States. Quarterly coordination meetings between the PSU and TSUs could be done on a rotational basis in the States and only occasionally in Khartoum;
- Ensure that funds are disbursed, as soon as possible, to Gedaref's TSU in order to carry out the necessary physical improvements of office space;
- Recruit specialized short-term consultants to assist PSU/TSU in implementing specific Project Outputs (e.g., expert on NSAs, expert on communication and advocacy, experts on strategy/policy formulation);
- Recruit short-term gender expert to assist the PSU/TSU in implementing the Gender Mainstreaming Guidelines beyond the gender disaggregation of participants in training and other type of workshops;
- Unify M&E framework for the four States, harmonize data collection (type, frequency, template), provide standardized template for bulleting and briefs;
- Improve management of LOAs ensuring that tranches are paid only when the activities have been undertaken and verified and financial receipts have been submitted;
- Assess National Program Coordinators' and, as required, organize a handover from the International Advisor to the NPC; Revise NPCs' ToRs, grade and salary to reflect their new responsibilities;
- Support the States to fill in vacant positions in a timely manner???
- Organize visit of FAOR to four States to discuss exit strategy including the institutional, legal, budgetary arrangements that are necessary for ensuring the Project's sustainability; and

- Quantify SFSTS costs (salaries, operational costs, etc.) to start planning an exit strategy and to make sure that the adequate funds are included in the States' annual budgets.

**Recommendation 2: To FAO and the EU and their partners (e.g., WFP, UNICEF, etc.) on the establishment of an effective cross-sectoral Food Security institutional framework and linking it to the National institutional framework (Output 1).**

The MTE recommends that FAO and the EU and their partners (e.g., WFP, UNICEF, etc.) continue advocating for the issuance of a Presidential Decree which would establish the Higher Council on Food Security and Nutrition under the office of the Vice President at the Federal Level.

**Recommendation 3: To the PSU and TSU on the establishment of an effective cross-sectoral Food Security institutional framework and linking it to the National institutional framework (Output 1).**

The MTE recommends further strengthening of the vertical and horizontal institutional linkages for improving food security and nutrition. The MTE recommends carrying out an in-depth institutional analysis which would also guide the formulation of an exit strategy.

ES33. This may include among others the following activities:

- Strengthen *vertical (upward) linkages* between the Federal FSTS and State FSTSES by establishing formal MoUs between the Federal FSTS and States FSTSES. Ensure that State FSTS share on a regular basis with Federal level bulletins, reports, etc. Ensure that quarterly visits are undertaken by the Federal FSTS to the States' FSTS for backstopping and monitoring. Set up an informal mailing list among all professional staff of FSTS (linking all nutrition-, crop production-, livestock staff, etc. in informal communication groups to exchange information and communicate on a regular basis);
- Strengthen *vertical (downward) linkages* between State FSTSES and focal points in the localities. Explore opportunities to collaborate with NGOs, INGOs and other UN agencies working at the locality level for strengthening information collection at the locality level. Expand number of staff trained at locality level. Provide locality focal points with an official letter explaining the reasons for collecting information and its use and dissemination;
- Strengthen *horizontal linkages* among the four SFSTSES (sharing of information and experiences, exchange visits, etc.);
- Strengthen *horizontal linkages* with the private sector, media, State parliamentarians, civil society organizations, research institutions and Unions, etc.;
- Establish and strengthen M&E in the four State and Federal FSTSES;
- Recruit a short-term expert to carry out an in-depth institutional assessment and provide recommendations for (i) streamlining and reducing number of working groups (coordination structures); (ii) revising and harmonizing TORs for different working groups and FSTS; (iii) suggest recommendations for an exit strategy which would address the institutional, financial and human resource issues within each State; and
- Request the State Government to issue, as soon as possible, a written order signed by the Wali ensuring that the Project's assets (offices, vehicles, computers, furniture)

remain with the SFSTS (regardless of where the FSTS would be located institutionally at the end of the Project).

**Recommendation 4: To the PSU and TSU on the capacity to review, plan, budget and monitor Food Security (FS) policies and strategies developed, resulting in more effective public action for food security and nutrition. (Output 2).**

The MTE team recommends greater attention and effort be placed to develop strategy and policy formulation capacities and to develop and implement a Communications Strategy that would complement effective policy making.

ES34. In order to achieve the above, the following steps may be considered:

- With the participation of the FAO Rep, organize awareness-raising workshops for high-level decision-makers (political) at State level (e.g., Wali, Ministers and DGs, Parliamentarians, and leaders of NSAs) to create buy-in for strategy and policy formulation;
- Organize a two-stage training in each State: (i) on policy and strategy formulation and implementation for appropriate level stakeholders (from government and non-government); (ii) followed by the elaboration of the State Food Security and Nutrition Strategy. Include the National Program Coordinators in this training;
- Ensure that gender issues are addressed in all food security and nutrition policies; Ensure that gender balance is considered in policy dialogue forums and that women are adequately represented in the decision-making process;
- Ensure that trainers for the above-mentioned training are highly qualified to offer both the training and facilitate the strategy formulation;
- Disseminate the FSN strategy once formulated to all government institutions and development actors in the State; and
- Recruit a communications expert to assist the Project in formulating and implementing a communications strategy.

**Recommendation 5: To the PSU and TSU on functional Regional level Food Security information systems strengthened and supports decision-making (Output 3).**

The MTE recommends the fine-tuning of the training workshops to improve their efficiency and effectiveness.

ES35. Several actions can be taken to improve and fine-tune the training activities which would improve both their efficiency and effectiveness. They may include among others the following activities:

- *Selection*: Improve the selection of participants by establishing and applying selection criteria (e.g., residing within the State and within localities for locality focal points, age considerations, specialization and function of participants within his/her line ministry, etc.). Furthermore, it is strongly recommended that participant selection is made at State level and not in Khartoum for better follow up.
- *Number of trainees*: Expand the number of trainees at State level to ensure that each FSTS staff and focal points at locality level has at least one or two other government staff trained on the same topic as back-up. Ensure greater representation of women among participants, especially in the States that have had so far low representation.

- *Venue*: Increase trainings done at the State level on a rotational basis to provide opportunity for States to learn from each other and to increase number of participants from States.
- *Topics*: Organize a training on analysis of causes and processes of food insecurity and malnutrition (not only data collection and analysis). Consider introducing the Right to Adequate Food concept and approach in future trainings. Set up information databanks to organize and harmonize all the different food security information systems available. Install database software in FSTS and provide on- the-job training on how to use it. Train FSTS admin/finance staff.
- *Training provision*: One-off training is normally not enough to change the activities and processes of individuals and their organizations. Hence, sustainable and long-term training solutions should be considered using partner institutions.
- *Institutionalization of training*: Ensure that organizations adopt the new responsibilities (data collection, analysis, etc.), raise awareness about the new responsibilities and ensure country ownership of the processes.
- *Follow up on TOT*: follow up on TOT training to ensure that they are being implemented at the State level, especially those trained on gender and food security and nutrition.
- *Quality*: Conduct pre and post tests to capture and assess the extent of knowledge and skills acquired. For training that is offered in packages, ensure that trainees have acquired knowledge/skills before moving on to the higher level module. Ensure that the same participant attends all the training modules.
- *Type of training*: expand type of training offered from classroom style to include additional on-the-job training, mentoring, online courses, etc.

**Recommendation 6: To the PSU, TSU and FSTS on functional Regional level Food Security information systems strengthened and supports decision-making (Output 3).**

The MTE recommends the improvement of the food security documents being produced, their wider dissemination, and the regular monitoring of their usage and impact.

ES36. The following actions are recommended:

- Harmonize food security and nutrition documents (bulletins, briefs, reports) that are produced in the four States and ensure that they are available in Arabic as well as in English;
- Widen outreach by disseminating the reports to include media, parliamentarians, research institutions and researchers and other concerned NSAs;
- Design and implement a user feedback mechanism; and
- Monitor systematically policy changes resulting from SFSTS policy briefs and bulletins.

**Recommendation 7: To the PSU and TSU on the strengthening of food security oriented Non-State Actors' capacity (Output 4).**

The MTE recommends urgently the acceleration and prioritization of the implementation of Output 4 for strengthening the capacities of food security oriented Non-State Actors.

ES37. In particular, the evaluation recommends the following:

- Recruit urgently a short term consultant to map NSAs (INGOS, NGOS, Unions, media, private sector, Chamber of Commerce) in each State and carry out a participatory capacity assessment and design an action plan for achieving this output;
- Develop and carry out specialized training for each category of NSA;
- Expand dissemination list of SFSTS-generated reports and documents to reach a wider number of NSAs, including the media, the private sector, researchers, university professors, parliamentarians, and religious leaders; and
- Explore opportunities for collaborating with other UN agencies, INGOs and NGOs to provide joint training and raise awareness at locality level (e.g., in Kassala, there is a potential of collaborating with WFP and its implementing partners at the locality level).

**Recommendation 8: To the PSU and TSU on better understanding of key food insecurity drivers and linking them to decision making (Output 5).**

The MTE recommends that a rigorous and participative quality assurance process be established and that the research reports be widely disseminated.

ES38. In order to achieve the above, the Project team may want to implement the following:

- Quality research: Ensure that an adequate review process to ensure quality of research is put in place and followed. Ensure that gender issues are analyzed. Results/recommendations should be action oriented. Organize a workshop where the eight draft research reports are presented with an external discussant to provide recommendations for finalization; and
- Dissemination of research/study reports: ensure dissemination to a wide range of relevant stakeholders and users, including academicians, government departments, development agencies, media, parliamentarians, and public libraries; and
- Action following research: Organize a workshop at State level to present revised draft and to design a participatory action plan with assigned tasks to utilize research results in order to implement activities which result in improved food security and nutrition at the State level.

**Recommendation 9: To the PSU and TSU on mainstreaming gender.**

The MTE recommends that the Gender Mainstreaming Guidelines are implemented and that efforts already undertaken by the Project for mainstreaming gender equality in FSPS are consolidated.

ES39. This should entail the following suggested actions:

- Regular follow up on training of TOT on gender, food security and nutrition;
- Ensure gender analysis, when relevant, is part of all research undertaken by the Project; and
- Ensure monitoring on progress in mainstreaming gender equality.

## **1 Introduction**

### ***1.1 Background and purposes of the evaluation***

1. The mid-term evaluation (MTE) of the “Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme (FSPS), GCP/SUD/038/EC” is a forward looking evaluation aimed at identifying challenges and opportunities for improving the Project during the second half of its implementation. It may also provide lessons for any future expansion of the Project in other States of the Sudan. Finally, it serves at identifying good practices which can be used to support the design, implementation and scaling up of similar initiatives, implemented by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in Sudan and in other countries/regions. Annex 1 includes the MTE’s detailed Terms of Reference (ToRs).

2. The Project is a three-year programme funded by the European Union (EU) and is being implemented by FAO in collaboration with the Government of the Republic of the Sudan. FSPS is designed to support the four targeted State governments of the Blue Nile, Gedaref, Kassala, and the Red Sea in addressing the capacity gaps related to: (a) food security inter-sectoral institutional coordination framework, food security policy and information system; and (b) the line ministries’ policy planning, budgeting, monitoring and implementation capacity.

3. The Contribution Agreement between FAO and the EU for the implementation of FSPS was officially signed on 6 November 2012. However, the actual implementation of the Project started in March 2013 when the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) was recruited. The total budget of the Project is EUR 8.6 million. As of 28 November 2014, approximately EUR 3,477,871 (40.44% of the total budget) has been spent/committed.<sup>1</sup>

4. The MTE was carried out from November 2014 to February 2015. It was conducted by two experienced capacity development experts with significant food security and evaluation experience (see Annex 2 for a brief bio).

### ***1.2 Methodology of the evaluation***

5. The evaluation adheres to the UNEG Norms and Standards. It responds to five overarching questions and several key questions inspired by the Programme’s Outcomes and by the internationally accepted evaluation criteria. The Evaluation Team (ET) adopted a consultative and transparent approach and made use of the following methods and tools: (i) a desk review of literature, including the documents detailed in Annex 3; (ii) preparation of an evaluation matrix with related evaluation questions; (iii) semi-structured interviews with key informants and stakeholders; (iv) direct observation during field visits to three States: Blue Nile, Kassala, and the Red Sea; and (v) de-briefing workshops in the three States and Khartoum to discuss and validate findings and propose possible recommendations.

6. Per the ToRs, the MTE focused on the following five key issues:

- The extent to which an effective cross-sectoral Food Security institutional framework was established and linked to the National institutional framework;

---

<sup>1</sup> The financial statement provided to the MTE was not officially endorsed by CSF, therefore, all the financial figures presented in this report are approximate.

- The extent to which the capacity to review, plan, budget and monitor Food Security (FS) policies and to develop strategies was enhanced, resulting in more effective public action for food security and nutrition;
- The extent to which the Regional level Food Security information systems were strengthened and support decision making;
- *The extent to which the capacity of Food Security oriented Non-State Actors' was strengthened; and*
- *The extent to which key food insecurity drivers are better understood and linked to decision making.*

7. The Evaluation Team (ET) began by meeting the OED Evaluation Manager in Rome to agree on the methodological way forward. It also held meetings with key senior FAO HQ technical staff who were involved in the conceptualisation and/or implementation of the Project. In Khartoum, following an in-depth briefing by the Programme Support Unit (PSU), the MTE carried out several interviews with key stakeholders, including the EU, line ministries and other partners such as WFP and FEWS NET.

8. The MTE carried out field visits to three out of the four States where the Project is being implemented. These were the Blue Nile, Kassala, and the Red Sea States. In each State, the MTE had an in-depth briefing with the Project's Technical Support Unit (TSU) and the State's Food Security Technical Secretariat (FSTS). In addition, the MTE met with the key stakeholders which included representatives from UN agencies, INGOs, line ministries, Non-State Actors, and academicians/researchers. A detailed list of persons met and interviewed is provided in Annex 4.

9. With regards to the content of the interviews, a list of questions was drawn. The questions were adapted to the stakeholders being interviewed (e.g., FSTS staff, line ministry staff, non-state actor, academia, etc.). Space was given for new questions that may have arisen during the interview.

10. Several debriefing sessions took place. A debriefing was organized in each of the three States that the MTE visited. In addition, a validation workshop was held in Khartoum where most of the key stakeholders were present to share the evaluation's preliminary findings and recommendations. Finally, a debriefing session took place in at FAO Headquarters (HQ) with OED and FAO technical staff to share the MTE's the key findings.

11. The MTE has the following limitations:

- *Limited time:* two days/State was allocated which were insufficient for spending the necessary time at the State level for meeting all the stakeholders and/or for having more in-depth discussions with them.
- *Coverage of States:* the MTE team was unable to visit the State of Gedaref. However, it held a meeting with the Gedaref FSTS and the State's Ministry of Agriculture's focal point in Khartoum which provided the MTE team with some impressions of the achievements and challenges in Gedaref but insufficient detailed information to evaluate the progress achieved so far in Gedaref as well as the challenges being faced.
- *Field missions limited to the States' capital:* budget and time constraints did not allow the MTE team to visit the localities, thus limiting the ability to assess the capacity to collect food security and nutrition information at the local level.

## 2 Context of the project as outlined in the Project Document

12. While sustainable development and poverty reduction form part of the Government of Sudan's strategic objectives, food security tends to be associated with agricultural and livestock production and is presented as one of the main objectives of the development of agriculture in the country.<sup>2</sup> Consequently, strategic thinking on food security is very much linked to the issue of availability of food through national production, particularly in relation to cereals. Hence, although the agriculture sector can address part of the availability and access problems, the overall food security situation in the country is much more complex.

13. The food insecurity and malnutrition situation in Sudan has been the result of several inter-related factors which collectively resulted in what has been known as a "complex emergency", and the main drivers varied in time and space. Key among these drivers are the civil war and its attendant displacement, climatic variability resulting in recurrent droughts and floods, inadequate investment in small-holder farming, lack of food security policies, poor rural infrastructure and weak rural markets. The continued limited access to public services for people in remote pastoralist regions and the focus on selected cereal commodities suitable for urban population and emerging international market situations will further exacerbate the food security situation in the Sudan. Limited access to basic public services combined with the above chronic and transient factors have resulted in more than three million people requiring humanitarian assistance every year. Numbers of vulnerable communities are also on the rise. According to the 2009 National Household Baseline Survey (NHBS), one out of three Sudanese suffered from food deprivation. Parts of the country remain in the grip of civil conflict and large numbers of people live in poverty. The prevalence of under nourishment remains high. The lack of national food security policies and strategies to address the various food insecurity drivers mentioned above has often been cited as a chronic problem. Moreover, there is limited attention from the Government for addressing food insecurity in a sustainable manner as the sector continues to be given less priority by the different States. Box 1 provides an overview of the specific food security context in the four targeted States.

### Box 1. Food Security Context in the Four Targeted States<sup>3</sup>

#### Blue Nile State

Due to its geographical location, the Blue Nile State has been part of the conflict which has had a devastating effect that left severe scars on the physical, human and economic assets of the state. It also suffers from a lack of basic infrastructure and social services.

The state has five livelihood and land-use patterns: large-scale semi-mechanized farming, agro-pastoralism, transhumant pastoralism (nomads), small-holder irrigation and fishing along the Blue Nile River and Roseires Dam. Historically, the Blue Nile State is a dry-season grazing land for nomadic pastoralists, rich with woodland, mostly of acacia species, with dispersed settled farming communities practicing rainfed agriculture, gum collection and small-scale flood/residual moisture cultivation (girouf). The principle livelihood system in the Blue Nile State is nomadic pastoralism and agro-pastoralism, with vegetable production practiced on the banks of the Roseires Lake and fishing in the lake. However, the vast majority of pastoral households in the Blue Nile State engage, to varying degrees, in crop production. The herders are therefore compelled to purchase bran, straw and sorghum grain from the semi-mechanized farmers. The herders are also dependent on limited water

<sup>2</sup> See, for example: Ministry of Agriculture & Forestry, "Strategy for National Development of Agriculture – Horizon 2015, June 2005 and High Advisory Committee, The Green Mobilization 2007-2010, November 2006.

<sup>3</sup> Inception and Progress Report, 1 February - 30 June 2013, Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme (GCP/SUD/038/EC), FAO, 2013.

resources and are constantly facing conflicts with other land users over access to land and water resources along the stock routes.

The NBHS (2009) revealed that the prevailing level of poverty in the Blue Nile State amounts to 56.5 percent of the population below the poverty line. Poverty rates are much lower in urban areas, where 29.5 percent are below the poverty line, compared to 59.6 percent of the rural population. The rainfed mono-cropping system used for food grain production, mainly sorghum, allows for little variety of vegetables to be included in the rainfed production system. The lack of sufficient agricultural extension and appropriate policies and strategies, inadequate pest control, and inappropriate water harvesting systems has further contributed to food insecurity in the state.

### **Gedaref State**

The economy in Gedaref is dependent largely on a mix of pastoralism and agriculture (traditional rainfed, mechanized rainfed and irrigated). Gedaref State has more than 10.6 million arable feddan<sup>3</sup>, though these huge resources are acquired by few well-positioned merchants, who have access to huge agricultural schemes that exceed the permitted acreage. This contributed to the problems of land shortage and blocked traditional routes that were used by pastoralists during their seasonal movements.

The NBHS (2009) revealed that the prevailing level of poverty in Gedaref State amounted to 50.1 percent of the population below the poverty line. Poverty rates are much lower in urban areas, where 26.5 percent are below the poverty line, compared to 57.6 percent of the rural population. The Nutrition Department of the State Ministry of Health, with support from the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), conducted a nutrition assessment of 147 villages in Gedaref State using a simple spatial sampling method during June-July 2012. The results reflected continuous deterioration of the nutrition level: the Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) rate was estimated at 20.1 percent and Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) at 5.0 percent. Comparing these results with those of 2009 (GAM was 16.1 percent and SAM was 3.8 percent) shows that there is a real food insecurity and malnutrition issue in the state.

### **Kassala State**

The population in Kassala State is characterized by high levels of chronic poverty and food insecurity and by vulnerability to shocks, including drought, floods and conflict. Hence, livelihoods are clearly dynamic and adapting to the changing environment which includes both threats, such as environmental degradation, and opportunities, such as urban growth. Levels of poverty are extremely high, with 85 percent of the population estimated to be below the poverty line. A high proportion of income is spent on food, with water and fuel also representing significant expenses, and high levels of household debt is common. The 2007 annual needs assessment found that for Kassala, "the 2006 agricultural season was good overall". It argues that, "the food security situation in Kassala reflects chronic poverty, rather than the impacts of transitory shock" and that "development and safety net interventions would be more appropriate than emergency food assistance".

There is a need for much more focus and analysis on the wider dimensions of food security, notably availability of and trends in wages for casual labor, cross border trade, marketing, access to land, urban poverty and rural to urban links, remittances and key items of expenditure within household budgets (health and education costs, water and fuel costs and taxation). More in-depth analysis of the pastoralist economy is also required in order to inform policies and interventions which impact on the food security of pastoralist groups.

One of the key historical problems in Kassala State is that, while food production of the staple crop sorghum (dhura) is primarily in the rainfed and traditional sector, investment in agriculture has historically been concentrated in the modern and irrigated sector and very little attempts were made to develop the traditional sector or address its problems. In addition, there is no national food security policy and food security management system, and generally there is fragmentation between various ministries, which has led to an unintegrated food security approach in the state. Furthermore, there is a deficiency of food security information, and a lack of adequate early warning systems, monitoring systems and quick-response mechanisms (poor timing of interventions). There is also limited research on and support to traditional agriculture and subsistence pastoralism.

Both Gedarif and Kassala States suffer the problem of continued influx of refugees since the 1960s and currently hosting over 300,000 refugees mainly from Ethiopia and Eritrea.

