



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the United
Nations

Sudan Productive Capacity Recovery Programme (SPCRP) - Capacity Building Component (SPCRP) in Northern Sudan– OSRO/SUD/622/MUL

Follow-up report to the management response

February 2015

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Office of Evaluation (OED)

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

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

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

© FAO 2013

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

All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request or addressed to copyright@fao.org