### **Red Sea State**

Over the last three decades, livelihood systems in the Red Sea State have been subject to different environmental and socio-economic challenges; they include drought, floods and long dry spells, which have had

a negative impact on the food security situation of the local population. Highly complex concerts of factors, both natural and man-made, have combined to create a situation of structural poverty and food insecurity. Acute malnutrition indices were reported to be the highest among all Sudanese states. The rural population in the Red Sea State has experienced several types of food insecurity, extending from mild malnutrition to severe famine during the last century. The accumulated impact of drought cycles and mismanagement of the meagre resources culminated in a chronic food security crisis that causes suffering to the nomads and agro-pastoralist population of the state. The predominant ethnic group is the Beja, whose traditional livelihood of transhumant pastoralism (moving from place to place in search of water and pastures for livestock) and agro-pastoralism, has adapted to the adverse unpredictable climate and limited natural resources base in the Red Sea State. The Beja and other population groups are now suffering from a chronic livelihoods crisis and acute food insecurity, as a result of various long-term macro-level factors that have negatively impacted their ability to grow crops and maintain sustainable herd sizes, which are the traditional main sources of food and income.

The natural resource base of the Red Sea State includes the fertile areas of Tokar and Arbaat, the natural pasture and grazing land, and marine resources distributed along the coastline. However, the availability of sufficient pasture and water to sustain large livestock herds has been reduced due to restricted access to traditional pasture areas (partly due to poor water policies and practices that have seen diversion of water from the former dry-season grazing areas of the Arbaat Delta to serve Port Sudan town) and the influx of other non-Beja groups, which in turn have increased the pressure on the remaining natural resources and contributed to ecological degradation. Small-scale crop production has also been negatively impacted over the last ten years by the rapid spread of Mesquite trees that has significantly reduced the area of agricultural land, disrupted irrigation channels and provided shelter for pests, particularly in the Delta areas and South Tokar. This has led to increased sharecropping by farmers. The lack of sufficient agricultural extension and appropriate policies and strategies, inadequate pest control and inappropriate water-harvesting systems has further contributed to the inability to grow crops and attain food security in the state.

### 3 Analysis of project concept and design

#### Box 2. Key findings

**The Project's theory of change is well-conceived** and is built on FAOs Capacity Development Framework which addresses capacities at the policy, organizational and individual level.

**The Project was intentionally designed in a "light" way**, leaving specific details open in order to allow for fine-tuning during implementation. However, the Project Document could have provided greater guidance and examples of the different types of training and associated methodologies and on the communications activities that were implemented. In addition, the Project's concept placed too much emphasis on the mid-level technical capacity development and did not focus sufficiently on the political level – partly due to donor consideration – nor on the localities' level which is the basic building block for any information system.

#### 3.1 Project's concept and theory of change

14. Between 2006 and 2012, the EU funded the "Sudan Institutional Capacity Programme: Food Security Information for Action (SIFSIA)". SIFSIA made tremendous effort in laying the foundations for integrated and coordinated food security information and policy action through intensive capacity building activities. However, despite its successes, SIFSIA's support was primarily delivered at the Government of Sudan (GoS) Federal level with limited outreach and support to the State level food security information system, through allocating modest funds and intensive capacity building activities.

15. The rationale for expanding the scope of food security information and policy implementation to the State level is twofold: (i) it enables the information at the Federal level to be more representative; and (ii) it allows the target States to make their own decisions based on information collected and analyzed at the State level.

16. The desired impact of the Project is to contribute to improved food security in four target States in the Sudan, over the long-term. More specifically, the Project's objective is to make "Food Security decisions more inclusive, better integrated, informed, implemented and monitored". The States' capacity will be strengthened in the collection and analysis of core or essential elements of food security information which will in turn help the Federal level to have enough knowledge about food security situations at the State/Regional level.

17. The Project's theory of change is built on FAOs Capacity Development Framework which addresses capacities at the policy, organizational and individual level. The Project's theory of change is straightforward. By building the individual capacities of a range of actors involved in improving food security and nutrition, by enhancing the capacities of the FSTS to collect, analyze and disseminate information; and by ensuring that the institutional and policy environment is conducive for improving food security and nutrition, the Project would be able to contribute to the improvement of food security and nutrition in the four targeted States. In addition, the Project's concept rested on the multisectoral nature of food security and nutrition and the importance of involving not only public institutions but also non-governmental ones, such as NGOs, universities and the private sector.

18. Assessing the validity of this theory of change requires reviewing the content and structure of the Project's logical framework (hereinafter, logframe). The logframe is simple, with one envisaged outcome expected to be achieved through the delivery of five outputs. A closer examination of the logframe (see Table 1) reveals that the outputs relate to better vertical and horizontal *institutional* integration (Output 1); improving information for better *policy formulation* and decision-making (Output 2); developing the *technical capacities of*

staff involved in food security and nutrition issues (Output 3); and improving implementation through the involvement of *Non-State Actors and academic/research institutions* (Outputs 4 and 5).

**Table 1. Project logframe result chain**

<b>Outcome: Food Security decisions are more inclusive, better integrated, informed, implemented and monitored in selected States of Sudan.</b>
Output 1: Effective cross-sectoral Food Security institutional framework established and linked to the National institutional framework.
Output 2: Capacity to review, plan, budget and monitor Food Security (FS) policies and strategies developed, resulting in more effective public action for food security and nutrition.
Output 3: Functional Regional level Food Security information systems strengthened and support decision-making.
Output 4: Food Security oriented Non-State Actors' capacity strengthened.
Output 5: Key food insecurity drivers are better understood and linked to decision making.

19. However, a closer examination of the results chain, especially its vertical linkages, demonstrates that there are weaknesses. The Project – due to donor requirements – did not place enough emphasis on the upward linkages between the States and the Federal level. This resulted in the Project being implemented directly at State level with very weak participation from the Federal level. In the opinion of the MTE, the Federal level has an important role to play in coordinating, monitoring and providing technical assistance to the States' level. Strengthening this relationship would also have an impact on the Project's institutional sustainability. Furthermore, the Project concept did not elaborate a strategy for concerted lobbying by the different stakeholders to ensure the establishment of the Higher Council on Food Security and Nutrition. Even though the Project was conceived to be implemented at the States' level, without such a Higher Council, the long-term sustainability might be jeopardized.

20. Similarly, regarding the downward linkages, the Project envisaged training one focal point per locality for collecting information. In the MTE's view, this is not sufficient for ensuring a well-functioning information system since such a system rests on the capacities available at the local level to collect and transmit data and information to the State level to be analysed.

21. The initial logframe elaborated as part of the Project Document, was revised and significantly improved during the Inception Phase. The revised logframe monitoring elements (indicators, means of verification, assumptions) are, in general, well-conceived (see Annex 5 Project logframe). Most of them are clear, relevant, valid and contextually sound. All indicators are quantitative, which is consistent with the way in which the corresponding outcome and outputs are worded. Means of verification are reliable and simple to use. Assumptions are logical and comply with the real-life context in which the Project works.

22. In conclusion and in the opinion of the MTE team, the Project's concept placed too much emphasis on the mid-level technical capacity development and did not focus sufficiently on the political level – partly due to donor consideration – nor on the localities' level which is the basic building block for any information system.

### 3.2 *Project Design*

23. The Project built on the achievements of the SIFSIA and the Sudan Productive Capacity Program (SPCR) – implemented in the Blue Nile and the Red Sea States. According to Project staff and several stakeholders, low involvement and consultations with different stakeholders at the State level during project design<sup>4</sup> led to unrealistic expectations by the project partners in terms of monetary and material benefits from the Project resources. The expectations are beyond the resource capacity of the Project, as all costs in the Project Document are reserved to specific expenses that do not accommodate some of the requests of the partners. This insufficient stakeholders' involvement at State level during the design phase resulted in poor understanding of the Project's objectives and required spending more time initially to get buy-in and for establishing the SFSTSeS.

24. The Project was intentionally designed in a “light” way, leaving specific details open in order to allow fine-tuning during implementation. For example, the design recognized the importance of carrying out Capacity Needs Assessments (CNA) for each State prior to the implementation of capacity development activities. The CNAs were meant to capture the needs and differences of each State in terms of capacities, intuitional set up, food security and nutrition challenges etc. It was also meant to provide the Project with greater flexibility during implementation to adapt the Project according to needs identified. As a consequence, the Project Document is agnostic on the training program that would be followed to build the technical capacity of staff. It states that “the method and type of training will be determined during the inception phase after a thorough training needs assessment is conducted”. While it is important not to “over-design” a project and to leave a certain degree of flexibility during implementation, the risk of having an “open” design is that the capacity development activities undertaken by the Project may be limited to classroom training, which was mostly the case in the FSPS. The Project Document could have provided some guidance and examples of the different types of training and methodologies such as “blended learning” - a combination of e-learning, online workshops, and mentoring - to provide continuous learning opportunities to staff. It could have identified potential local partners (research centers, universities, UN agencies) that could have provided part of the training and, in general, provide better guidance on the training activities. Identifying and working with local partners (universities, UN agencies, training institutes) would ensure that training can be repeated, and that ongoing support can be provided to learners.

25. The design envisaged communication activities which mostly focused on Project “visibility” campaigns. Both design and implementation could have been improved should there have been a communication strategy for the Project which would have included training media professionals on food security and nutrition issues, assisting the FSTS in implementing an information dissemination strategy (mapping first the recipients of information then identifying the best channel of communicating with them whether by email, printed documents, high-level workshops etc.).

26. The Project Document did specify the Government's financial contribution (local component), in particular, it mentioned “a direct contribution to programme activities (starting after the first year) that should progressively increase as the programme nears its

---

<sup>4</sup> Several consultation workshops were held once implementation had started. However, stakeholders interviewed indicated that during the design, not enough stakeholders were consulted or involved in the design.

completion” and that the State FSTS would be provided with adequate office space”. However, the Project’s budget did not include financial resources specifically for setting up the SFSTSes. While in the Blue Nile and Red Sea States, the TSU and the FSTS were provided the offices of previous FAO projects, in Gedaref and Kassala it was not the case. This design weakness was addressed during implementation when funds - originally earmarked for office furniture - were re-allocated for constructing/rehabilitating offices for the FSTS in Gedaref and Kassala. However, as of the MTE, the resources for Gedaref to ensure adequate office space have not yet been fully disbursed which has an impact on the Project’s implementation and staff morale.

## 4 Analysis of the implementation process

### Box 3. Key findings

**Project management is well-conceived in the ProDoc.**

**Financial management could be improved** since to date, approximately 40.44% of the total budget has been expended with a large variance in expenditures among the different budget lines

The Project has an excellent monitoring system for the training activities it is undertaking at the input and output level. However, it is missing the opportunity to monitor the learning achieved and the outcomes realized.

**The Project has a two-level institutional setup** which consists of multisectoral Food Security Technical Secretariats at both the Federal as well as the State level.

### 4.1 Project Management

27. The Project is managed by a Program Support Unit (PSU) in Khartoum and four Technical Support Units (TSU) at the State level (see Table 2). The PSU was established within the existing FSTS, taking advantage of investments made by SIFSIA and ensuring some light-weight support to the Federal FSTS. Its main role is to provide overall management and coordination of the activities, with essentially three functions: (i) provision of technical assistance and support to the TSUs, State FSTS and State line ministries (where appropriate) and to Non-State Actors, localities and other public institutions through the State TSU; (ii) overall management (finance, procurement, logistics etc.) monitoring, review and approval of Project activities at Federal level and in the States; and (iii) coordination and ensuring synergies among Project activities and other institutions.

28. The TSUs were established in each of the targeted States. The TSU is responsible for: (i) capacity building of the State FSTS and its technical units; (ii) monitoring and follow up of Project activities implemented by the State FSTS; and (iii) supporting line ministries' food security information system components. While originally, as stated in the Project Document, the TSU was supposed to be under the office of the State Governor within the Strategic Planning General Secretariat, during implementation the TSU and the SFSTSs were established within the State's Ministry of Agriculture. Being located in close physical proximity with the SFSTSes and the Ministry of Agriculture's focal points has allowed daily interaction and facilitated two-way communication.

29. According to different stakeholders interviewed by the ET in the four States, there is a need for greater support from the PSU to both the TSUs and the Project focal points in the Ministries' of Agriculture in the four States. The support needed includes greater backstopping the PSU (e.g., more frequent field missions to the States, stronger technical feedback on the draft policy briefs/bulletins, greater clarity regarding budget expenditures per State, etc.). The insufficient backstopping provided so far has strained the relationship between the PSU and the TSUs. The ET has been informed that the PSU is planning to address this in the second half of the Project and intends to increase the frequency of its backstopping missions to the four States. In addition, the TSUs face certain implementation challenges at the State level that require greater backing from the PSU and, possibly, also from the FAO Representative.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> The MTE was informed that a field mission headed by the FAO(R) was organized in June 2014 to discuss project sustainability and the States' support. However, the mission had to be postponed as the officials from the Federal government were unable to participate.

**Table 2. Staffing of Project as Envisaged in ProDoc**

<b>PSU Staff</b>
One international CTA <sup>6</sup> (36 months)
One international Food Security Information Systems Expert <sup>7</sup> (24 months)
One national Programme Coordinator (36 months)
Support staff composed of one administration and finance officer, one driver and one office attendant/cleaner
<b>TSU Staff</b>
One International Technical Advisor (24 months)
One National State Programme Coordinator (36 months)
One National Technical Advisor seconded by the counterpart institutions
Support staff composed of an administration and finance officer, a driver and an office attendant/cleaner

30. A high-level Project Advisory Committee (PAC) was formed with Federal and State level government representatives as well as the EU and FAO (see Box 3). The PAC meets twice a year and it reviews the FSPS's work plans and reports and monitors progress. It has been much weaker in giving FSPS strategic direction or in providing significant technical input, guidance or feedback. Recently a Project Technical Committee (PTC) was established to support the PAC. The PTC has increased the PAC's efficiency since it reviews the relevant Project documents prior to the PAC meetings and submits its technical comments and recommendations for the PAC's approval. It is to be noted that the Ministry of Health is represented neither in the PAC nor in the PTC. Furthermore, the Ministry of Animal Resources, Fisheries and Range has not attended the PAC meetings; though its presence and contributions in the PTC were highly appreciated.

**Box 4. Members of the Project Advisory Committee (PAC)**

The PAC is composed of the following members;

1. Undersecretary, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, Government of Sudan;
2. Undersecretary, Ministry of Animal Resources, Fisheries, and Range, Government of Sudan;
3. Directors General (DGs), State Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation;
4. DGs, State Ministry of Animal Resources, Fisheries, and Range;
5. Secretary General, Strategic Planning Secretariat at State level;
6. Chief Technical Advisor, FSPS;
7. FSPS focal person in the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation;
8. Director, Food Security Technical Secretariat;
9. Ministry of Finance, Director of General Administration of International Cooperation; and
10. European Union.

31. The Project has received technical backstopping from Senior staff of the Office for Partnerships, Advocacy and Capacity Development (OPC), and the Agricultural Development Economics Division (ESA). In line with the subsidiarity principle, the technical support is also provided by FAO Regional Office for the Near East and North Africa based in Cairo.

32. With the exception of recruiting consultants to provide specific training, the Project has not envisaged the recruitment of short-term technical expertise (e.g., communication

<sup>6</sup> The CTA, in addition to coordination and overall management, will have technical responsibilities especially in relation to FSTS and the preparation of basic guidelines for all project outputs.

<sup>7</sup> The specialist essentially divides his time between the states primarily for output 3 and output 1 on rotational bases since there will be no fulltime technical expert in all the States except the Technical Advisor.

specialist, NGO expert, institutional expert, etc.) to provide specific and targeted assistance during project implementation. Stronger technical leadership from FAO would help (i) in making the technical support more demand driven; and (ii) in identifying the best source for it.

33. In the second half of the Project, opportunities for the FAO Representative to support the FSPS at higher political levels in government should be better exploited, especially in relation to establishing the Food Security Council and for increasing the political support and buy-in at the State level.

34. The Project has experienced several delays due to different reasons. (i) lengthy negotiations with the EU on the extent of funding and involving the Federal level in the Project held up the Project initially; (ii) the recruitment of the CTA and State International Advisors took several months to be completed; (iii) the International Advisors based in Gedaref and the Blue Nile resigned and additional delays were experienced to recruit their replacements (see Table 3); (iv) delays in Project implementation due to the long time required to issue travel permits for Project staff travelling to/from the States. This, at times has hindered the smooth and timely implementation of some of the planned activities (e.g., the postponement of the inception and planning workshops to later dates in Blue Nile and Red Sea States); (v) the Government of Sudan's requirement that the presence of the International Advisor in the Blue Nile State should be limited to three weeks at a time; and (vi) delays in completing the Capacity Needs Assessments for each State due to the need to repeat them since the first assessments were not carried out according to FAO standards.

**Table 3. Chronology of Recruitment of the International staff**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Recruitment/Resignation of Staff</b>
February 2013	Recruitment of CTA (Khartoum)
March 2013	Recruitment of Food Security Information Systems Expert (Khartoum)
April 2013	Recruitment of International Advisors (Blue Nile)
May 2013	Recruitment of International Advisors (Kassala)
June 2013	Recruitment of International Advisors (Gedaref)
July 2013	Recruitment of International Advisor (Red Sea)
February 2014	Resignation of International Advisors (Blue Nile and Gedaref)
June 2014	Recruitment of International Advisors (Blue Nile)
July 2014	Recruitment of International Advisors (Gedaref)

35. The Project has a good reporting practice. The semi-annual and annual progress reports prepared by the Project team outline the progress achieved in term of activities, outputs and expected results in addition to the challenges associated with the implementation process and recommend a way forward. In addition, the consolidated progress reports include State-specific progress reports in the annex section. They provide useful information and have contributed to this evaluation substantially. However, the Table summarizing the annual update of activity implementation could be improved by adding clear delivery rates and details for activities at State level: It would be useful if this table would include an additional column for "comments" that would provide greater details regarding the achievement rates that are being reported. Furthermore, the Project is succeeding in achieving impressive outcomes at the State level which are not systematically captured, monitored and reported (see Section 5.2). The Project had foreseen the establishment of users' feedback mechanism for the recipients of the FSTS bulletins, briefs, and reports (see Box 4). Unfortunately, this mechanism has yet to be set up. It would provide a good opportunity to capture the use of this information and to improve it.

### Box 5. Feedback from Ministry of Health, Department of Nutrition and FEWS NET

In a meeting with the MTE team, the Ministry of Health Department of Nutrition, expressed appreciation of the information it receives from the State FSTS. Significant improvements are noticed in terms of (i) timeliness of reports, (ii) completeness, and (iii) quality in terms of data collection and analysis.

The Department has also realized that it is reaching only 25% of those who suffer from severe malnutrition and is planning to take action to expand its outreach to cover a greater number of malnourished people.

Similarly, FEWS NET shared its impressions with the MTE team and noted that significant improvement in the quality of reports/bulletins it is receiving from the SFSTSES. FEWS NET usually sends a note of appreciation to the relevant FSTS when it receives a report of high quality. Furthermore, FEWS NET has noted, when it conducts field missions in the States and interacts with the SFSTSES and working group staff, that there is a remarkable enhancement of capacities in terms of understanding food security and nutrition concepts, verbal presentation and written analysis.

A users' feedback mechanism would be able to capture this kind of information and would demonstrate the results that the Project has been able to achieve.

36. In addition, to the reporting system, the Project has the following monitoring tools:

- **Baseline survey:** The Project has carried out Capacity Needs Assessments in the four States which could potentially be used to provide information on the existing pre-implementation capacities. However, the Project has missed the opportunity to document and track the capacities at the individual level prior to providing the trainings and the progress achieved both in knowledge acquired and changes in behavior which would have provided more accurate baseline information. A competency assessment is planned to be carried out in 2015 after one year following the implementation of the recommendations of the Capacity Needs Assessment (CNA).
- **Database system for capacity building component:** The Project has an excellent database system for the Project's training activities. The database provides the following information: the participant's name, sex, institutional and State affiliation, institution providing training, and venue and dates of training.
- **Evaluation forms<sup>8</sup>:** The Project has evaluation forms that participants in the training activities are asked to complete at the end of the training. These forms are perception-based and do not capture neither the learning achieved nor any change in behavior as a result of the training. Box 5 provides examples of how learning can be better monitored.
- **Regular coordination and review meetings:** Quarterly coordination meetings are carried out bringing the four TSUs and the PSU together to discuss Project activities. In addition, the PAC meets twice a year and reviews and monitors the timely delivery of inputs and outputs.

### Box 6. Different Levels of Monitoring Learning Programmes

**Level 1: Participant satisfaction:** are generally administered through questionnaires at the end of the initiative, are the most common form of evaluation. It is important to note, however, that such questionnaires are not good predictors of the extent to which participants have learned or will be able to use what they've learned on the job. To the contrary, research shows little or no correlation between participant ratings of learning initiatives and

<sup>8</sup> The Project team reported that in addition to the evaluation forms that participants are asked to complete, pre and post tests are also carried out. However, late and insufficient evidence was provided on the pre and post test assessment. The ET considers it did not have sufficient information to evaluate pre and post assessments which should be carried out with rigor in order to assess knowledge acquired.

actual learning/use of the learning. Thus, participant satisfaction questionnaires are generally useful for measuring quality of processes, but not for results other than satisfaction.

**Level 2: Learning** can be measured either formally or informally. Formal measures of learning can be done through pre- and post-tests to examine what was the starting knowledge of participants and how the initiative added to that knowledge. However, for many courses, such tests may not be feasible or particularly useful. Informal gauges of learning can include participant in-class presentations, projects or on-the-job achievements. In addition, facilitators, coaches or trainers can use questions on material to check participant understanding and reinforce learning.

**Level 3: Workplace behavior outcomes** is the most important level of results evaluation of learning initiatives, and one of the most challenging. For learning initiatives to contribute to organizational capacity, participants have to be willing and able to apply knowledge, skills and attitudes acquired through learning. To understand how participants have used learning in their workplaces, it is necessary to do a post-initiative evaluation of the behavior outcomes. Such evaluations should generally be done at least six months but no more than two years after the initiative – enough time to ensure that participants have had sufficient time to implement learning, but not so long that they are likely to have forgotten learning content.

**Level 4: Organizational impact** rarely results from stand-alone learning initiatives. For this reason, while impact evaluations may be done of broader organizational capacity development programmes which address the various aspects of capacity problems, they are rarely done for learning interventions alone.

**Source:** FAO, 2012. FAO Good Learning Practices for Effective Capacity Development, Learning Module 3.

37. In conclusion, the Project has an excellent monitoring system for the training activities it is undertaking at the input and output level. The Project has developed a comprehensive M&E framework for the capacity building component, which outlines the tools and methods to assess the outcome of the training. The M&E activities related to the assessment of the impact and outcome of the training package is planned to take place in 2015. However, the Project is missing the opportunity to monitor the learning achieved and the outcomes realized on the basis of the analysis of food security and nutrition that the State FSTS are undertaking.

#### 4.2 *Financial resources management*

38. Table 4 shows the structure of the Project's budget.

**Table 4. Overall structure of project budget\***

	<b>Categories</b>	<b>Total budget (Euros)</b>	<b>Expenditures cumulative (as of 28/11/2014) (Euros)</b>	<b>Expenditures per Total Output Budget (%)</b>
Output 1	Effective cross-sectorial food security institutional setup established and linked to the food security institutional framework	1,751,615	503,155	28.73%
Output 2	Government's capacity to review, plan, budget and monitor food security policies and strategies developed, resulting in more effective public action for food security and nutrition	842,963	163,942	19.45%
Output 3	Functional regional food security information systems strengthened and supports decision making	869,452	306,207	35.22%
Output 4	Capacity of food security oriented Non-State Actors strengthened	400,000	1,907	0.48%
Output 5	Key food security drivers are better understood and integrated to decision making	364,444	105,673	29.00%

TSU costs	Technical support units in the States	2,312,000	1,388,546	60.06%
PCU costs	Project Support unit	1,496,910	821,494	54.88%
Overhead costs	Project Support Costs (7 % of actual cost)**	562,617	186,947	33.23%
	<b>TOTAL ***</b>	<b>8,600,000</b>	<b>3,477,871</b>	<b>40.44%</b>

\* The figures presented in this table are approximate, pending approval from CSF (FAO's Finance Division)

\*\* Project Support Costs (administrative costs) calculated only against the Actuals and not against Commitments

\*\*\*Total Expenditure (EURO): Sum of Actuals + Hard Commitments

39. An analysis of the budget reveals that it was designed to reflect budget allocation and expenditures per Output and for the PSU and TSU. It does not provide information on what was planned to be allocated for the Federal level and for each State<sup>9</sup>. Consequently, the expenditure reporting equally does not reflect expenditures carried out at Federal and State level.<sup>10</sup> Though the budget for each State is prepared in a participatory matter during the annual work planning and budgeting process done at the beginning of the year, the lack of clear budget allocation per State in the ProDoc has contributed to a *perception* of lack of budget transparency at the State level. Nevertheless, the MTE team was able to obtain partial<sup>11</sup> allocations for each State (see Table 5). These allocations reflect the LOAs signed in 2013 and 2014 with the FSTS (State level), the research teams, and construction firms. The Khartoum LOA was signed with the Federal FSTS.

**Table 5. Total LOAs Signed in 2013 and 2014 in US\$**

State	LOA
Blue Nile	95,181
Gedaref	90,699
Kassala	88,654
Red Sea	72,591
Khartoum	118,392
<b>Total</b>	<b>US\$465,517</b>

40. Table 5 above also reveals that approximately 24% of the total budget has been allocated to Project management (PSU and overhead costs). Given that this is a capacity development project and most of the inputs are “soft”, another 27% has been allocated for providing technical assistance (TSU). An analysis of expenditures per Output, reveals that expenditures for Output 4 (Capacity of food security oriented Non-State Actors strengthened) are lagging far behind and stand at mid-term at only 0.5% of allocated budget. None of the five Outputs' expenditures has reached 50%, with the highest expenditure rate is that of Output 3 (Functional regional food security information systems strengthened and supports decision making) having spent around 35% of what was originally allocated. By contrast, the

<sup>9</sup> Annex III to the Grant Agreement, Budget for the Action, shows under each sub heading the budget allocated to the Federal and State Level through LOAs, GOE, and expandable/non-expandable expenses. However, the Budget does not provide a breakdown per State. A total amount of 142,000 Euros is allocated to all the FSTSes (Federal and State level).

<sup>10</sup> The expenditures carried out by the FSTSes are reflected in the financial reports of the LOAs. As per the procurement (per State) and GOE, the information can be deducted from the TL. However, the system of documenting the transaction (description) could be improved to show for which State the expenditure took place.

<sup>11</sup> Partial allocations since they do not capture the allocation and expenditures on training activities for participants from the four different States as well as the Federal level participants.

TSUs and PSU have expended approximately 60% and 55% of their allocated budget respectively.

41. The Government of Sudan (GoS) is supposed to make substantial financial contributions to the Project, but these have been difficult to track accurately. Per the Project Document, the GoS is expected to cover the FSTS’ staff salaries; (ii) pay the salaries of the State FSTS after the first year they are established; and (iii) make direct contributions to Project activities (starting after the first year) which should progressively increase as the Project nears its completion. Furthermore, the Government and States are expected to provide the State FSTS with adequate office space and cover their entire running costs starting from year three of the Project. Quantifying all the above costs is essential to start planning an exit strategy and to make sure that adequate funds are included in the States’ annual budgets to ensure the FSTSes’ continuity.

42. Finally, no budget revision has been done since the start of the Project. It is expected that, following the MTE, a budget revision will be carried out as part of the request for a no-cost extension.

#### ***4.3 Efficiency and effectiveness of the institutional arrangements including Government’s participation***

43. The Project has an institutional set-up at both the Federal as well as the State level. At the Federal level, the Federal Food Security Technical Secretariat (FFSTS) established by SIFSIA is the Project’s main implementing partner. It is expected to play an important role in harmonization of methodologies, archiving national databases, as well as facilitating policy dialogue and national coordination activities. In addition, the Project has a focal point within the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation.

44. Similarly, at the State level, the State Food Security Technical Secretariat (SFSTS) were established by the Project and are the implementing partner at the decentralized level and a senior staff from the State Ministry of Agriculture acts as a focal point. The FSTS staff – both at the Federal and State level – are heavily represented by Ministry of Agriculture (see Table 6). In the four targeted States, the Ministries of Agriculture and/or Livestock staff constitute 64% of all FSTS staff. The most diverse FSTS is that of the Red Sea State which has representatives from the Ministry of Finance, Social Affairs, and Health in addition to two from the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock.

**Table 6. Number of FSTS Staff from Ministry of Agriculture/ Livestock per State**

State	Number of FSTS staff	Number of FSTS Staff from Ministry of Agriculture/Livestock
Blue Nile	5	3
Gedaref	5	4
Kassala	7	5
Red Sea	5	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>14 (64%)</b>

45. The Project has signed five LOAs - one with the Federal and four with the State FSTS in 2013. In addition, in line with the Project Document, four LOAs with the State FSTS have been signed in 2014. The LOAs outline specific activities that the FSTSes need to implement within a specified timeframe. The LOAs are paid in tranches and it is important to ensure that

payment is made on the basis of verifiable activities undertaken and financial receipts submitted.

46. In addition to the FSTS, the Project has set up different coordination mechanisms at the State level. As a result, there is a plethora of Technical Working Groups, Working Committees, and Sub-Committees in the four States with unclear roles and responsibilities. Though each of these Groups and Committees have their own ToRs, they sometimes overlap with those of the FSTS. The member of these groups have unrealistic expectations that the Project should cover transportation costs, allowances, and other running costs (printing, coffee breaks, etc.). Streamlining, simplifying and reviewing the TORs of these State-level coordination mechanisms will be necessary to ensure their effectiveness and sustainability beyond the Project's lifetime.

## 5 Analysis of results and contribution to stated objectives<sup>12</sup>

### Box 7. Key Findings

**The Project has achieved mixed results at the Output level, with Outputs 1, 3 and 5 satisfactory and Outputs 2 and 4 unsatisfactory.** At the outcome level, the stated outcome is already being achieved in three out of the four States, where the policy briefs and/or policy bulletins produced by the FSTSeS have resulted in policy changes that improved the food security and nutrition situation.

**Gender is considered in both the implementation and monitoring of this Project.** The Project has developed Gender Mainstreaming Guidelines for each of its outputs and it is important to ensure that the guidelines are being implemented.

**The Project is collaborating with a few partners,** yet there are several opportunities that are being missed and the Project can expand its collaboration and coordination with other development organizations, such as UNICEF, UNDP and international NGOs.

### 5.1 Achievements at Outputs level

47. The expected outputs of the Project are as follows:

48. **Output 1:** Effective cross-sectoral Food Security institutional framework established and linked to the National institutional framework. This output is relatively on track with an expenditure rate of approximately 29%.

49. The activities envisaged to achieve this output are the following: (i) Conduct an in-depth assessment of the existing Food Security institutional setup (decrees, legal status, mandate, working groups, functional units, budget allocated, etc.) for food security policy/strategy formulation, planning, coordination and management. (ii) Organize consultative workshops to present findings of institutional assessment/analysis. (iii) Support the FSTSeS' capacity development. (iv) Support operations of the Food Security Committee based on the specific needs of each State. (v) Strengthen the Food Security and Nutrition Technical Working Groups (FSNTWG) and support their operationalization. (vi) Enhance coordination with Federal level institutions. (vii) Strengthen locality level food security information producing units. (viii) Enhance coordination and linkages with localities.

50. Each of the four targeted States has established a high-level multisectoral Food Security Committee (FSC) headed by the Governor (Wali) in the Red Sea State and by the Minister of Agriculture in the other three States. The FSC is supported by the Food Security and Nutrition Technical Working Groups (FSNTWG) that hold monthly and quarterly meetings, respectively and which the Project has helped set up. In addition, four FSTSeS were established at the State level and their capacities have been built (see Box 7). The Project has signed LOAs between FAO and each of the targeted States' FSTSeS as well as a LOA with the Federal FSTSeS.

### Box 8. In their own words...what the FSTSeS staff have shared with the MTE

- ✓ "Before (FSTSeS) we generated reports, now I can do analysis"
- ✓ "I was unaware of the concept of 'food security'; I thought food insecurity was only about agriculture production"
- ✓ "I learnt how to write a policy brief addressed to decision-makers"
- ✓ "I learnt how to work in a multisectoral team"

<sup>12</sup> The term 'results' includes outputs and outcomes.

- ✓ “I learnt how to use information from different sources and do cross-analysis”
- ✓ “It (FSPS) created collaboration and cooperation among different units and ministries”
- ✓ “I know I have to answer the ‘so what?’ question”
- ✓ “Now I know the difference between a report and a policy”
- ✓ “I learnt about the FEWS NET website and am using it”
- ✓ “I learnt about the socio-economic aspects of food insecurity and malnutrition”
- ✓ “Now it is easier for me to use the computer and database”

51. The Project has successfully established strong horizontal linkages at the State level, especially among different line ministries. It has also set up different working groups that include governmental and non-governmental representatives to discuss FSN issues at the State level. As a result of the Project’s activities, there is better understanding of the multisectoral aspects of FSN issues and of the importance of access and utilization and not only production to improve FSN. Horizontally, information sharing and coordination among the four States is very weak though - when it occurs - it can have a strong positive effect as was the case when Kassala State initiated its anti-locust campaign based on information it had received from the Red Sea State.

52. The vertical (upward and downward) linkages between the States and the Federal level as well as between the States and the localities still needs to be significantly developed. For example, although the LOA signed with the Federal FSTS envisages quarterly backstopping visits by the FFSTS to the SFSTS, so far there has been only one technical backstopping mission in December 2013 by the FFSTS staff.<sup>13</sup> The FFSTS should play a stronger role in providing guidance and in supporting the SFSTSes. In addition, there is no direct contact between the technical staff at both the Federal and State FSTSes. For example, the nutrition officer in one SFSTS does not communicate on technical issues with any of the other nutrition officers whether they are in other States’ FSTS or within the Federal FSTS. Similarly, for the livestock officers, the crop production officers, etc. Facilitating regular communication on technical issues and for information-sharing among the technical staff could further enhance the linkages between the Federal and State levels as well as among the four State FSTSes.

53. Furthermore, though the Project has trained one focal point per locality to collect and forward FSN information to the States’ FSTS, the relationship needs to be strengthened, especially when in some cases (e.g., the Red Sea State), some of the focal points who were trained do not even reside within the locality. At the locality level, there are several challenges for collecting FSN information. There is cultural resistance to providing information and suspicion regarding the use of the information. Adding to this difficulty, is that other projects implemented at the locality level in the past have paid to obtain information and there is an expectation that the FSPS would do the same. An official letter provided to the localities’ focal points outlining the purpose for collecting information and how it may be utilized may help overcome some of these challenges. An information campaign that provides feedback to the localities on how the information is being used for the benefit of the local communities may also prove to be helpful.

---

<sup>13</sup> This is excluding other missions which were carried out by FFSTS staff including one by Director General of FFSTS during the project launch in April/May 2013 and a second one by the General Secretary of the FFSTS in September 2014 to Blue Nile State to participate and guide the State’s Food Security and Nutrition Committee meeting. A third mission was undertaken by the Federal FSTS related exclusively to IPC issues.

54. Finally, though the Project has succeeded in setting up and supporting the Food Security Committees at the State level, there is no corresponding national institution. The decree to establish the Higher Council on Food Security and Nutrition has still to be issued.<sup>14</sup> It is important that both the Committees at the State level as well as the Higher Council at the Federal level include representatives of the Ministry of Health in order to ensure that nutrition is fully addressed.

55. However, what the Project has yet to accomplish is to conduct an in-depth assessment of the existing Food Security institutional setup (decrees, legal status, mandate, working groups, functional units, budget allocated, etc.) for food security policy/strategy formulation, planning, coordination and management and to organize consultative workshops to present findings of the institutional assessment/analysis. This analysis at both the State and Federal level is essential because it would pave the way for discussions on the sustainability of the institutional setup and could provide recommendations on how the FSTS' institutional setup could be firmly cemented in the Government's Federal and State structures.

56. Output 2: Capacity to review, plan, budget and monitor Food Security (FS) policies and strategies developed, resulting in more effective public action for food security and nutrition. This output is lagging in implementation and expenditures to date are approximately 20% of what has been budgeted.

57. The activities planned to achieve this output are the following; (i) identification and review of selected food security related policy documents; (ii) trainings in various areas of policy and strategy development; (iii) preparation of a comprehensive situation analysis report on the status of food security policies/strategies/programs in the State; and (iv) the establishment and coaching of Policy Dialogue Forums (PDF).

58. Based on FAO's capacity development methodology, Capacity Needs Assessments<sup>15</sup> (CNA) for each State were first carried out in 2013. However, due to the poor quality of the assessments done by an external consultant, the Project Team decided to repeat the exercise with the support of technical staff from FAO HQ. This resulted in a delay in the CNAs' completion (December 2013) and validation (January 2014). In order not delay further implementation, the Project initiated capacity development activities prior to the CNAs' validation. For example, five trainings were held in 2013 on food security orientation, Food and Agriculture Market Information system (data collection and analysis), food security basics and IPC, food security analysis and report writing, and computer basics.

59. According to several participants in the policy and strategy formulation training, there is a need for further training on these issues since the training offered was a good introduction on policy formulation however insufficient for developing the capacities of participants to the level required to design strategies and formulate policies. Furthermore, in the participants' opinion the consultant who was selected to deliver the Policy Analysis training was not sufficiently qualified. There is a need to recruit a team of consultants - or one or more

---

<sup>14</sup> A memo of the formation of a Food Security Council has been submitted to the Vice President office at the beginning of 2012 and has already been presented to the Parliament and the decision of its formation has yet to be issued.

<sup>15</sup> Although the Capacity Needs Assessments are reported by the Project team as Outputs under Output 2, it is the view of the MTE Team that it would be more appropriate to include them under Output 1 which supports the institutional set up at the State level and which pre-supposes a Capacity Needs Assessment.

training/academic institutes - to develop the capacities of appropriately selected participants in order to obtain the results for this output.

60. The identification of both the consultants and the participants are crucial for developing this type of capacity which requires different skill sets for delivering this type of training (policy-making) from the technical training (food security information). Skills required to build policy-making and policy-influencing capacities include:

- Strong skills of political economy analysis to understand the political economy of policy-making and to identify how and where to engage in policy-making;
- Strategic skills to identify opportunities and policy-windows as they arise;
- Strong research skills, and an ability to coach and mentor others in developing those skills, to carry out sound analysis and to make the transition from analysis to policy recommendations;
- Excellent communication skills, both writing skills and inter-personal skills to build relationships with key policy-makers and decision-makers; and
- Coordination skills to involve stakeholders including non-state actors in policy dialogue and formulation.

61. As mentioned earlier, the Project design did not envisage a strong and creative communications strategy to support the policy formulation and implementation Output. Such a communications strategy (which would include specific training on communications, training for media professionals, information dissemination plans, information feedback loops, training on lobbying and advocacy, etc.) would need to be designed and implemented sooner rather than later in order to ensure that this Output achieves the results intended. Written reports alone rarely influence decision-making, and neither should electronic dissemination be the main or sole means of communication. Instead, the Project's policy development component should aim to foster discussion and debate, ensuring that as many of the target audience as possible hear and discuss the findings of the information system and of commissioned policy-relevant research.

62. **Output 3:** Functional Regional level Food Security information systems strengthened and supports decision-making. This output is on track with approximately 35% expenditure level to date.

63. The project has organized several training workshops (see Annex 6) to improve the knowledge and skills of FSTS and line ministries staff in the following areas:

- Concepts of food security and food security assessments
- Food and Agriculture Market Information System
- Integrated Food Security analysis (using the IPC tool)
- Geographic Information System (GIS)
- Nutrition monitoring tools
- Gender mainstreaming in food security
- Food Security report writing
- Basic computer skills
- Data collection and analysis

64. A total of 302 persons have been trained so far, representing governmental and non-governmental institutions. However, as mentioned above, in the absence of pre and post tests and/or reports from the TSUs assessing increased knowledge and/or change in behavior, it is

difficult to assess the extent to which the training has reached its objectives. Nevertheless, there is anecdotal evidence that several attendees have indeed developed their capacities.

65. Almost all of the training has been “classroom” type of training and the Project has not fully explored other training modalities (online, mentoring, on-the-job, exchange visits among the four States, etc.). In Gedaref, the International Advisor has used the staged capacity building model and implemented “on-the-job” training for FSTS staff which has been positively received (see Box 8). The FSTS Coordinator expressed his appreciation by stating that “the last few months of on-the-job training have been worth more than all of last year’s classroom trainings”.

**Box 9. On the Job training in Gedaref**

The TSU, in Gedaref, has jointly assessed the capacity needs of the FSTS staff to perform tasks (as per ToRs), jointly planned approaches and activities to build capacity and monitor results. The TSU provides on-the-job training to FSTS staff on a daily basis. On-the-job learning activities include among other:

- ✓ *Coaching/mentoring on a daily basis:* while they are performing a task, a TSU staff sits with each FSTS staff and identifies clear learning objectives, provides support and feedback, helps FSTS staff identify a variety of solutions to the challenges faced, and reviews the progress made in maintaining and developing the skills and knowledge acquired by the learner.
- ✓ *Face-to-face training:* on a monthly basis, FSTS officers participate in a number of training workshops broken down into three to five-hour sessions that focus on the core skills needed to perform the Secretariat's tasks. These training workshops are offered in phases and are meant to develop specific skills such as market, nutrition, food security analyses ...etc. They are usually followed by direct application.
- ✓ *Training of trainers:* The TSU has built capacity of FSTS staff to train stakeholders at State level. The training material is collated/prepared by the TSU who then discusses it with FSS staff and emphasizes the technical implications and provides possible illustrations to use.
- ✓ *Debriefings after key activities with stakeholders:* TSU provides feedback on what went well and what did not go so well after each key event, drawing lessons and developing best practices.
- ✓ *Sharing technical materials:* all materials shared are discussed with the staff to facilitate understanding, spark discussions and discuss ways the information could be used in their day-to-day activities.
- ✓ *Distance learning:* Independent learning is also strongly encouraged. Relevant distance learning modules offered by UN agencies and institutions, and appropriate free online trainings have been identified by the TSU and will be proposed to FSTS staff based on needs.
- ✓ *Learning by doing:* TSU makes it a key point to have FSTS staff engaged in all tasks that fall under their responsibilities and follows up closely to provide the support needed.
- ✓ *Learning by participating:* Officers are also encouraged to participate in TSU’s capacity building efforts with other stakeholders at which they have the opportunity to “learn by participating”. This is particularly the case with activities linked to the “food insecurity drivers” studies.

In addition, post on-the-job learning evaluation forms for FSTS learners and TSU coaches are being developed for application starting in 2015.

66. With technical assistance from the TSUs, the States’ FSTS have produced a number of Food Security documents (Policy Briefs, Monthly Updates and Bulletins) which are widely disseminated (See Table 7).

**Table 7. Number of Food Security documents produced per State**

State	No. of Policy Briefs	No. of Monthly Updates	No. of Bulletins
Blue Nile	3	7	4
Gedarif	2	3	3
Kassala	5	9	6
Red Sea	3	7	6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>19</b>

67. However, there is no harmonized template for producing these documents and, sometimes are produced only in English and not in Arabic, limiting their potential use by policy-makers. Furthermore, each FSTS publishes them at a different frequency and dissemination outreach is somewhat limited. Finally, the user feedback mechanism envisaged in the Project’s design has yet to be set up. Such a mechanism would be able to capture how the information is being used and would provide an opportunity to improve the documents being produced.

68. **Output 4:** Food Security oriented Non-State Actors’ capacity strengthened. This output is significantly behind schedule with an expenditure rate of only 0.5%.

69. The results of this Output are the weakest which is evidenced by the very low rate of expenditures, which at mid-term, are less than 0.5% of what was planned under the Project. Kassala and the Red Sea States have produced a draft capacity needs assessment of Non-State Actors. However, all NSA actors the ET met were unaware of this needs assessment which leads the MTE to conclude that it was not carried out in a consultative and participatory way, thus limiting its usefulness. In addition, the NSAs included in those reports are limited to the Unions of Farmers, Traders, Fishermen, etc. and a few NGOs implementing food security and nutrition activities at the State level.

70. The Project has overlooked the important role that the media – as a NSA - can play in disseminating information and advocating for policy change. Equally, the private sector is not being involved sufficiently in the implementation of the Project. For example, with the exception of Gedaref where one representative of the private sector participated in the CNA validation workshop, the private sector is totally absent. Furthermore, the Project has not identified Members of Parliament as key NSAs in policy and law formulation and approval. Finally, it was noted in several meetings with NSAs that their understanding of the Project’s objectives is unclear and that they expect the Project to provide agriculture inputs.

71. Yet, as the case of the Blue Nile State demonstrates, the NSAs have an important role to play in improving food security and nutrition. In the Blue Nile State, the introduction of legislation regarding the iodization of salt is attributed to NSA campaigning. Recently, the NSAs have taken the decision to lobby the State Assembly and the Wali to formalize the State FSTS’ legal status and institutional set up. Finally, the INGOs and national NGOs see their participation in the working groups as an opportunity to bring to the government’s attention some issues that they cannot or are not authorized to do directly.

72. Notwithstanding all of the above points, the NSA have not been totally excluded from the Project. For example, NSA representatives have attended the CNA validation and work-planning workshops (see Table 8). Several NSA staff participate in the FSNTWG and they have attended several trainings offered by the Project. Clearly, additional efforts need to be made to improve the delivery of this Output.

**Table 8. NSA Participation in CNA Workshops**

		State			
		Blue Nile	Gedaref	Kassala	Red Sea
<b>CNA Validation Workshop</b>	Total participants	52	39	54	34
	Total NSA participants	8	10	10	7
	<b>% NSA participants</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>Work-planning</b>	Total participants	50	43	48	34
	Total NSA	10	12	6	7

<b>workshop</b>	participants				
	<b>% NSA participants</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>21%</b>

73. **Output 5:** Key food insecurity drivers are better understood and linked to decision making. This output is on track and has expended around 29% of the budgeted amount.

74. The Project has signed LOAs with two different research teams in each State. Table 9 provides a list of the research topics in each State and the amount of the LOAs. As the topics indicate, they cover a range of food security and nutrition issues, including production, utilization, nutrition, socio-economic factors, and land tenure. Some address rain-fed agriculture, others examine the role of fisheries and livestock on food security and nutrition. The objective is to fund research that would lead to action for improving the food security and nutrition in the four targeted States. A good example of a research team is the one which is carrying out a study on the “Factors Related to Food Utilization and Intake Patterns in Hamishkorieb Locality” in Kassala. The team is composed of university researchers, NGO and government representatives and it is expected that this partnership would improve the chances that the results of the research would be utilized by the government (e.g., leading to policy change) and by service delivery NGOs (e.g., for better targeting). It is to be noted, however, that the LOAs all range around US\$16,500 which leads the MTE team to conclude that some (if not all) proposals may have been over-budgeted. In addition, the lengthy duration for carrying out the field research and writing the reports, which are expected to be finalized in February 2015, may prove to be relatively late in the Project’s life to effectively be able to guide decision-making as was the Output’s initial objective.

**Table 9. LOAs with Research Institutions**

State	Research Topic	Institution	Start Date	LOA Amount (US\$)
<b>Blue Nile</b>	Factors affecting production and productivity in rain-fed sector in Blue Nile State, the case of existing challenges and prospects	Demazin Agricultural Station	Sep 2014	16,646
	A study on the impact of the level of household income and staple food market prices on food security among the urban and peri-urban population of Blue Nile State	Blue Nile University, Agriculture economics and policy analysis unit	Sep 2014	16,646
<b>Gedaref</b>	Analysis of household economic activities and effects on food security among farmers’ livelihoods groups in Gedarif state	Nawaem Organization for Women and Children Development Gedarif Office	June 2014	16,762
	Women Land Tenure and its Impact in Improving Household Food Security in Gedarif State: Policy Implications	Faculty of community Development & Women Studies Gedarif University	June 2014	16,524
<b>Kassala</b>	Factors Related to Food Utilization and Intake Patterns in Hamishkorieb Locality in Kassala State,	Faculty of Medicine & Health Sciences - University of	May 2014	16,477

	Community Based Study	Kassala		
	Impact of Non-farm income activities on food security in Kassala State	Faculty of Economics and Administration Sciences – University of Kassala	May 2014	16,728
<b>Red Sea</b>	Investigating the Contribution of Fishery Sector in the Household Food Security in the Red Sea State	Institute of Marine Research - University of Red Sea	October 2014	17,431
	Investigating the Socioeconomic factors that contribute to high Malnutrition in Red Sea State	Faculty of Post Graduate Studies - University of Red Sea	July 2014	16,510

75. For the second half of the Project, emphasis should be placed on ensuring the quality of the research, the dissemination of the **reports**, and the use of the information generated for advocating policies and strategies that would improve food security and nutrition in the four targeted States.

## 5.2 *Achievements at Outcome level*

76. The Project’s outcome as stated in the Project Document is “Food Security decisions are more inclusive, better integrated, informed, implemented and monitored in selected States of Sudan”. It is impressive that - notwithstanding the delay in starting implementation of activities and though the Project is only half-way through implementation - the stated outcome is already being achieved in the Blue Nile, Kassala, the Red Sea States, and to a lesser extent in Gedaref State. In the three States, the policy briefs and/or policy bulletins produced by the FSTSEs have generated discussions within the Food Security and Nutrition Technical Working Groups (FSNTWG) at the State level and resulted in policy changes that improved the food security and nutrition situation. Table 10 highlights some of the outcomes achieved in these three States. Though the Project has been successful in achieving these outcomes in a relatively short period of time, neither the State FSTSEs, nor the TSUs and the PSU are monitoring and reporting systematically these results. Finally, these achievements should be widely disseminated as part of the Project’s communication strategy once it is designed.

**Table 10. Achievements at the Outcome Level per State**

<b>State</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
Blue Nile	Labor import policy	Based on FSTSE-generated information and benefiting from the advocacy training and interaction of several stakeholders, the members of the policy and working group and led by Farmers Union, conducted two campaigns that led to major policy decisions. When above average production of sorghum and sesame was expected and due to labor shortages (most workers shifted to traditional gold mining) and fearing major harvest loss, the State government was lobbied and it took a decision allowing the importation of laborers from Ethiopia, which saved the harvest season.
	Export policy	After production, sesame prices dropped to below production costs. Another campaign by the working groups was organized to lobby the State Wali, Government and the State Assembly, and a decision was taken to allow export to Ethiopia (which had been stopped since 2011) and as a

		result prices went up to 500 SDG/kantar, not only in the Blue Nile but in all other sesame production areas of Sudan. The same was applied to sorghum.
	Advocacy for fixing sesame prices	In October 2014 the Farmers' Union of Blue Nile State organized advocacy campaign on fixing the declining prices of sesame. Based on advocacy strategy, the Union conducted a series of meetings with the Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources and Sudanese Agricultural Bank have issued circular fixing the sesame prices at SDG 500 for one Cantar of grade one, SDG 450 for one Cantar of grade 2 and SDG 350 for Cantar of grade 3 sesame.
	Salt Iodization Law	Salt Iodization: In a situation update, the Project presented the results of the 2013 Nutrition survey carried out by the Ministry of Health and highlighted the high rates of iodine deficiency in three localities; Roseris, Bau and Kurmuk. The Project Nutrition Working Group collaborated closely with the State Ministry of Health (MoH). As a result, the MoH organized several meetings with the working group and the High Food Security Technical Committee, and used the information provided by the FSTS to lobby State the legislature. The result was law which imposed adding iodine to salt. The MoH also started an awareness campaign targeting salt traders and citizens on the value of adding iodine to salt.
	Zakat Chamber targeting strategy	Representatives of the Zakat Chamber attending the FSTS-organized nutrition situation update orientation workshop on the results the MoH nutritional survey. The findings were conveyed to Zakat Chamber's senior management. The Director of the Zakat Chamber visited the Project and requested more details and the continuous supply of information to use as a tool for targeting. The FSTS linked the Zakat Chamber to the MoH's Nutrition Department. As a result, the Zakat Chamber's traditional assistance to poor families and its food distribution system were updated for better targeting and will be carried out in coordination with the Nutrition Department.
Kassala	Export policy	The FSTS Policy Brief No. 2 of March 2014 focused on the onion input and market prices. The policy brief highlighted that the surplus production of onions had led to a sharp drop of onion prices in the local markets. The price dropped by 92 % from SDG 600 per sack in November 2013 to SDG 50 in March 2014, leading to high financial losses by onion farmers. The State Government in consultation with the Federal Government facilitated the exportation of onions to the neighbouring countries of Eritrea and Ethiopia in April 2014.
		The FSTS Policy Brief No. 4 of May 2014 highlighted the soaring prices of sorghum in the state. The average sorghum price in May 2014 was 67% higher than in May 2013. The high prices continued to affect food access by the vulnerable households in the State. The recommendations in the Policy brief were discussed at the State Cabinet of Ministers for action. The suggested actions included: the State Government should regulate the movement of sorghum especially in the border markets in order to control the informal cross-border trade; new trade control measures should be established that restrict smuggling across the border markets; and there is an urgent need for coordinated monitoring of sorghum supply, demand and overall market situation by all the government departments that deal with sorghum in the state.
		The FSTS Policy Brief No. 5 of November 2014 focused on the surplus Sorghum production as a result of the good 2014 rainfall season, leading to a sharp drop of prices thereby hurting the farmers. The price of Feterita sorghum dropped by 31% between September and November 2014. The Policy brief therefore recommended that the State Government needs to protect Sorghum producers, mainly the small-scale farmers, by undertaking policy measures to absorb the surplus supply of sorghum in the local markets so as to stabilize the market price for sorghum. The Government was requested to consider the suggested short and medium to long-term interventions required to address the surplus sorghum production and the subsequent drastic drop in prices in the State. The State Minister, Ministry

		of Agriculture, Fisheries, Irrigation and Livestock (MAFIL) issued a directive to all ministries and locality administrations in the State on 30 <sup>th</sup> November 2014 that revised taxes and fees applicable to sorghum and other crops. The Minister’s directive was aimed at reducing financial losses by farmers in the State and will be captured in the Annual State budgets currently under review and preparation.
Red Sea		The FSTS FS Bulletin No. 1 of October 2013 reported on the loss of 25-40% of the food produced in Red Sea State due to mainly inadequate harvest/storage and transport facilities. Food losses refer to the decrease in edible food mass throughout the different segments of the food supply chains – production, postharvest handling, agro-processing, distribution (wholesale and retail), consumption. Food losses and their prevention have an impact on the environment, food security for poor people, food quality and safety, and Red sea State economic development. The exact causes of food losses vary throughout the country and the world and are very much dependent on the specific conditions and local situation in a given state and country. During the year 2013, numerous studies have been undertaken to assess the quantities of food losses and food waste in many localities of the state. Most of these studies were conducted at state level, and based on literature review, statistical data, and stakeholder interviews, the SFSTS produced its first Bulletin in October 2013, reporting a food loss of between 25-40% in the state. In view of this, the state government in consultation with the State Food Security Committee has taken an action, and purchased 10 harvesters, to decrease the field loss of production. The first state to show the positive impact of the food security reports produced by the SFSTS in 2013, others have followed in 2014
		The FSTS Policy Brief No. 1 of April 2014 highlighted the cucumber input costs, and marketing. A field visit by TSU, and SFSTS to Tokar locality has revealed that; cucumber productivity per Fadden was estimated at 7 tons [7000 Kg], however one sack of cucumber [20 Kg] was sold at 3 SDG in Tokar local market, and at 200 SDG per sack of 20kg in Port Sudan with a distance of only 160 Km from Tokar, although transport cost was only 3 SDG per sack to Port Sudan. The state government through the State Food Security Committee (FSC) again had initiated an action, and strengthened the Rural Market Association by providing some transport facilities, and reduced local taxes as well. This has been of great benefit to all actors in the food production and supply chains and to the food security for poor people in terms of increasing their purchasing power.

### 5.3 Gender equality

77. Gender was considered in both the implementation and monitoring of this Project and to a lesser extent in the design. The Project developed Gender Mainstreaming Guidelines for each of its outputs (see Annex 7) and is monitoring the number of staff trained by disaggregating participants by sex and State (see Table 11). On average, in the four States around 41% of people trained are women. The Red Sea State has the highest ratio of female participants which stands at 55% of the total number of persons trained; whereas the Blue Nile State has only been able to include around 26% of women in its training activities, possibly due to the insecurity situation in the State. In addition, the Project offered a specific TOT on gender and food security and nutrition issues. Unfortunately, no follow up was made to ensure that the trainers did train other staff at the State level.

**Table 11. Percentage of females trained per State**

State	Male	Female	Total	% Female
Blue Nile	53	19	72	<b>26.4</b>
Gedarfif	43	35	78	<b>44.9</b>

Kessala	45	26	71	<b>36.6</b>
Red Sea	31	38	69	<b>55.1</b>
Sub total	172	118	290	<b>40.7</b>
Madani	0	2	2	<b>100</b>
Khartoum	4	6	10	<b>60</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>41.7</b>

78. As to the Capacity Needs Assessment Validation and the Work Planning workshops that were organized by the Project, the average number of women participating in both workshops was around 26%, with Gedaref having the highest number of women participants in both workshops (38% and 40%, respectively) and the Blue Nile State having the lowest (13% and 14% respectively) (see Table 12). However, the CNAs did not assess the capacities regarding gender analysis of food security and nutrition.

**Table 12. Number and Percentage of Women Participating in Workshops**

		State				
		All 4 States	Blue Nile	Gedaref	Kassala	Red Sea
<b>CNA Validation Workshop</b>	Total participants	179	52	39	54	34
	Total women participants	47	7	15	15	10
	<b>% women participants</b>	<b>26.3</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>Work-planning workshop</b>	Total participants	175	50	43	48	34
	Total women participants	47	7	17	13	10
	<b>% women participants</b>	<b>26.9</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>29%</b>

79. Among the eight research topics being funded under Output 5, the one being carried out by the University of Gedaref addresses specifically women's land tenure and its impact on improving household food security. It is too early to assess whether the other seven research reports will include a gender analysis.

80. When it comes to staffing, the PSU and the TSUs are male-dominated, with only two women (the International Advisor in Gedaref's TSU and the National Staff in the PSU in Khartoum) among the professional staff. This is partially explained by the fact that there were few qualified women applicants to the positions available within the PSU and TSUs. The gender balance in the FSTS is better – with around 41% female staff - although there are still few women in key positions of responsibility (see Table 13).

**Table 13. Number of Female FSTS Staff per State**

State	Number of FSTS staff	Number of Female Staff
Blue Nile	5	2
Gedaref	5	1
Kassala	7	3
Red Sea	5	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>9 (41%)</b>

#### **5.4 Capacity Development**

81. Given that the Project is a capacity development project, this has been addressed throughout the MTE report and more specifically through the analysis of the achievements at the outcome level in Section 5.2 above as well as Section 6.4 on sustainability and Section 6.5 on impact below. Nevertheless, it is worth highlighting the importance and benefits of placing an International Adviser in each State in close proximity to the FSTS and the Ministry of Agriculture. This has allowed daily interaction and on-the-job training to take place and is key to capacity development. Some of the main factors that the MTE identified which have contributed to more effective capacity development are listed in Box 9.

## **Box 10. Factors contributing to more effective capacity development**

- ✓ Security in the State
- ✓ Low staff turnover, especially the International Advisor position
- ✓ Open door policy of TSU
- ✓ Transparent and participatory planning and budget preparation with the Ministry of Agriculture's focal point
- ✓ Higher initial (pre-Project) government capacities
- ✓ Higher presence of other partners (e.g., UN agencies, NGOs)
- ✓ Having a Senior Government Official as champion
- ✓ Embedding the Project within the Ministry (physical proximity, daily interaction, on-the-job training)
- ✓ Implementation of previous FAO projects in the State on which current Project can build on
- ✓ Implementation of other FAO projects with which current Project can collaborate with (on technical and operational issues)

### **5.5 *Human-Rights Based Approach***

82. Neither the Project Document nor the Project activities address the benefits of using rights-based approaches - in particular the Right to Food – in improving the food security and nutrition situation in the four targeted States. Since the training courses being offered are demand-driven, if the stakeholders are unaware of the rights-based approaches, it would be difficult for them to request such training to be included among the topics covered. In other capacity development projects implemented by FAO, training on the Right to Adequate Food concept and approach was initially supply-driven. However, the novel perspective generated interest among participants and even demand for future trainings to emphasize a rights-based approach for improving food security and nutrition. The Project may wish to consider introducing the Right to Adequate Food concept and approach in some of its future trainings.

### **5.6 *Partnerships and Alliances***

83. The Project has established partnerships at different levels and varying degrees. Within FAO, the Project is linking up with the former Emergency and Rehabilitation Coordination Unit (ERCU) which was implemented in the Blue Nile, Kassala, and the Red Sea States. ERCU was primarily an emergency program distributing food and agricultural implements to small farmers. Its main strength is coordinating food security efforts between UN agencies, INGOs, national organizations and the relevant government institutions, which provided the entry point for the FSPS project and played logistical support at the start. In the three States, the ERCU staff are active members in the FSPS working groups and are making use of the information provided by the FSTS.

84. The Project is also collaborating with FEWS NET on technical training. FEWS NET staff have been invited to deliver training and in its turn, FEWS NET has invited FSTS to participate in the training it is offering. It also writes back to the FSTSes appreciation notes when it receives reports based on good analysis (e.g., policy brief on water table in Kassala and food security updates from Blue Nile). A Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was discussed – but not signed - between FEWS NET and the FSPS to share food security reports, experiences in food security data collection analysis, FSTS staff training, collaborate in conducting livelihood, food and crop assessment.

85. The relationship between FSPS and WFP's Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM) unit is also good though it could be further strengthened, both at the Federal and State level. WFP can be a strong ally to lobby for the elaboration of a national food security and nutrition strategy as well as for establishing the Higher Council on Food Security and

Nutrition. The annual CFSAM formally brings together FSPS, FEWS NET, and WFP VAM in a coordinated activity.

86. There are several opportunities that the Project can explore to expand its collaboration and coordination with other development partners. For example, UNICEF could be a useful ally as well as a source of technical expertise on nutrition. WFP, in addition to providing training expertise, can be a partner in developing the capacities at the localities level (e.g., in Kassala where WFP and its implementing NGO partners are actively present at the localities level). Similarly, there are advantages to working closely with some INGOs (e.g., German Agro Action in the Red Sea State) to further improve data collection in the localities.

87. In conclusion, the Project should continue exploring opportunities and expanding its partnership with other organizations in order to avoid duplication, leverage training already implemented by other partners, invite partners to offer training, and for two way information sharing (FSTS-generated reports and partners' reports).

## 6 Analysis by evaluation criteria

88. The Project was assessed through the internationally accepted evaluation criteria, i.e. relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability.

### 6.1 Relevance

#### Box 11. Key findings

**The Project is highly relevant** and has contributed to both FAO's Strategic Objective H - Improved food security and better nutrition – which was in effect during Project preparation as well as to FAO's current Strategic Objectives 1 and 5. In addition, the Project is relevant to Sudan's Country Programming Framework (CPF). Equally, it is relevant to the Government of Sudan's development plans, in general, and to the needs and priorities of the four targeted States, more specifically.

#### 6.1.1 *Relevance to FAO and other international policies*

89. The Project is relevant and is contributing to FAO's Strategic Objectives 1 and 5 (see Table 14). Furthermore, it was also relevant to Strategic Objective H Improved food security and nutrition – which was one of FAO's objectives at the time of Project design.

**Table 14. FAO's Strategic Objectives 1 and 5**

1 - Contribute to the eradication of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition	101 - Member countries and their development partners make explicit political commitments in the form of policies, investment plans, programmes, legal frameworks and the allocation of necessary resources to eradicate hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition.
	102 - Member countries and their development partners adopt inclusive governance and coordination mechanisms for eradicating hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition.
	103 - The decision of member countries and their development partners regarding food security and nutrition is based on evidence and high-quality, timely and comprehensive food security and nutrition analysis that draws on data and information available in the network of existing sector and stakeholder information systems.
5 - Increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises	501 - Countries and regions adopt and implement legal, policy and institutional systems and regulatory frameworks for risk reduction and crisis management.
	502 - Countries and regions provide regular information and early warning against potential, known and emerging threats.

90. In addition, the Project relates to Sudan's Country Programming Framework (CPF), specifically its Output 1: "Capacity to formulate policies, plans and projects and programs, and follow up implementation improved". The CPF states that FAO projects can support formulation and implementation of policies that cover poverty alleviation, food security, land

tenure, improving nutritional status, and raising productivity. It is equally relevant to the 2013-2015 UNDAF's Pillar 1: Poverty Reduction, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Livelihoods through improving food security. The UNDAF also emphasizes that capacity development will be linked with Sudan's efforts to effectively shift toward decentralization, which is critical because many of the country's most pressing development issues must be addressed at sub-national level.

91. Finally, capacity development strategies are required for achieving the Millennium Development Goal - MDG1 - on hunger reduction through the integration of food security objectives within long-term and broad-based poverty reduction policies and strategies to support country level interventions.

#### *6.1.2 Relevance to the Government of Sudan's development plans*

92. While the Government of Sudan has not yet developed its national food security policies and strategies; a number of projects and programs which contribute to food security are being implemented by various national public institutions with support from international agencies and donors. The abrupt drop in oil revenues, and therefore in foreign exchange since July 2011, resulted in rapidly deteriorating economic conditions in the Sudan which has triggered renewed government interest in the role that agriculture and livestock can play in Sudan's economic future.

93. The recommendation of the National Food Security Action Plan to establish the Food Security Technical Secretariat (FSTS) as an intersectoral policy formulation and coordination institution; the execution of specific food security projects being supported by the Agricultural Revitalization Program (ARP); and the inclusion of a number of food security activities in the five-year (2012-2016) strategic plan are also some of the initiatives which indicate the Government's renewed interest in addressing food insecurity and, therefore, the Project's relevance to the Government's development plans.

#### *6.1.3 Relevance to the targeted States' priorities and needs*

94. The Project is relevant to the four targeted States' priorities and needs for two reasons. First, the four States have a high level of food insecurity, mostly due to problems of distribution and accessibility and less as a result of insufficient production or availability. The four States have the following characteristics: adverse environmental conditions, armed conflicts, rapid urban growth and changing food consumption habits have been major factors in causing food deficit. In addition, lack of adequate information, absence of appropriate policies, traditional and inefficient production systems, poor planning and poor coordination between concerned institutions at both State and Federal levels have significantly contributed to the perpetuation of food insecurity.

95. Second, the Project's relevance was enhanced during the implementation phase since the Capacity Needs Assessments were carried out to capture the particular needs for each State. In addition, slight modifications were made to the Project's initial design to accommodate differences among the four States increasing the Project's relevance (e.g., funds were made available for Gedaref and Kassala States to build offices which were not envisaged in the initial Project design).

96. In particular, in the Blue Nile State, the Secretary General of the State Planning Council highlighted the extent to which the FSPS was relevant to the Council's plans. He

indicated that the FSPS contributed to the Council's focus on three sectors: the economic, social and governance sectors. FSPS contributed to State plans by building capacities of government staff, setting up a database that guides decision makers, and creating stronger links between all State bodies concerned with food security, including the localities.

## 6.2 Efficiency

### Box 12. Key findings

**The Project's efficiency has been negatively impacted** due to implementation delays caused by several security, logistical and management reasons. This has resulted in a high project- management-to-activities expenditure ratio. However, the Project has realized several important outcome-level achievements that are not possible to quantify and which positively influence the Project's efficiency. There are several steps that the Project can take in the second half of its implementation to improve efficiency.

97. Efficiency is often defined in economical term as the ratio between inputs (i.e., the work done) and outputs (i.e., the result achieved). The Project's efficiency has been negatively affected due to the delays that were outlined in Paragraph 32 above. In terms of training costs, it is difficult to quantify exactly how much was spent on training and, therefore, difficult to analyze the efficiency of the training activities. As mentioned earlier the MTE considers that Output 5 could have been more efficiently delivered since it is in the MTE's opinion that the budgeted amounts for each research report are on the high side. However, the Project has realized several important outcome-level achievements that are not possible to quantify and which positively influence the Project's efficiency.

98. In the opinion of the MTE, the Project's efficiency can be improved with the following actions:

- *Increasing and expanding partnerships:* by leveraging the expertise and resources of other FAO projects and partners, the Project could increase its efficiency. For example, other UN agencies (e.g., WFP and UNICEF) can provide training and other resources (e.g., share information on NGOs). Some NGOs can also assist in building the capacities at the localities' level.
- *Shifting training venue to the four States on a rotational basis:* In 2013 three out of the five training workshops were held outside the four States and in 2014, 10 out of 12 trainings were offered either in Madani or Khartoum. By offering training workshops within the four targeted the States, it is likely that the cost of the training may decrease and there will be greater opportunity to increase the number of trainees from within the State where the training is being offered. It will also allow States to better interact and learn from each other.
- *Improving the delivery ratio of the five outputs to the PSU and TSU:* Currently, the average rate of expenditures for the five outputs stands at 23%; whereas that of the PSU and TSU combined it is 58%. By improving the delivery rate for the five outputs and accelerating the implementation of the activities foreseen, the Project's efficiency would be improved.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>16</sup> The ET recognizes that expenditures during the startup period of a project are heavily skewed towards project management costs. The point that the ET is making is that there should be a greater balance during the second half of the project between PSU/TSU expenditures and Output expenditures because there is a risk that, once a no cost extension is approved, more funds will be shifted to the PSU/TSU budget lines at the expense of the Output budget lines which will decrease even further the total budget allocated to the five Outputs.

### 6.3 *Effectiveness*

#### **Box 13. Key findings**

**The Project has been moderately satisfactory** in meeting overall its immediate objective in a relatively short implementation period. However, there are certain Outputs (2 and 4) that are lagging behind in implementation and, therefore, have limited if any effectiveness.

99. In accordance with the findings and conclusions provided in section 5, the evaluation team confirms the Project is effective in meeting expected Outputs 1 and 3, but not in achieving Outputs 2 and 4. The effectiveness of Output 5 will depend on the results of the research and its usage to influence decision making and policy formulation.

100. For Output 1, the institutional setup's effectiveness could be further strengthened by consolidating the horizontal linkages within and among the States and establishing stronger vertical linkages. A communication strategy would greatly enhance the effectiveness of Output 2 once the appropriate government and nongovernment staff have been trained on strategy formulation and policy making. The area in which the Project has been most effective is in the generation and usage of information. The policy briefs/bulletins have been utilized by different actors (government, non-government and other development partners) to formulate policies and design activities to improve food security and nutrition in the four targeted States (see Section 5.2 above and 6.5 below).

101. Given that the FSPS is a capacity development project, its effectiveness greatly depends on the selection of training participants, the extent of the multisectoriality of participants, and the type and quality of the training.

102. The selection process followed by the Project to determine who would participate in the trainings offered was based on the institutions nominating representatives. The participant selection to the trainings was often carried out by the States in collaboration with the TSU. However, there were some trainings (e.g., the Gender mainstreaming training) where the participants at the State level were nominated by the Federal level which - according to the TSUs - resulted in training of staff that were not the most appropriate. Furthermore, in the Red Sea focal points of some localities did not even reside in the localities thus further limiting the effectiveness of training them.

103. In terms of institutional affiliation, as Table 15 below shows, the vast majority of the participants are from line ministries. If the FSTS staff are also included, 80% are governmental staff. The remaining 20% are divided among unions, NGOs, universities and one representative of the private sector. A wider institutional representation would help ensure that the multi-sectoriality of food security and nutrition would be further enhanced.

**Table 15. Institutional affiliations of participants in training**

Institutional affiliation	Number of participants	% of Total
FSTS	23	8
<b>Line Ministries</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>72</b>
Unions	17	6
NGOs/INGOs/UN	24	8
Universities/Research institutions	10	3
FSPS	6	2
Private sector	1	0.3
Volunteers	5	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>100</b>

104. Furthermore, while the majority of participants (232) have attended only one training, there are a few that have participated in several trainings which leads the MTE to question the selection of the participants. For example, there are 21 individuals who have participated in seven or more trainings (see Table 16).

**Table 16. Number of participants/training workshop**

No of workshops	Individuals	Beneficiaries
1	232	232
2	34	68
3	6	18
4	4	16
5	2	10
6	3	18
7	4	28
8	7	56
9	4	36
10	4	40
11	2	22
<b>Total</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>544</b>

105. By varying the type of training offered and selecting the appropriate modalities, the Project's effectiveness could be further improved. For example, as seen in the case of Gedaref, ongoing mentoring and on-the-job training should be central to the capacity-building program, since it is usually more effective for sustained capacity-building than one-off participation in a training course. Furthermore, e-Learning materials and video can be an effective way of enhancing and reinforcing learning following participation in a training course. Training of trainers, if not followed up immediately with the cascade training of other staff loses its effectiveness. Exchange visits among the four States to learn from each others' experiences could provide hands-on learning and new perspectives for dealing with specific implementation challenges.

106. In addition, it is important for the different institutions to utilize the newly acquired skills - whether data collection, analysis or report production – immediately following the training. This requires the 'institutionalization' of the new skills through review and agreement of responsibilities of the various institutions involved in food security and nutrition information systems.

107. In conclusion, one-off participation in training courses is not enough for effective and sustained capacity-building. The Project would improve greatly its effectiveness if it would have a menu of approaches for capacity building, including follow-up on TOTs, and on-the-job training and mentoring, online learning, exchange visits, etc.

#### 6.4 Exit Strategy and Sustainability

##### Box 14. Key findings

**At MTE, it is too soon to comment on the Project's sustainability.** However, discussions have been initiated to implement an exit strategy and ensure sustainability. These include the legal and institutional set up of the FSTS, its financial sustainability and its staffing with multi-sectoral technically capable staff.

108. The sustainability of the Project is related to the extent to which the FSTSes are (i) legally and institutionally established, (ii) multisectoral, (iii) financially sustainable (i.e., included in the State's budget), and (iv) staffed with technically capable and dedicated professionals. Currently, the FSTSes are embedded within the Ministry of Agriculture in the four States and benefit from having the Ministry of Agriculture as a champion. However, the FSTSes are supposed to be constituted of staff from different ministries and are expected to provide policy briefs and analyses based on data collected to the States' Food Security Committees. It is unclear what the legal/institutional arrangements will be once the Project ends and how the FSTSes will be embedded in the government structure. In some States (e.g., Kassala), the Ministry of Agriculture has initiated discussions to ensure that the FSTS is legally established as a Department within the Ministry. The Blue Nile stakeholders are discussing two different options (see Box 14).

##### Box 15. Two Options Advanced by the Blue Nile for Institutional Sustainability

The Blue Nile State has a well-functioning State Planning Council which is headed by the Governor (*Wali*). The stakeholders consulted in the Blue Nile suggested two options for the institutional sustainability of the FSTS.

*Option A:* The FSTS would be legally established as a Commissionerate directly reporting to the *Wali* but housed within the Ministry of Agriculture.

*Option B:* The FSTS would be legally established as a unit within the State Planning Council.

109. There will be several details that would need to be addressed, such as the arrangements for seconded staff from other Ministries, duration of secondment, reporting arrangements, etc. Regarding the financial aspect, Kassala and the Red Sea States have initiated discussions to ensure that the FSTS' budget is included in the State's budget. Proposals have been made, yet so far have not been approved. In Gedaref, in November 2014, the Ministry of Agriculture took the decision to integrate the FSTS Secretariat as a fully-fledged Department within the Ministry. In addition, a running budget was allocated for 2015 and the State's Ministry of Finance and Economics will contribute to the overall program, thus paving the way for an exit strategy.

110. While it is laudable that the different States are discussing and planning for an exit strategy which would ensure the Project's sustainability, there is a risk that every State would choose a different institutional set up for the FSTS which would jeopardize in the long-run the institutional sustainability since it would make it virtually impossible to link up the State level FSTSes to the Federal one if they report to different government institutions (e.g., Ministry of Agriculture, Governor, or State Planning Council). The Project's sustainability is also dependent on the capacity of the Federal FSTS to continue playing the role of coordinator, quality insurer and trainer for the FSTS at the State level. The Federal FSTS has

also an important role to play to ensure that the legalization of the States' FSTS is institutionally aligned with the yet to be formed Higher Council on Food Security and Nutrition. This is essential for harmonizing institutional setup and unifying vertical linkages between the Federal and State FSTSes.

Finally, the Project's sustainability is dependent on (i) the locality focal points' abilities to collect and transmit accurate, reliable and timely data to the FSTS at the State level; (ii) on the well-functioning of the information systems that have been set up at the State level (e.g., in Gedaref State) and (iii) on the FSTS' capacity to analyze the food security and nutrition data, as well as to write policy briefs, bulletins, market updates and disseminate them to a wide audience in a timely manner.

111. The Project has invested in raising awareness at the State level and high-level decision-makers (Wali, Ministers and Director-Generals of Agriculture) are involved in the Project. Given that there are upcoming elections that may result in a change in leadership, time is of the essence to implement all the institutional, legal, budgetary arrangements that are necessary for ensuring the Project's sustainability.

112. Finally, it was already envisaged in the Project design that the International Advisors would hand over the TSU to the National Program Coordinators (NPC) at the end of the second year. The NPCs' capacities would need to be assessed and - if deemed sufficiently developed - a handover needs to be organized and the NPCs' ToRs and salary grade revised to reflect their new responsibilities. The Project's budget would have to be revised accordingly to reflect the staffing changes.

## 6.5 *Impact*

### Box 16. Key Findings

**Project impact is satisfactory.** There are preliminary indications that the Project may contribute to improving Food Security and Nutrition in the four States. This may occur through the different usage of the information and analysis generated by the Project by governmental institutions, UN agencies and other development partners such as NGOs.

113. The Project's envisioned impact is "Improved Food Security in Target States in Sudan". Since this evaluation is a mid-term one, it is premature to assess what impact the Project may have on the Food Security situation in the four States where it is being implemented. However, it is to be noted that "Improved Nutrition" is not included in the desired impact.

114. Nevertheless, there are preliminary indications that the Project may contribute to improving Food Security and Nutrition in the four States. This may occur through the different usage of the information and analysis generated by the Project by governmental institutions, UN agencies and other development partners such as NGOs. For example, the MoH in Kassala has indicated that it has started targeting pockets of a locality that the FSTS brief demonstrated were suffering from a high level of malnutrition. WFP, based on information included in the bulletin produced by the FSTS on market oil prices, changed its assessment and the assistance it was providing to refugees in Kassala. German Agro Action, a NGO, has used the information generated by the Red Sea FSTS to submit a proposal for improving food security in the State. In the Blue Nile, the Zakat Chamber is planning to use FSTS information for determining the type of food assistance it will provide and for improving its targeting strategy in the State.

115. In addition, there are several unexpected outcomes which will also have an impact on the long term on the food security situation be it though increased production (e.g., in the Red Sea State), improved collaboration (e.g., in the Blue Nile State), or availability of continuous training (e.g., in Kassala). Box 16 provides details on the three unexpected outcomes.

#### **Box 17. Examples of Unexpected Outcomes**

In the **Blue Nile State**, the Agricultural Research Station (ARS), since its establishment in 1992, was considered a Federal institution and had limited links with local actors. The Project provided the first support for research from within the State. The Project also provided the first opportunity for collaboration between the ARS and the Blue Nile University, since they were the two institutions contracted for carrying out the research under Output 5. The two institutions started cooperating together which resulted in the ARS staff teaching at the University and University staff carrying out field research. Furthermore, the two institutions are using each other's physical assets. This enhanced relationship is expected to play a positive role in peace building and development at the community level.

In **Kassala State**, university professors, as a result of participating in different workshops offered by the Project which increased their awareness and knowledge regarding food security and nutrition issues, have decided to establish a food security course. They have requested technical assistance from the International Advisor for course design and content. By offering a food security course on a permanent basis, it is expected that future training on food security and capacity development would become permanent and sustainable.

In the **Red Sea State**, the International Advisor used his professional and academic background to provide technical expertise which enhanced cucumber production. The TSU team, together with the FSTS and extension department staff, carried out a number of trips to the localities between 2013 and early 2014 and met with the farmers' union and research teams in their respective research field sites. The TSU team gave various on-the-job training on modern family farming technologies and crop protection methods that resulted in an increase in cucumber production from 620grams to 2,700 grams per fruit indicating more than a four-fold increase. Through this, the FAO Emergency programme (ERCU) provided the Tokar Delta Locality certified vegetable seeds that had increased further their crop production.

## 7 Conclusions and Recommendations

### 7.1 Conclusions

116. Based on the evidence collected throughout the evaluation process, the MTE drew a number of conclusions, which can be organized around the five key evaluation questions as follows.

117. *To what extent an effective cross-sectoral Food Security institutional framework was established and linked to the National institutional framework?*

118. Overall, the Project has succeeded in the four targeted States – the Blue Nile, Gedaref, Kassala, and the Red Sea – in bringing together different line ministries and some Non-State Actors to carry out multi-sectoral food security analysis with a unified understanding of the food security concept in a culture where there has traditionally been little collaboration. Multi-sectoral Food Security Committees (FSC) and Food Security Technical Secretariats (FSTS) have been established in the four targeted States. The FSTSes tend to be more heavily represented by the Ministry of Agriculture and are currently attached to the Ministry of Agriculture. They have established strong horizontal linkages within the States through different coordination mechanisms and working groups. However, the vertical linkages - upward with the Federal FSTS and downward with the localities - are weak. Furthermore, linkages and collaboration and information exchange among the four States is also poor to non-existent. Finally, the SFSTS have not been incorporated in the institutional structure of the State Government nor in its budget which will have an impact on the Project's sustainability. Discussions have been initiated at the State level to ensure that an appropriate exit strategy is put in place prior to the end of the Project.

119. At the Federal level, the FSTS was established by SIFSIA, a precursor FAO project. However, there is no institution corresponding to the FSC at the Federal level. The Higher Council on Food Security and Nutrition has yet to be established though it was one the recommendations of the SIFSIA evaluation in 2012. This continued delay in establishing the highest level inter-ministerial decision-making body may be a reflection of weak political will and both FAO and the EU in Khartoum need to continue lobbying for the issuance of the Presidential Decree which would allow the establishment of the Higher Council.

120. *To what extent the capacity to review, plan, budget and monitor Food Security (FS) policies and to develop strategies was enhanced, resulting in more effective public action for food security and nutrition?*

121. The Project has attempted to strengthen the capacities to develop policies and strategies for improving food security and nutrition. A two-week visit to Namibia and a training on sector policy analysis and design were implemented. However, they are insufficient to reach the level of capacity desired for policy planning, budgeting and monitoring. The approach to be followed in developing such capacities must be different from that of training for specific technical capacities. It is also important to ensure that those selected to participate in this training are at a sufficient senior level in their respective institutions and are in a position to influence policy-making.

122. Furthermore, policy-making goes hand-in-hand with an effective communications strategy. The Project did not envisage the design and implementation of a communication strategy that would (i) assist the FSTSes in having wider dissemination of its reports and

analyses, (ii) develop the capacities of stakeholders to lobby and advocate for specific food security and nutrition activities; and (iii) build the capacities of media professionals to report and monitor food security and nutrition in their respective States.

123. *To what extent the Regional level Food Security information systems were strengthened and support decision making?*

124. The Project has succeeded in training 302 staff from different governmental and non-governmental institutions on various topics related to food security and nutrition. The training offered covered both technical topics (e.g., data collection and analysis, GIS, food security and nutrition concepts) to soft skills (e.g., report writing). The vast majority of those trained (approximately 80%) come from line ministries and there is room for expanding the participants to include representatives from outside the government.

125. As a result of the training received, the four FSTSEs are producing good quality food security and nutrition policy briefs and bulletins that are highly appreciated and being used by line ministries, UN agencies and NGOs. These analytical reports are already producing an impact at the States' level and have been used to introduce/modify policies related to food security and nutrition.

126. *To what extent the capacity of Food Security oriented Non-State Actors' was strengthened?*

127. The Project has included representatives of Non-State Actors (NSA) in most of the training it has offered. They were also invited to participate in the Capacity Needs Assessment workshops – albeit in small numbers. NSAs are also represented on the various Food Security and Nutrition technical working groups and coordination committees. However, the Project's approach to NSAs is limited to representatives of the various unions (farmers, fishermen, vegetables, etc.) and does not include NGOs, the private sector, the media, etc. A comprehensive mapping of NSAs and a capacity needs assessment and development have yet to be carried out. A focused effort in the second half of the Project needs to be done in order to meet the Project's objective of building the NSAs capacities and ensuring their greater involvement in improving the food security and nutrition situation at the State level.

128. *To what extent key food insecurity drivers are better understood and linked to decision making?*

129. The Project has signed a total of eight LOAs with four different universities, one research center and one NGO to carry out research on various topics related to food security and nutrition covering production, accessibility and utilization and covering several sectors (e.g., agriculture, fisheries, livestock, natural resource management). The research is still ongoing therefore it is early for the MTE to determine to what extent the results and recommendations of the research teams would be linked to decision-making. However, it is important to ensure the quality of the research and its wide dissemination if it is going to have a role in shedding light on particular aspects of food security and nutrition and if it is to guide decision-makers either to modify certain interventions or to issue specific policies for improving the food security and nutrition situation in their States.

130. In conclusion, the FSPS has faced and overcome several challenges during the first half of its implementation. Notwithstanding the difficulties, the FSPS has been able to achieve important results. As a direct consequence of the reports produced by the FSTSEs, several policy changes for improving food security and nutrition have been implemented in the targeted States. Looking forward, the FSPS, during the second half of the Project, should consolidate its achievements by further strengthening the institutional set up and by focusing its efforts on developing the capacities for policy formulation. It should equally place greater attention on reaching out and developing the capacities of a greater number of NSAs as well expand its definition of NSAs. In addition, in this second half of the Project, efforts undertaken in mainstreaming gender equality in the FSPS should be capitalized and consolidated. This entails among others the implementation of the Gender Mainstreaming Guidelines and monitoring of progress made in mainstreaming gender equality. Finally, the Project team as well as the FSTSEs would need to immediately initiate discussions to ensure a smooth exit strategy and to guarantee the institutional, financial and technical sustainability of the Project.

## 7.2 *Recommendations*

131. The recommendations put forward by this mid-term evaluation are forward looking and aim at providing guidance for the better implementation of activities in the second half of the project.

### **Recommendation 1: To the PSU and TSU on improving Project management.**

The MTE recommends a no cost-extension and budget revision. In addition, the MTE recommends the improvement of Project management through different steps, including recruiting short term consultants, better monitoring of expenditure rates, and harmonization of M&E framework among other steps.
---

132. It is in the opinion of the MTE that the following actions would have a positive impact on Project implementation and therefore, the Project team may wish to take them into consideration:

- Monitor more closely expenditures to achieve a greater balance between project management expenditures and output-based expenditures;
- Invite the Ministry of Health to be represented in both the PAC and Project Technical Committee to ensure that nutrition issues are included, monitored and addressed by the project.
- Encourage the Ministry of Livestock to participate in the PAC;
- Organize an externally facilitated workshop for PSU and TSU in order to address staff morale, backstopping, communication, and implementation of activities at the State level issues;
- Increase PSU backstopping missions to the four States. Quarterly coordination meetings between the PSU and TSUs could be done on a rotational basis in the States and only occasionally in Khartoum;
- Ensure that funds are disbursed, as soon as possible, to Gedaref's TSU in order to carry out the necessary physical improvements of office space;
- Recruit specialized short-term consultants to assist PSU/TSU in implementing specific Project Outputs (e.g., expert on NSAs, expert on communication and advocacy, experts on strategy/policy formulation);

- Recruit short-term gender expert to assist the PSU/TSU in implementing the Gender Mainstreaming Guidelines beyond the gender disaggregation of participants in training and other type of workshops;
- Unify M&E framework for the four States, harmonize data collection (type, frequency, template), provide standardized template for bulleting and briefs;
- Improve management of LOAs ensuring that tranches are paid only when the activities have been undertaken and verified and financial receipts have been submitted;
- Assess National Program Coordinators' and, as required, organize a handover from the International Advisor to the NPC; Revise NPCs' ToRs, grade and salary to reflect their new responsibilities;
- Support the States to fill in vacant positions in a timely manner???
- Organize visit of FAOR to four States to discuss exit strategy including the institutional, legal, budgetary arrangements that are necessary for ensuring the Project's sustainability; and
- Quantify SFSTS costs (salaries, operational costs, etc.) to start planning an exit strategy and to make sure that the adequate funds are included in the States' annual budgets.

**Recommendation 2: To FAO and the EU and their partners (e.g., WFP, UNICEF, etc.) on the establishment of an effective cross-sectoral Food Security institutional framework and linking it to the National institutional framework (Output 1).**

The MTE recommends that FAO and the EU and their partners (e.g., WFP, UNICEF, etc.) continue advocating for the issuance of a Presidential Decree which would establish the Higher Council on Food Security and Nutrition under the office of the Vice President at the Federal Level.

**Recommendation 3: To the PSU and TSU on the establishment of an effective cross-sectoral Food Security institutional framework and linking it to the National institutional framework (Output 1).**

The MTE recommends further strengthening of the vertical and horizontal institutional linkages for improving food security and nutrition. The MTE recommends carrying out an in-depth institutional analysis which would also guide the formulation of an exit strategy.

133. This may include among others the following activities:

- Strengthen *vertical (upward) linkages* between the Federal FSTS and State FSTSes by establishing formal MoUs between the Federal FSTS and States FSTSes. Ensure that State FSTS share on a regular basis with Federal level bulletins, reports, etc. Ensure that quarterly visits are undertaken by the Federal FSTS to the States' FSTS for backstopping and monitoring. Set up an informal mailing list among all professional staff of FSTS (linking all nutrition-, crop production-, livestock staff, etc. in informal communication groups to exchange information and communicate on a regular basis);
- Strengthen *vertical (downward) linkages* between State FSTSes and focal points in the localities. Explore opportunities to collaborate with NGOs, INGOs and other UN agencies working at the locality level for strengthening information collection at the locality level. Expand number of staff trained at locality level.

Provide locality focal points with an official letter explaining the reasons for collecting information and its use and dissemination;

- Strengthen *horizontal linkages* among the four SFSTSEs (sharing of information and experiences, exchange visits, etc.);
- Strengthen *horizontal linkages* with the private sector, media, State parliamentarians, civil society organizations, research institutions and Unions, etc.;
- Establish and strengthen M&E in the four State and Federal FSTSEs;
- Recruit a short-term expert to carry out an in-depth institutional assessment and provide recommendations for (i) streamlining and reducing number of working groups (coordination structures); (ii) revising and harmonizing TORs for different working groups and FSTSEs; (iii) suggest recommendations for an exit strategy which would address the institutional, financial and human resource issues within each State; and
- Request the State Government to issue, as soon as possible, a written order signed by the Wali ensuring that the Project's assets (offices, vehicles, computers, furniture) remain with the SFSTSEs (regardless of where the FSTSEs would be located institutionally at the end of the Project).

**Recommendation 4: To the PSU and TSU on the capacity to review, plan, budget and monitor Food Security (FS) policies and strategies developed, resulting in more effective public action for food security and nutrition. (Output 2).**

The MTE team recommends greater attention and effort be placed to develop strategy and policy formulation capacities and to develop and implement a Communications Strategy that would complement effective policy making.

134. In order to achieve the above, the following steps may be considered:

- With the participation of the FAO Rep, organize awareness-raising workshops for high-level decision-makers (political) at State level (e.g., Wali, Ministers and DGs, Parliamentarians, and leaders of NSAs) to create buy-in for strategy and policy formulation;
- Organize a two-stage training in each State: (i) on policy and strategy formulation and implementation for appropriate level stakeholders (from government and non-government); (ii) followed by the elaboration of the State Food Security and Nutrition Strategy. Include the National Program Coordinators in this training;
- Ensure that gender issues are addressed in all food security and nutrition policies; Ensure that gender balance is considered in policy dialogue forums and that women are adequately represented in the decision-making process;
- Ensure that trainers for the above-mentioned training are highly qualified to offer both the training and facilitate the strategy formulation;
- Disseminate the FSN strategy once formulated to all government institutions and development actors in the State; and
- Recruit a communications expert to assist the Project in formulating and implementing a communications strategy.

**Recommendation 5: To the PSU and TSU on functional Regional level Food Security information systems strengthened and supports decision-making (Output 3).**

The MTE recommends the fine-tuning of the training workshops to improve their efficiency and effectiveness.

135. Several actions can be taken to improve and fine-tune the training activities which would improve both their efficiency and effectiveness. They may include among others the following activities:

- *Selection:* Improve the selection of participants by establishing and applying selection criteria (e.g., residing within the State and within localities for locality focal points, age considerations, specialization and function of participants within his/her line ministry, etc.). Furthermore, it is strongly recommended that participant selection is made at State level and not in Khartoum for better follow up.
- *Number of trainees:* Expand the number of trainees at State level to ensure that each FSTS staff and focal points at locality level has at least one or two other government staff trained on the same topic as back-up. Ensure greater representation of women among participants, especially in the States that have had so far low representation.
- *Venue:* Increase trainings done at the State level on a rotational basis to provide opportunity for States to learn from each other and to increase number of participants from States.
- *Topics:* Organize a training on analysis of causes and processes of food insecurity and malnutrition (not only data collection and analysis). Consider introducing the Right to Adequate Food concept and approach in future trainings. Set up information databanks to organize and harmonize all the different food security information systems available. Install database software in FSTS and provide on- the-job training on how to use it. Train FSTS admin/finance staff.
- *Training provision:* One-off training is normally not enough to change the activities and processes of individuals and their organizations. Hence, sustainable and long-term training solutions should be considered using partner institutions.
- *Institutionalization of training:* Ensure that organizations adopt the new responsibilities (data collection, analysis, etc.), raise awareness about the new responsibilities and ensure country ownership of the processes.
- *Follow up on TOT:* follow up on TOT training to ensure that they are being implemented at the State level, especially those trained on gender and food security and nutrition.
- *Quality:* Conduct pre and post tests to capture and assess the extent of knowledge and skills acquired. For training that is offered in packages, ensure that trainees have acquired knowledge/skills before moving on to the higher level module. Ensure that the same participant attends all the training modules.
- *Type of training:* expand type of training offered from classroom style to include additional on-the-job training, mentoring, online courses, etc.

**Recommendation 6: To the PSU, TSU and FSTS on functional Regional level Food Security information systems strengthened and supports decision-making (Output 3).**

The MTE recommends the improvement of the food security documents being produced, their wider dissemination, and the regular monitoring of their usage and impact.

136. The following actions are recommended:

- Harmonize food security and nutrition documents (bulletins, briefs, reports) that are produced in the four States and ensure that they are available in Arabic as well as in English;
- Widen outreach by disseminating the reports to include media, parliamentarians, research institutions and researchers and other concerned NSAs;
- Design and implement a user feedback mechanism; and
- Monitor systematically policy changes resulting from SFSTS policy briefs and bulletins.

**Recommendation 7: To the PSU and TSU on the strengthening of food security oriented Non-State Actors' capacity (Output 4).**

The MTE recommends urgently the acceleration and prioritization of the implementation of Output 4 for strengthening the capacities of food security oriented Non-State Actors.

137. In particular, the evaluation recommends the following:

- Recruit urgently a short term consultant to map NSAs (INGOS, NGOS, Unions, media, private sector, Chamber of Commerce) in each State and carry out a participatory capacity assessment and design an action plan for achieving this output;
- Develop and carry out specialized training for each category of NSA;
- Expand dissemination list of SFSTS-generated reports and documents to reach a wider number of NSAs, including the media, the private sector, researchers, university professors, parliamentarians, and religious leaders; and
- Explore opportunities for collaborating with other UN agencies, INGOs and NGOs to provide joint training and raise awareness at locality level (e.g., in Kassala, there is a potential of collaborating with WFP and its implementing partners at the locality level).

**Recommendation 8: To the PSU and TSU on better understanding of key food insecurity drivers and linking them to decision making (Output 5).**

The MTE recommends that a rigorous and participative quality assurance process be established and that the research reports be widely disseminated.

138. In order to achieve the above, the Project team may want to implement the following:

- Quality research: Ensure that an adequate review process to ensure quality of research is put in place and followed. Ensure that gender issues are analyzed. Results/recommendations should be action oriented. Organize a workshop where the eight draft research reports are presented with an external discussant to provide recommendations for finalization; and
- Dissemination of research/study reports: ensure dissemination to a wide range of relevant stakeholders and users, including academicians, government departments, development agencies, media, parliamentarians, and public libraries; and

- Action following research: Organize a workshop at State level to present revised draft and to design a participatory action plan with assigned tasks to utilize research results in order to implement activities which result in improved food security and nutrition at the State level.

**Recommendation 9:** To the PSU and TSU on mainstreaming gender.

The MTE recommends that the Gender Mainstreaming Guidelines are implemented and that efforts already undertaken by the Project for mainstreaming gender equality in FSPS are consolidated.

139. This should entail the following suggested actions:

- Regular follow up on training of TOT on gender, food security and nutrition;
- Ensure gender analysis, when relevant, is part of all research undertaken by the Project; and
- Ensure monitoring on progress in mainstreaming gender equality

## **Annex 1      Terms of Reference**

### **1. Background of the Project**

1. The Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme (FSPS), GCP/SUD/038/EC is a three-year programme funded by the European Union (EU) EUR 8.6 million and is being implemented by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in collaboration with the Government of the Republic of the Sudan. FSPS was designed to support the target state governments in addressing the capacity gaps related to: (a) food security inter-sectoral institutional coordination framework, food security policy and information system; and (b) the line ministries' policy planning, budgeting, monitoring and implementation capacity.

2. The direct beneficiaries of the Programme include: state line ministries in the target states (Blue Nile, Kassala, Gedaref and Red Sea States), State-level non-ministerial public institutions (e.g. Strategic Planning General Secretariat), selected localities in target states, selected non-state actors in the above states and the Food Security Technical Secretariat (FSTS) at targeted states and the federal one. Direct and indirect stakeholders in the Programme include at the federal level: The Ministry of Health (MoH), the Sudan Meteorology Authority (SMA), Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries (MoARF), Strategic Reserve Corporation (SRC), Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS), Ministry of Finance and National Economy (MoFNE), Humanitarian Aid Commission (HAC), World Food Programme (WFP), United Nations Children Fund (UNICEF), World Health Organization (WHO), United Nations Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA), European Union (EU), United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Department for International Development (DFID), Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (AECID), European Community Humanitarian Office (ECHO) and the World Bank (WB). Indirect beneficiaries and stakeholders include the population living in the target states, various line ministries in the federal Government and non-ministerial public institutions at the federal level.

3. The contribution Agreement between FAO and the EU for the implementation of FSPS was officially signed on 6th November 2012. However, the actual implementation of the programme was started in March 2013 due to various factors that include the rigorous recruitment process by FAO and clearance of all the international staff by the Government of Sudan.

4. The expected Impact of the programme is the long-term improvement of food security in targeted states of Sudan.

5. The programme has following outcome: "Food Security decisions more inclusive, better integrated, informed, implemented and monitored".

6. The Impact and outcome are to be achieved primarily by strengthening governments' capacities to prioritize and formulate food security policies and strategies based on well researched evidence and through inclusive and consultative mechanisms in which lower-level governance structures and major non-state actors become part of the prioritizing and decision making processes.

## 2. Purpose and scope of the Evaluation

7. In accordance with the Project Document, an independent Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) will be undertaken. The overall purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to determine progress being made towards the achievement of project outcomes and to identify corrective actions if necessary. The independent mid-term evaluation will provide an evaluation of project's conceptualization and design and of projects implementation from November 2012 until October 2014.

8. The following key issues will be addressed by the Mid-Term Evaluation:

- Extent to which an effective cross-sectoral Food Security institutional framework was established and linked to the National institutional framework;
- Extent to which the capacity to review, plan, budget and monitor Food Security (FS) policies and strategies developed was enhanced, resulting in more effective public action for food security and nutrition;
- Extent to which the Regional level Food Security information systems was strengthened and supports decision making;
- Extent to which the capacity of Food Security oriented Non-State Actors' was strengthened;
- Extent to which key food insecurity drivers are better understood and linked to decision making.

9. The evaluation will also

- review the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation;
- analyze effectiveness of implementation and partnership arrangements;
- identify issues requiring decisions and remedial actions;
- identify lessons learned about project design, implementation and management;
- highlight technical achievements and lessons learned;
- analyze whether the project is on track with respect to achieving the expected results; and
- propose any mid-course corrections and/or adjustments to the Work Plan as necessary.

### *a. Evaluation criteria*

10. The project will be critically assessed through the internationally accepted evaluation criteria, i.e. relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. In line with the new FAO project cycle, the evaluation will assess compliance with the following UN Common Country Programming Principles; Gender equality, Capacity Development and Results Based Management.

11. For the purposes of the evaluation, the definition of **food security** used is that promoted by FAO as originally defined at the World Food Summit 1996 and framed within a multisectoral causal model that identifies food availability, access, utilization and stability as underlying domains related to food security. *"Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food which meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life."*

### *b. Evaluation issues*

12. An initial list of key sub questions has been identified through discussions with project stakeholders. The evaluation team may identify other issues in the course of evaluation.

### **3. Relevance of concept and design**

13. Relevance and coherence of the FSPS programme to development priorities and needs, in particular:

- The national development priorities and programmes of the Government of Sudan, at central and State level, as well as the needs of the population;
- FAO Country Programming Framework and strategic priorities;
- FAO Global Goals and Strategic Objectives/Core Programming Functions; UNDAF.

14. Clarity and realism of the programme's development and immediate objectives, including specification of targets and identification of institutional beneficiaries and prospects for sustainability;

Quality, clarity and adequacy of the programme design including:

- clarity and logical consistency between, inputs, activities, outputs and progress towards achievement of objectives (quality, quantity and time-frame); appropriateness of the adopted approach in tackling the identified problems.
- realism and clarity in the specification of prior obligations and prerequisites (assumptions and risks) and adequacy of resources (time, funding, human resources) for the successful implementation of the project;
- clarity of external coordination and institutional relationships, and in the managerial and institutional framework for implementation and the work plan; specific analysis of the mechanisms designed to ensure synergy and sustainability of the actions.
- likely cost-effectiveness of the programme design;
- adequacy and appropriateness of the technical solutions proposed (level of sophistication of systems, equipment, proposed institutional set-up, etc) with respect to the existing (or expected) capacities in State Government institutions expected to take over them.

### **4. Effectiveness of outputs and outcomes**

15. Overall effectiveness of the project, actual or potential, in attaining its intermediate/specific objectives. In addition to the full and systematic assessment of outputs produced to date (quantity and quality as compared with work plan and progress towards achieving the immediate objectives) and of the outcomes achieved, expected and unexpected, their robustness and expectations for further uptake and diffusion,<sup>17</sup> the evaluation will focus on the following:

- Assessment of the quality of monitoring, information management and reporting, including visibility and communication;
- Number and quality of sector or sub-sector policies/strategies formulated and revised by each target states;
- Extent to which decisions are made on the basis of food security and nutrition information generated by the State FSTS;
- Extent to which information about agricultural, livestock, nutrition and natural resources status of each target state are strengthened, maintained, utilised and linked to the national system;
- Extent to which non state actors are part of the FSN decision making processes in each target state;

---

<sup>17</sup> 'FAO projects should have (only) one outcome. Programmes may have more.' From FAO Project Cycle Guidelines, 2012.

- Extent to which state level academic and research institutions are able to prioritise, design, participate and conduct research on key food insecurity drivers;
- Coverage of the information being generated and disseminated (sectoral coverage, geographic coverage of the most vulnerable groups, etc).

16. Use made by the project of FAO's normative and knowledge products and actual and potential contribution of the project to the normative and knowledge function of the Organization.

#### ***4.1 Efficiency and effectiveness of project implementation process***

17. Assessment of project management:

- Quality, realism and focus of work plans;
- Assessment of delivery, causes and consequences of delays and of any remedial measure taken, if any;
- Monitoring and feed-back loop into improved management and operations;
- Staff management;
- Development and implementation of an exit strategy.

18. Institutional Setup:

- Administrative and technical support by FAO HQ, regional, sub-regional and country office, as appropriate;
- Institutional set-up, internal review processes, coordination and steering bodies;
- Inputs and support by the Government/s and resource partner/s;
- Extent to which all relevant stakeholders are included in the institutional set up (State FSTS, FSC and FS/P Working Groups) and actively participating in dissemination of food security update reports to decision and policy makers;
- Extent to which vertical linkages with the national food security technical secretariat and horizontal linkages with State line ministries and other institutions at state level are established and maintained by States FSTS.

19. Assessment of financial resources management, including:

- Adequacy and realism of budget allocations to achieve intended results;
- Adequacy and realism of Budget Revisions in matching implementation needs and project objectives;
- Rate of delivery and budget balance at the time of the evaluation and in relation to work-plans.

20. Analysis of the application of the UN common country programming principles, cross-cutting themes, and of the Humanitarian Principles and Minimum Standards in the case of emergency projects

21. Analysis of gender mainstreaming for gender equality. This will include:

- extent to which gender equality considerations were reflected in project objectives and design to address the needs, priorities and constraints of both women and men, and in the identification of beneficiaries;
- extent to which gender equality considerations were taken into account in project implementation and management;
- Extent to which gender relations and equality have been or will be affected by the project. Particular attention will be devoted to the four FAO's Gender Equality Objectives attainable at the level of initiative or thematic area: i) Equal decision-making; ii) Equal access to

productive resources; iii) Equal access to goods, services and markets; iv) Reduction of women's work burden,<sup>18</sup>

- Analysis of gender equity in the management and staffing of the project.

22. Analysis of the Capacity Development dimension in the design, implementation and results of the project, at individual, organizational and enabling environment levels.<sup>19</sup> This will include CD on both technical and soft-skills, i.e. planning, budgeting, partnering and negotiating.

23. Extent to which the capacity of the newly established institutional set up and line ministries are enhanced to review, analyse and develop new policies.

Analysis of the adoption of the Human-Rights Based Approach, namely:

- the integration of the Right to Food dimension and principles, in the design, implementation and results of the project;
- the integration of decent rural employment concerns in the design, implementation and results of the project.

24. Analysis of Partnerships and Alliances, namely:

- how they were planned in the project design and developed through implementation;
- their focus and strength; and
- their effect on project results and sustainability.<sup>20</sup>

25. Stakeholder participation in the design, management and implementation of the project, and the level of local ownership.

#### **4.2 Impact**

- i. Overall impact of the project, actual or potential, positive and negative, produced directly or indirectly, intended or unintended; and
- ii. Overall contribution of the project to FAO Country Programming Frameworks, Organizational Result/s and Strategic Objectives, as well as to the implementation of the corporate Core Functions.

#### **4.3 Sustainability**

26. The prospects for sustaining and up-scaling the project's results by the beneficiaries and the host institutions after the termination of the project. The assessment of sustainability will focus, in addition to technical, social and economic aspects as appropriate, on the institutional sustainability of the following products and outcomes:

- the institutional set up for Food Security;
- the information systems;
- the food security and nutrition policy and strategy;
- capacity development of the key partners; state and non-state actors

27. Based on the above analysis, the evaluation will draw specific conclusions and formulate recommendations for any necessary further action by Government, FAO and/or other parties to ensure sustainable development, including any need for follow-up or up-scaling action. The evaluation will draw attention to specific good practices and lessons to be

---

<sup>18</sup> See FAO Policy on Gender Equality.

<sup>19</sup> See: <http://www.fao.org/capacitydevelopment/en/>

<sup>20</sup> See: <http://www.fao.org/partnerships/partners-home/en/>

learned as they are of interest to other similar activities. Any proposal for further assistance should include specification of major objectives and outputs and indicative inputs required.

## **5. Evaluation methodology**

### *c. Approach and tools*

28. The evaluation will adhere to the UNEG Norms & Standards.<sup>21</sup> FAO Office of Evaluation, OED, will manage this evaluation in full transparency, while ensuring that it remains completely independent and external to the project management.

29. The evaluation will adopt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. Triangulation of evidence and information gathered will underpin its validation and analysis and will support conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation methodology will draw upon the views and perspectives of Government(s), FAO and EU staff at country level, data and documentation reviews, and interviews with key decision maker and partner stakeholders working in the area of food security.

30. The evaluation will make use of the following methods and tools: (i) Desk Review: Review of literature, including the documents detailed under point 10 (reference material); (ii) preparation of an evaluation matrix with related evaluation questions and benchmarks; (iii) Stakeholder Review; (iv) Semi-structured interviews with key informants, stakeholders and participants, supported by check lists and/or interview protocols; direct observation during field visits; surveys and questionnaires; and (v) Workshops in the field (Khartoum and States) to discuss and validate findings, and propose possible recommendations.

31. Particular attention will be devoted to ensure that women and other under-privileged groups will be consulted in adequate manner. Insofar as possible and appropriate, interaction will also take place with non-participants to canvass their opinions. The Sustainable Livelihoods Framework,<sup>22</sup> the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) framework can be used for assessment of project results.<sup>23</sup>

### *d. Stakeholders and consultation process*

32. The evaluation team will discuss in detail with the key stakeholders of the project and will take into account their perspectives and opinions.

33. While the ultimate beneficiaries of the programme are households vulnerable to food insecurity and malnutrition, for the purposes of this evaluation, the primary beneficiaries are considered to be decision makers dealing with food security policy and programming in the State Governments. Other beneficiaries are the international community (donors, UN, NGOs)

---

<sup>21</sup> United Nations Evaluation Group, <http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards>

<sup>22</sup> The Sustainable Livelihoods Framework identifies five different capitals (human, social, natural, financial, and physical), each including different assets. It helps in improving understanding of livelihoods, in particular of the poor. For more information, among others: [http://www.livelihoods.org/info/guidance\\_sheets\\_pdfs/section2.pdf](http://www.livelihoods.org/info/guidance_sheets_pdfs/section2.pdf)

<sup>23</sup> SWOT is a widely used strategic planning tool, useful also in the assessment of development interventions, to canvass their strengths and weaknesses, as well as future perspectives. It is particularly used in focus groups, but it can be adapted to individual interviews as well.

and local organizations dealing with food security issues either in emergency or in longer term development contexts.

34. Other key stakeholders include:

- Project Advisory Committee members;
- Food Security Committees at State level;
- Government representatives from the partner organizations;
- Direct and indirect stakeholders in the Programme;
- FAO Representative and other relevant staff; and
- Direct beneficiaries, including FSTS at targeted states and the federal one, state line ministries in the target states, state-level non-ministerial public institutions (e.g. Strategic Planning General Secretariat), selected localities in target states, selected non-state actors. etc.

35. The evaluation team will maintain close liaison with: the FAO Office of Evaluation, the Project Task Force members and Project staff at headquarters, regional, sub-regional or country level. Although the mission is free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment on behalf of the Government, the donor or FAO.

36. The team will present its preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations to the project stakeholders in the visited country/ies and insofar as possible, in the relevant FAO Decentralized Office and in HQ, to obtain their feedback at the end of the data-gathering phase.

37. The draft ToR will be circulated among key stakeholders for comments before finalisation; suggestions will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by OED. The draft evaluation report will also be circulated among key stakeholders for comments before finalisation; suggestions will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by the evaluation team.

## **6. Roles and responsibilities**

38. FAO Budget Holder (BH), the Lead Technical Officer (LTO) and the Project Task Force (PTF) of the project to be evaluated are responsible for initiating the evaluation process, drafting the first version of the Terms of Reference, and supporting the evaluation team during its work. They are required to participate in meetings with the team, make available information and documentation as necessary, and comment on the draft final terms of reference and report. Involvement of different members of the project Task Force will depend on respective roles and participation in the project.

39. The BH is also responsible for leading and coordinating the preparation of the FAO Management Response and the Follow-up Report to the evaluation, fully supported in this task by the LTO and PTF. OED guidelines for the Management Response and the Follow-up Report provide necessary details on this process.

40. FAO Office of Evaluation assists the BH and LTO in drafting the ToR, in the identification of the consultants and in the organization of the team's work; it is responsible

for the finalization of the ToR and of the team composition;<sup>24</sup> it shall brief the evaluation team on the evaluation methodology and process and will review the final draft report for Quality Assurance purposes in terms of presentation, compliance with the ToR and timely delivery, quality, clarity and soundness of evidence provided and of the analysis supporting conclusions and recommendations.

41. The Office of Evaluation has also a responsibility in following up with the BH for the timely preparation of the Management Response and the Follow-up to the MR.

42. The Evaluation Team is responsible for conducting the evaluation, applying the methodology as appropriate and for producing the evaluation report. All team members, including the Team Leader, will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs for the final draft and final report.

43. The Team Leader guides and coordinates the team members in their specific work, discusses their findings, conclusions and recommendations and prepares the final draft and the final report, consolidating the inputs from the team members with his/her own.

44. The Evaluation team will be free to expand the scope, criteria, questions and issues listed above, as well as develop its own evaluation tools and framework, within time and resources available.

45. The team is fully responsible for its report which may not reflect the views of the Government or of FAO. An evaluation report is not subject to technical clearance by FAO although OED is responsible for Quality Assurance of all evaluation reports.

46. As a contribution to the OED Knowledge Management System:
- the Team Leader will be responsible for completing the OED quantitative project performance questionnaire, to be delivered at the same time with the final evaluation report;
  - OED will ask all team members to complete an anonymous and confidential questionnaire to get their feedback on the evaluation process.

## **7. Evaluation team**

47. Mission members will have had no previous direct involvement in the formulation, implementation or backstopping of the project. All will sign the Declaration of Interest form of the FAO Office of Evaluation.

48. The evaluation team will comprise the best available mix of skills that are required to assess the project, and as a whole, will have expertise in all the following subject matters:

- food security policy and strategy and food security information systems;
- knowledge of the country and familiarity with its political, socio-economic and institutional conditions;
- Gender equality and HRBA;

---

<sup>24</sup> The responsibility for the administrative procedures for recruitment of the team, will be decided on a case-by-case basis.

- Conduct of evaluations.

49. Furthermore, to the extent possible, the team will be balanced in terms of geographical and gender representation to ensure diversity and complementarity of perspectives.

## **8. Evaluation deliverables**

50. The evaluation report will illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation issues, questions and criteria listed in the ToR. It will include an executive summary. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report.

51. The recommendations will be addressed to the different stakeholders and prioritized: they will be evidence-based, relevant, focused, clearly formulated and actionable.

52. The evaluation team will agree on the outline of the report early in the evaluation process, based on the template provided in Annex I of this ToR. The report will be prepared in English with numbered paragraphs, following OED template for report writing. Translations in other languages of the Organization, if required, will be FAO's responsibility.

53. The team leader bears responsibility for submitting the final draft report to FAO within two weeks from the conclusion of the mission. Within two additional weeks, FAO will submit to the team its comments and suggestions that the team will include as appropriate in the final report within maximum two weeks.

54. Annexes to the evaluation report will include, though not limited to, the following as relevant:

- Terms of reference for the evaluation;
- Profile of team members;
- List of documents reviewed;
- List of institutions and stakeholders interviewed by the evaluation team;
- List of project outputs;
- Evaluation tools.

## **9. Evaluation timetable**

55. The evaluation mission to the Sudan is scheduled to take place from 25 November to 10 December.

56. The Team Leader will receive one day briefing in Rome prior to travelling to Sudan in order to a) discuss the TOR for the evaluation with OED evaluation service staff, b) interview the key technical and operational units within FAO responsible for supporting the delivery of the FSPS project, and c) revise the evaluation matrix for the evaluation and prepare data gathering tools during this period. Other team members will have reading and preparation days from home and will be provided with a briefing package of FSPS project and contextual information for Sudan.

57. The Evaluation team will have an initial 3 day country and security brief in Khartoum, meeting with EU and FAOR, and discuss with the Programme Support Unit of the Programme to be evaluated. The team will then travel for 12 days in the four target States (3 days in each State) for interviews and documentation review. The team will present the main findings and recommendations to FAOR and PAC members in Khartoum in a debriefing prior to the departure of the mission.

58. The timetable in the box below shows a tentative programme of travel and work for the evaluation team. It will be finalised upon the recruitment of the evaluation team.

### 9.1 *Tentative timetable of the evaluation*

<b>Task</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
ToR finalization	September - October		OED -FAO Sudan
Team identification and recruitment	October - November		OED
Mission organization	October - November		OED/FAO Sudan
Reading background documentation	November	2 days	Evaluation team
Briefing	26 November	1 day	OED – LTU
Travel	27 November – 13 December		OED
Mission to	Rome – Sudan	15 days	FAO Sudan

### 9.2 *Annexes*

- Project evaluation report outline
- FAO Strategic Objectives, Results and core functions, 2010-2019;
- OED project performance questionnaire

## **Annex 2      Brief profile of evaluation team members**

*Rima Al-Azar*, Team Leader, has more than twenty years of experience in international development, including the design, implementation, supervision and evaluation of complex programs. She has worked in more than 50 countries as staff and/or consultant with FAO, IFAD, WFP, UNDP, UNICEF the World Bank, and the EU. She has designed and evaluated several capacity development programs related to food security and gender. Ms. Al-Azar has carried out institutional assessments and stakeholder consultations to better design, implement and evaluate programs. She is fluent in English, French and Arabic and has working knowledge of Spanish and Italian.

*Hassan Abdel Ati (PhD)*, Team Member, graduated with a BA (Hon.) in Geography from the University of Khartoum (1976), obtained his MSc Economics in Regional Planning (1979) and a PhD in Development Studies from the University of Wales, Swansea, UK. He has worked as a Teaching Assistant (1977-78), and Lecturer (1983-1992) at the Department of Geography, University of Khartoum. He was Head of Department 1987-1989 and Coordinator of Red Sea Area Programme (RESAP) 1989-1992. In addition, he has worked as a visiting lecturer and researcher at the universities of Juba (Sudan), Swansea (Wales-UK) and Bergen (Norway) and collaborated with a number of regional and international research institutions. He has edited, co-edited and authored 10 books, published over 30 articles in international journals and wrote over 50 workshop and conference papers in the areas of development, environment, peace building and civil society. Some of the books include Sudan Population and Future Challenges, 2012 (in Arabic and English); Peace in Sudan: so near, so far, 2009; Sudan: The Challenges of Peace and Redressing Marginalization, 2006; Sustainable Development in Sudan Ten Years after the Rio Summit: A Civil Society Perspective, 2002; and Managing Scarcity: Human Adaptation in East African Drylands, 1997 (Co-editor). He has worked for UNDP, FAO, UNHCR, UNWomen, the World Bank, and over 30 international organizations. Finally, he is a member of several Regional and Global research institutions and civil society networks.

### **Annex 3 List of documents reviewed**

FAO, 2012. Country Programming Framework for the Republic of Sudan CPF (2012-2016).

FAO, 2012. FAO Good Learning Practices for Effective Capacity Development, Learning Module 3.

FAO, 2012. Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme in Sudan, Project Document, Prepared by Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), August 2012.

FAO, 2013. Duty Travel Back-to-Office Report, submitted by Luca Russo and Laura Mattioli, 25 April 2013.

FAO, 2013. Duty Travel Back-to-Office Report, submitted by Mohamed Aw-Dahir, 16 April 2013.

FAO, 2013. Food Security Information System's Institutional Setup in the Four States of Sudan, Preliminary Assessment Report, July 2013.

FAO, 2013. Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme (GCP/SUD/038/EC), Inception and Progress Report, 1 February - 30 June 2013.

FAO, 2013. Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Development Programme (GCP/SUD/038/EC), Annual Progress Report, December 2013.

FAO, 2014. FAO Capacity Development. Case Study: Sudan. Multi-stakeholder Processes: Key to Effective Capacity Development.

FAO, 2014. Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme (GCP/SUD/038/EC), Semi Annual Progress Report, 1st January – 30th June 2014.

FAO, 2014. Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme (GCP/SUD/038/EC) (FSPS), Summary Report of the target States Capacity Needs Assessment in Sudan (Kassala, Red Sea, Blue Nile and Gedaref States).

FAO, 2014. Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme (GCP/SUD/038/EC) (FSPS), Final Report of the Capacity Needs Assessment Kassala State, Sudan, January 2014.

FAO, 2014. Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme (GCP/SUD/038/EC) (FSPS), Final Report of the Capacity Needs Assessment Red Sea State, Sudan, January 2014.

FAO, 2014. Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme (GCP/SUD/038/EC) (FSPS), Final Report of the Capacity Needs Assessment Blue Nile State, Sudan, January 2014.

FAO, 2014. Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme (GCP/SUD/038/EC) (FSPS), Final Report of the Capacity Needs Assessment Gedaref State, Sudan, February 2014.

FAO, 2014. Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme (FSPS), Sudan, Non-State Actors Capacity Assessment in Red Sea State, Sudan, May 2014.

FAO, 2014. Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme (FSPS), Sudan, Capacity Development Plan for Non-State Actors in Kassala State, Sudan, May 2014.

UN, 2012. United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Sudan 31 May 2012 Khartoum.

## Annex 4 List of institutions and stakeholders met/contacted during the evaluation

Name	Position	Institution
<b>Khartoum</b>		
Dr. Abdi Jama	Representative	FAO Sudan
Rosanne Marchesich	Deputy Representative	FAO Sudan
Charles Agobia	Chief Technical Advisor	PSU FSPS & CBP
Yergalem Beraki	FSISS	PSU, Khartoum
Gamal Younis	National Coordinator	PSU, Khartoum
Dr. Nabeel Ahmed Saad	General Secretary	National FSTS
Fatima El-Hassan	Assistant General Secretary	FSTS
Siham Mukhtar	Officer	FSTS
Dr. Kamal Tag ElSir ElSheikh	Under Secretary	Ministry of Livestock, Fisheries and Range
Dr. Salwa Sorkati	Head Nutrition Department	Federal Ministry of Health
Baha ElDin M. Khamis	Under Secretary	Ministry of Agriculture
Adil Osman	Director, International Cooperation, FSTS Focal Point	Ministry of Agriculture
ElAmin Hassan ElAmin	Director General	Ministry of Agriculture
Abdel Rahman Norein	National Technical Manager	FEWSNET, Khartoum
Bakri Osman	VAM Officer	WFP
Cosimo Lamberti Fossati	Program Manager, Rural Development & Food Security	European Union
<b>Kassala State</b>		
HE Magzoub Abu Musa	Minister of Agriculture	Kassala State
Ali Eisa	Director General	Ministry of Agriculture
David Obongo	Technical Advisor, FSPS & CBP	Kassala State
Ibrahim Hassan Dirar	State National Program Coordinator, FSPS & CBP	Kassala State
Dr. Ali Ibrahim	Representative, Ministry of Health, State High FS Committee	Ministry of Health
Dr. Tahani Khidir Suleiman	Head of Nutrition Department	Ministry of Health
Osman Bannaga	Director, Strategic Planning Council	Ministry of Finance
Dr. Gibril Osman	Senior Project Coordinator	FAO IFSP, Kassala State
Salih Orabi	National Coordinator	FAO IFSP, Kassala State
Wigdan Abdel Rahman	Team leader, FAO-ERCU	FAO, Kassala State
Mubarak Malik	Commissioner / State Wali Advisor on NGOs	Kassala State
Gamal Mohamed ElHassan	Director, Development and Planning Unit	Ministry of Finance
Aisha Abdalla Ahmed	Deputy Director, Development and Planning Unit	Ministry of Finance
Khalil Zayed	Coordinator, FSTS	Ministry of Animal Wealth
Rawan Ahmed Abbas	Nutrition Officer, FSTS	Ministry of Health
Intisar Sharief	Livestock Officer, FSTS	Ministry of Animal Wealth
Wisal Salih	Forestry/ Fishery officer, FSTS	Ministry of Agriculture
Ali Ahmed	Market Information Officer, FSTS	Ministry of Agriculture
Fath El Rahman Ibrahim	Agro-Met Officer	Ministry of Agriculture
Khidir Ramadan	Metrology/ Crop Production Officer, FSTS	Ministry of Agriculture
Abdel Gadir Mohd Ali	Chairperson, FS Technical Working Group	FSTS, Kassala State
Ikhlas Abdel Rahman	Chairperson, IPC	Ministry of Agriculture
Dr. Ibrahim ElSadig	Director, Agricultural Research Station, Head of FS Technical Working Group	Ministry of Agriculture
Dr. Tag ElSir Abdel Rahman	Dean, Faculty of Agriculture	University of Kassala
Hayder El Amin	Vegetable & Fruit Farmers Association	Kassala State
Ammar Abdel Hameed	Chairperson, Waad Organization	Kassala State
Ahmed M. Abdalla Lomamba	Head, Kassala Sub-Office	WFP
Prof. Abdalla Ali Mohammed	Vice Chancellor	Kassala University
Dr El Tayeb Mohamadain	Principle (Team Leader Research I)	Kassala University
Dr. Fatima Abbas Khalid	Faculty of Medicine (Team Leader Research II)	Kassala University
Mohammed Tahir Yagoub	Director, VC Office	Kassala University
Imad ElDin Babiker	Media and Public Relations Director	Kassala University
<b>Blue Nile State</b>		

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Institution</b>
Awad AlSammani	Advisor MoAF, Acting Minister of Agriculture	Ministry of Agriculture
Mohamed Gorashi	Head of Planning MoA, chair of FSC	Ministry of Agriculture
Wondimagegne Shiferaw	Technical Advisor, TSU	Blue Nile State
Abdel Moniem Ishag	State National Program Coordinator, FSPS & CBP	Blue Nile State
Salma Elagib Mahgoub	FSTS Coordinator	Blue Nile FSTS
Nusayba Gabralla Suliman	FSTS Market officer	Blue Nile FSTS
ElHadi Khairalla	FSTS Livestock officer	Blue Nile FSTS
Yasir Bashir Ajbna	FSTS Nutrition officer	Blue Nile FSTS
Mohamed Ayoub Abedrahman	FSTS Crop Production Officer	Blue Nile FSTS
Huziafa Ibrahim	FAO-ERCU	FAO
Mubarak Abdelbasit	Director of Strategic Planning Council	Blue Nile State
Mohamed Elkhatim	Strategic Planning Council, Member FSC	Blue Nile State
Dr. Abubakar Altahir	Director Agriculture Research Station, (Head of Research Team I)	Blue Nile State
Abdel Aziz M. Abbakar	Blue Nile University (Member of Research Team II)	Blue Nile State
Farouq Mohammed Abdel Hai	Chairperson, Farmers Union Steering Committee (Member NSA Working Group)	NSA, Blue Nile State
Abdel Halim Ahmed ElHassan	Chairperson, Gum Arabic Farmers Association	NSA, Blue Nile State
Hamad ElNil Ahmed ElNayer	Chairperson, Small Farmers Union	NSA, Blue Nile State
Salih Marwan Mahgoub	ISRA Organization (NGO)	NSA, Blue Nile State
AlNazeer Daffalla	ISRA Organization (NGO)	NSA, Blue Nile State
Mutaz Mohamed Hassan	Food Security & Livelihood sector, World Vision (INGO)	NSA, Blue Nile State
Mohammed Izz ElDin Modawi	Damazin Locality	NSA, Blue Nile State
Ahmed Yousif Khamis	Food Security & Livelihood sector, IRW	NSA, Blue Nile State
Alaa ElDin Hassan ElTom	Mubadroon (NGO)	NSA, Blue Nile State
Gamal Ahemed	Director, Crop Market	Blue Nile State
Imad Hamad	Crop Market Focal point, Member policy working group	Blue Nile State
Adil Elzain	Head IPC Working Group, Deputy Planning Directorate	Blue Nile State
<b>Red Sea State</b>		
H.E. Mr. Ibrahim Abu Fatima	Minister of Agriculture, Animal Resources & Fisheries & V/Chairman FSC	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Resources & Fisheries
Mr. Essan El Dein Sorkati	Director General	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Resources & Fisheries
Mr. Mohamed Abdalla Tahir	Deputy Director General	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Resources & Fisheries
Ali-Nur Duale	Technical Advisor, TSU	Red Sea State
Mohammed Saleh Mohammed Ali	SFSTS Coordinator	FSTS, Red Sea State
Fathia Ali Albakri	Crops officer	FSTS, Red Sea State
Hassina Abdoelhafiz Saleh	Market officer	FSTS, Red Sea State
Badria A.Elrahim	Livestock & Fisheries officer	FSTS, Red Sea State
Badr Aldeen Hassan Maki	Nutrition officer	FSTS, Red Sea State
Om Salma Osman Mohamed	Marketing working group	FSN Technical Working Group
Khad malla Ahmed Alhassan	Marketing working group	Food Security and Nutrition Technical working group
Omayma Saed Ahmed	Crop Production working group	Food Security and Nutrition Technical working group
Dr. Nahla Ahmed Jalal	Livestock and Fishery working group	Food Security and Nutrition Technical working group
Huda Idris Mohamed	Crop Production working group	Food Security and Nutrition Technical working group
Najlaa Ahmed Mageet	Nutrition working group	Food Security and Nutrition Technical working group
Siham Awad Alkareem	Marketing working group	Food Security and Nutrition Technical working group

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Institution</b>
Mohamed Jafar Abu Bakker	Livestock working group	Food Security and Nutrition Technical working group
Tahani Abd Algadir Sati	IPC working group	Food Security and Nutrition Technical working group
Idriss Saleh Hassry	IPC working group	Food Security and Nutrition Technical working group
Hassan Mohamed Ali	Fishermen Union	NSA, Red Sea State
Madani Adroup Mohamed	Pastoralists Union	NSA, Red Sea State
Rihamab Mohamed Mahmoud	Farmers Union	NSA, Red Sea State
Abd Algadir Omer Ohaj	Abu Hadia for Women Development Society	NSA, Red Sea State
Osman Hamza Mohamed	Vegetable Marketing Association	NSA, Red Sea State
Mahmoud Mohamed Arkab	Fishermen Union	NSA, Red Sea State
Professor Ahmed Abdelaziz	Researcher	University of Red Sea
Dr. Ali Abdalla	Researcher	University of Red Sea
Hassan Seral Khatim	Head of Red Sea State Office	FAO/ERCU
Adolf Schuett	Director	German Agro Action
Mohamud ElHaj Saleh	Programme Manager	German Agro Action
Sara Mohamed Omar	Head, Department of Nutrition	Ministry of Health
AfraH Hussein	Director of Planning and PAC member	Ministry of Economics and Investments

## Annex 5 Project Logframes

Objective	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<p><b>Development Goal:</b> Improved food security in target States in Sudan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent to which food production is increased</li> <li>• Extent to which prevalence of undernourishment is decreased</li> <li>• Extent to which purchasing power has increased</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Reports from concerned line Ministries (MoA ad MoARF)</li> <li>✓ Farmers/Pastoralists Unions reports on food production</li> <li>✓ FAO and other international agencies' annual reports</li> <li>✓ MoH/Directorate of Nutrition's periodic bulletins on nutrition</li> <li>✓ INGOs/NGOs reports on nutrition</li> <li>✓ CBS report on household income and expenditures</li> <li>✓ PRSP annual report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peace and stability prevail</li> </ul>
<p><b>Outcome</b> Food Security decisions more inclusive, better integrated, informed, implemented and monitored in selected States of Sudan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent to which FS investments are increased and better monitored</li> <li>• Extent to which FS investments, policies &amp; strategies are informed by research, food security information system</li> <li>• Extent to which inter-sectoral/ministerial collaboration on food security is improved</li> <li>• Extent to which non state actors and localities are involved in planning and implementing FS strategies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Ministry of Finance reports</li> <li>✓ FS related sector ministries' reports</li> <li>✓ Food Security research reports (recommendations)</li> <li>✓ Strategic Plan documents</li> <li>✓ FS periodic coordination reports</li> <li>✓ Joint, collaborative action plans and initiatives</li> <li>✓ Minutes and/or workshop reports on FS sector plans &amp; strategy formulation</li> <li>✓ Sector M&amp;E and progress reports</li> <li>✓ Localities FS oriented work plan and strategies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State FS institutional structure is well functioning to manage and lead the state FS activities</li> <li>• FS information system generates relevant information and data for decision making</li> <li>• FS demand-driven action research conducted and practical results/findings produced</li> <li>• FS state and NSAs are committed to participate in planning &amp; implementation of State FS plans</li> </ul>
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Effective cross-sectoral Food Security institutional framework established and linked to the National Institutional framework</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing decrees are operationalized</li> <li>• All relevant stakeholders are included in the institutional set up and actively participate with appropriate horizontal and vertical linkages</li> <li>• Functional units are established and hosted under and inter-sectoral arrangement/institutional framework</li> <li>• Extent to which vertical linkages with the national food security institutional set up are established</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Interviews with relevant persons and institutions and direct observation</li> <li>✓ Reports generated and disseminated</li> <li>✓ TORs of institutional setup</li> <li>✓ Minutes of meetings held by stakeholders</li> <li>✓ MoU among different sector institutions</li> <li>✓ Establishment orders/letters</li> <li>✓ Direct observation</li> <li>✓ Meeting minutes and reports of functional</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inter-sectoral FS institutional framework established under the Governor's office</li> <li>• Willingness and commitment of sectoral partners to FS as common objective</li> <li>• Necessary and sufficient</li> </ul>

Objective	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	<p>and maintained</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number and quality of policy documents produced, disseminated and feedbacks generated</li> <li>• Extent to which localities are part of State FS decision making processes</li> </ul>	<p>units</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)/Letter of Agreement (LoA) between State and National FS institutional set up</li> <li>✓ Written correspondence between the two levels and FS technical reports from State to National</li> <li>✓ Membership composition of FS institutional set up at different levels</li> </ul>	<p>capacity and resources are availed to all levels of the institutional set up</p>
<p><b>Output 2:</b> Capacity to review, plan, budget and monitor Food Security (FS) policies and strategies developed, resulting in more effective public action for food security and nutrition</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent to which sector policies, strategic plans and programmes meet recognized standards</li> <li>• The number and quality of sector or sub-sector policies/strategies formulated &amp; revised</li> <li>• Extent to which line ministries have developed monitoring systems that take into account food security priorities and investments</li> <li>• Extent to which sector ministries budget processes reflect food security priorities and investments</li> <li>• Type of public actions taken as a result of improved capacity for addressing critical food security and nutrition problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Line Ministries' sector and sub-sector policy documents</li> <li>✓ Line Ministries' Strategic plans, action plans or annual work plans</li> <li>✓ Consistency among policies, strategic plans and work plans</li> <li>✓ Line Ministries FS oriented M&amp;E system</li> <li>✓ Sector ministries M&amp;E reports</li> <li>✓ Sector plans with budget allocations</li> <li>✓ FS oriented activities implemented</li> <li>✓ Direct observation of reviewed policy documents</li> <li>✓ Line ministries progress/periodic reports</li> <li>✓ Line Ministries M&amp;E reports</li> <li>✓ Meetings minutes &amp; reports of FS activities at different levels of decision making process</li> <li>✓ Direct observation of locality level FS activities on the ground</li> <li>✓ Locality level M&amp;E reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Necessary and sufficient capacity and resources are availed to target institutions</li> <li>• Sector ministries are willing and committed to coordinate their FS activities and to collaborate with other FS actors</li> </ul>
<p><b>Output 3:</b> Functional Regional level Food Security information systems strengthened and supports decision making</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent to which crop and livestock production monitoring system is maintained, utilized and linked to the national system</li> <li>• Extent to which agricultural information are strengthened, maintained, utilized and linked to the national system</li> <li>• Extent to which health and nutrition monitoring systems are developed, utilized and linked to the national system</li> <li>• Extent to which IPC analyses are regularly produced and utilized and linked to the national</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Procured hardware &amp; software in use</li> <li>✓ Lower levels incoming sectoral monitoring data reports</li> <li>✓ Lower levels incoming sectoral health &amp; nutrition reports</li> <li>✓ Updated sectoral monitoring information systems</li> <li>✓ Periodical state level sectoral data reports</li> <li>✓ Periodical state level health &amp; nutrition reports</li> <li>✓ National FS information reports reflect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sector ministries fully understand the inter-sectoral nature of FS and are willing and committed to network and collaborate</li> <li>• Willingness and commitment of staff at all operational levels</li> <li>• Necessary and sufficient capacity and resources are availed at all levels and</li> </ul>

Objective	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• system</li> <li>• Extent to which decision are made on the bases of food security information generated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>target states institutions</li> <li>✓ State periodic IPC reports</li> <li>✓ National FS reports reflect state IPC reports</li> <li>✓ Sate periodic NRM reports</li> <li>✓ National FS reports reflect state NRM reports</li> <li>✓ Line ministries' reports, circulars and official public statements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>steps of the process</li> <li>• Effective mechanisms linking the state and national level, built on mutual understanding and benefits</li> <li>• User relevant and targeted FS information produced and disseminated</li> </ul>
<p><b>Output 4:</b> Food Security oriented Non-State Actors' capacity strengthened</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent to which Non-State Actors own plans reflect food security priorities</li> <li>• Extent to which Non-State Actors are part of FS decision making process</li> <li>• Extent to which Non-State Actors are able to network and to establish vertical and horizontal linkages</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ NSA FS work plans</li> <li>✓ Organizational structure of FS institutional set up</li> <li>✓ Meeting minutes &amp; reports of FS decision making process</li> <li>✓ Organizational structure of the NSAs</li> <li>✓ MoU, LoA with partner organizations</li> <li>✓ NSAs and partners reports of joint FS initiatives and activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacities provided are well tailored to the needs of the NSAs and their roles in FS</li> <li>• Willingness of NSAs to learning and applying the imparted capacity (knowledge and skills)</li> <li>• Leaders of NSAs are willing and committed to involve their grassroots members</li> <li>• The role of NSAs in FS recognized ad supported by State Government and ministries</li> </ul>
<p><b>Output 5:</b> Key food insecurity drivers are better understood and linked to decision making</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of food security research generated and utilized</li> <li>• Extent to which state level institutions are able to prioritize, deign, participate and conduct food security research</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Research report produced</li> <li>✓ Minutes of FS decision making organs on FS issues</li> <li>✓ FS policy/strategy options proposed &amp; tabled to decision makers</li> <li>✓ State level institutions FS research work plans &amp; reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective inter-sectoral participation in the FS brainstorming and diagnostic stage</li> <li>• All public and non-public FS actors are willing and committed to collaborate</li> <li>• FS need-driven action research conducted and practical results/findings produced</li> </ul>

<b>Project Hierarchy</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Means of Verification</b>	<b>Risks/Assumptions</b>
Overall Objective (Impact) Improved Food Security in target States in Sudan	Percentage increase in the state food production	1-Project baseline and post implementation reports 2-Reports from concerned line Ministries (MoA and MoARF). 3-FAO and other international agencies annual reports	Peace and stability prevail in target states Presence of food security projects/programme funded by the private sector, national and state government, EU and other donors in the target states
	Percentage decrease in malnutrition level among children less than 5 years old	1-Project baseline and post implementation reports 2-MoH/Directorate of Nutrition's periodic bulletins on nutrition. 3-INNGOS/NNGOs reports on nutrition	
	Percentage increase in purchasing power	1-Project baseline and post-implementation reports 2-CBS report on household income and expenditures 3-PRSP annual report	
Specific Purpose (Outcome) Food Security decisions need to be more inclusive, better integrated, informed, implemented and monitored in selected states of Sudan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least three food security policies, strategic plans and programmes are reviewed and revised by each state, disseminated and feedback must be generated</li> <li>- M&amp;E system of technical line ministries, included food security indicators.</li> <li>- Percentage of sector ministries budget reflects food security priorities and investments.</li> <li>- Number of food security decisions taken by the Government and NSAs, based on Food Security Information.</li> <li>- Number of food security decisions, policies, strategies and investments that have been developed/adjusted by institutional framework in collaboration with non-state actors.</li> <li>- At least two decisions are made based on the food security studies and research reports.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project progress report</li> <li>- States FSTS progress reports</li> <li>- States FSTS progress reports</li> <li>- States Food Security Committee reports</li> <li>- States Food Security Committee reports</li> <li>- TSU progress reports</li> </ul>	State and national government are committed to support the development and implementation of food security policies, strategic plans and investment programmes State and non-state actors are committed to participate in planning and implementation of state food security plans.
Output 1: Effective cross-sectoral food security institutional framework established and linked to the national institutional framework.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- State Food Security Committee, FSTS and FSWG are established and functional.</li> <li>- Number of quarterly reports developed by each state and submitted to the Federal level FSTS</li> <li>- Number of training and backstopping missions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- ToR of each instructional framework</li> <li>2- TSU project progress reports</li> <li>3- Training and backstopping mission reports</li> </ul>	Expert staff will be nominated by state governments as member of food security institutional framework Office space will be offered by

Project Hierarchy	Indicators	Means of Verification	Risks/Assumptions
	<p>organized by Federal FSTS in each target state.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of food security decisions, circulars, policies and strategies developed and revised with direct and indirect participation of localities.</li> <li>- Number of coordination meetings organized between target state FSTS and federal FSTS.</li> <li>- FSWG is established/restructured and functional.</li> <li>- At least three annual plans and budgets developed by Federal and state FSTS</li> <li>- At least six semi-annual reports and budgets developed by Federal and state FSTS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4- States FSTS progress reports</li> <li>5- TSU and PCU progress reports</li> <li>6- FSTWG progress reports</li> <li>7- TSU progress reports</li> <li>8- TSU progress reports</li> </ul>	<p>state government for food security Institutional Frameworks</p>
<p>Output 2: Capacity to review, plan, budget and monitor Food Security policies and strategies developed, resulting in more effective public action for food security and nutrition.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of training workshops and on-the-job-training sessions supported by the project in each state.</li> <li>- -At least 200 staff from state government institutions attended training supported by the project in the four target states</li> <li>- At least five different training sessions organized in each state annually;</li> <li>- At least 30% of the trained staff attended at least three trainings</li> <li>- 80% of the trained staff gained knowledge and skills pertaining to the training topics.</li> <li>- 40% of the trained staff are competent to effectively perform their jobs and to train other staff through post training assessment</li> <li>- Type and number of office equipment provided by the project to state FSTS</li> <li>- Number of trained staff involved in state food security policy review/analysis, revision and development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1-Project progress reports</li> <li>2-Project Progress reports</li> <li>3-Reports generated by training database</li> <li>4- Reports generated by training database</li> <li>5-Pre- and post-test of the training reports</li> <li>6-Result of competency survey</li> <li>7-Project progress and inventory reports</li> <li>8-Surveys report</li> </ul>	<p>Availability of competent staff at state level to provide technical supports to the members of the institutional framework</p> <p>Trained members of the institutional framework will not be shifted to another state or another department within the state</p> <p>State government will provide all the required resources for sustaining the activities of the food security institutional framework in the state by the end of the project cycle</p>
<p>Output 3: Functional Regional level Food Security information systems strengthened and supports decision-making.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of food security reports (quarterly food security update/bulletins, ad-hoc special reports, at least one per year policy briefs in each state) produced and shared with State and Federal level decision makers</li> <li>- IPC analysis reports produced at state level and shared with state and national FSTS bi-annually.</li> <li>- Regular data and information is shared between the FSTS and localities</li> <li>- Number of monitoring trips organized by each state FSTS to the localities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1-FSTWGs technical and progress reports</li> <li>2-ICP reports</li> <li>3-TSU progress reports</li> <li>4-Trips reports</li> </ul>	<p>Sector ministries fully understand the inter-sectoral nature of food security and are willing and committed to network and collaborate</p> <p>Willingness and commitment of staff at all operational levels.</p> <p>Necessary and sufficient capacity and resources are availed at all levels and steps of the process.</p>

Project Hierarchy	Indicators	Means of Verification	Risks/Assumptions
			Effective mechanisms linking the state and national level, built on mutual understanding and benefits.
Output 4: Food Security oriented Non-State Actors' capacity strengthened.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least five NSAs in each state plans reflect food security priorities.</li> <li>- Number of coordination meetings related to food security policies or strategies attended by NSAs.</li> <li>- At least five training workshops organized for members of non-state actors in each state by the end of the project.</li> <li>- At least five NSAs in each state attended training sessions supported by the project.</li> <li>- 100 members of the NSAs attended training sessions supported by the project in four states.</li> <li>- At least 3 NSAs supported by the project in each state actively participated in development, implementation and monitoring of food security programmes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1-Reports produced and circulated by non-state actors</li> <li>2-Minutes of the State Food Security Committee and FSTS meetings</li> <li>3-Reports generated by training database system</li> <li>4-Reports generated by training database</li> <li>5-Reports generated by training database</li> <li>6-Surveys reports</li> </ul>	<p>Capacities provided are well tailored to the needs of the NSAs and their roles in food security.</p> <p>Willingness of NSAs to learning and applying the imparted capacity (knowledge and skills).</p> <p>Leaders of NSAs are willing and committed to involve their grass root members.</p> <p>The role of NSAs in food security recognized and supported by the state Government and ministries</p>
Output 5: Key food insecurity drivers are better understood and linked to decision making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least two food security and nutrition research reports produced and circulated in each state.</li> <li>- At least three dissemination workshops organized in each target state.</li> <li>- At least two policy dialogues are conducted in each state to discuss findings of the results of the researches/studies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1-Study and research report produced by each target state</li> <li>2-TSU progress reports</li> <li>3-TSU progress reports</li> </ul>	<p>All public and private research and academic institutions at national and state levels have the capacity, are willing and committed to undertake research and studies on drivers of food insecurity</p>

## Annex 6 Trainings Held in 2013 and 2014

Training Held in 2013								
	Training Topic	Trainees	# of Participants			Trainers/Facilitators	Training Dates	Venue
			Male	Female	Total			
1	FS Orientation	Programme staff, Coordinator and National TA of the 4 FSTS	21	9	30	PSU and R TSU/ Computer Training Centres/institution MU	27-29 August	Wad Madani
2	Computer basics	SFSTS members	19	15	34		16-18 Sept	All 4 States
3	Food and Agriculture Market Information system (data collection and analysis)	SFSTS members, States Programme Coordinators, and States level FAMIS focal persons	20	13	33	FSPS/PSU, Federal FSTS, and FEWS NET	24-27 Sept	Wad Madani
4	Food security basics and IPC	SFSTS members and States Programme coordinators	18	10	28	FSPS/PSU, Khartoum FSTS (IPC working group ) and FEWS NET	07-10 Oct	Wad Madani
5	Food security analysis and report writing	States FSTS and States Programme coordinators	16	9	25	FSPS/PSU a external training facilitator (consultant)	11-14 Nov	Port Sudan
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>94</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>150</b>			

Training Held in 2014								
	Training Topic	Trainees	# of Participants			Trainers/Facilitators	Training Dates	Venue
			Male	Female	Total			
1	Data collection and compilation and dissemination	23 Locality level FSI focal persons from 11 localities	60	45	105	SFSTS/TSU	15-30 April	4 States
2	Market analysis for food security analysis	3 SFSTS members	7	9	16	FEWS NET, FFSTS	27-30 April	Khartoum
3	Sector policy analysis and design	1 SFSTS coordinator and 1 State National Technical Advisors	6	1	7	Regional training institute (ICD training center in Namibia)	April-May	Namibia
4	GIS and Natural Resource Monitoring	1 SFSTS member	2	2	4	International consultant & FEWS NET	5-7 May	Khartoum
5	M & E, Programme and Project Planning	2 SFSTS members and 4 State line ministries staff	12	12	24	FSPS/PSU, National Consultant	18-22 May	Wad Madani
6	Study Tour to Somalia on IPC analysis	FSTS Coordinator and IPC working groups	4	5	9	IPC team in Somalia	8-13 August	Somalia
7	IPC Training Level II	SFSTS and IPC working groups	7	5	12	3 from GSU and 3 from NTWG of IPC & IPC Global partners	26-Aug	Khartoum
8	Advocacy and policy training workshop	Non State Actor from 4 States	21	3	24	PSU and two consultant	23-29 Sep	Wad Madani
9	Basics of Nutrition Monitoring and Analysis	FSTS and Nutrition staff from 4 from MOH	10	14	24	Staff from Nutrition Dep of MOH	10-14 August	Wad Madani
10	Gender	Gender focal staff	2	21	23	Staff of gender unit of	19-23	Wad

	mainstreaming	of line ministries of the 4 target states				Federal MoAI	Sept	Madani
11	State-based policy training	FSTS, State and NSA	79	37	116	National Consultant	Oct-Nov	Four States
12	Policy analysis workshop	FSTS, TSU and line ministries of the 4 target States	22	8	30	International consultant	16-20 Nov	Khartoum
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>232</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>394</b>			

## **Annex 7      Checklists on Gender Mainstreaming in FSPS Programme**

### **Output 1:      Effective cross-sectoral Food Security institutional framework established and linked to the National institutional framework.**

- ✓ Encourage adequate representations of women in all institutional set ups established with the support from the programme
- ✓ Considering gender balance in all institutional capacity development activities that include trainings
- ✓ Incorporate gender consideration in the food security decision making process

### **Output 2:      Capacity to review, plan, budget and monitor Food Security (FS) policies and strategies developed, resulting in more effective public action for food security and nutrition.**

- ✓ Gender balance in all local policies and programmes. To what extent gender issue is considered in all policies and programmes developed and being developed in the States
- ✓ Consider if food security related programmes have meaningfully responded to the specific needs of women and men of all ages
- ✓ Ensure that gender balance is considered in policy dialogue forums; adequate representation of women in policy dialogue forums
- ✓ Consider any potential effect the planned programme interventions, policies, etc. may have to women and men of all ages. Once risks are identified from a gender front, we need to establish appropriate measures to minimize them
- ✓ Ensure proper consultations and involvement of women and men in designing projects or programs
- ✓ When drafting or designing a proposal ensure you take on board gender roles of women and men of all ages, and examine who has control over resources
- ✓ Also assess who lacks and needs what assistance

### **Output 3: Functional Regional level Food Security information systems strengthened and supports decision making.**

- ✓ Gender considerations in food security data collection both in terms of improving the capacities of data collectors on how to consider gender disaggregation in preparing and filling and questionnaires
- ✓ Disaggregate all households- level outcome indicators by sex of household dietary diversity index, coping strategies index by sex of the household income provider households
- ✓ Provide sex-disaggregated data on child nutrition data
- ✓ Gender disaggregation in food security data analysis and reporting
- ✓ Collecting data on the economic roles of women and men (their income sources), and their differences in ownership of assets, (especially of livestock assets) access to and control over resources/assets (land and other productive assets)
- ✓ Efforts should be strengthened in collecting data on women and men daily earnings for the different income generating activities/avenues. This is important in understanding the cost of minimum basket and their different purchasing power

- ✓ Collecting data and information on the expenditure patterns (the % spending on food, non-food or saving) of the household categories (based on sex of income providers) should continue to be captured

**Output 4: Food Security oriented Non-State Actors' capacity strengthened.**

- ✓ Considering gender balance in all capacity development activities related to NSA (lobbying and advocacy, communication)
- ✓ Strengthening the role of women in institutional setup of the NSA in the four states
- ✓ Considering special training programme to women based development associations and organizations
- ✓ Awareness creation on how to organize and creation of more women based NSA in the States

**Output 5: Key food insecurity drivers are better understood and linked to decision making.**

- ✓ Considerations of gender in all food security related researches and studies
- ✓ Equal considerations needs to be given to women researchers
- ✓ Research agenda and topics need to address some of women related food insecurity issues that require adequate investigation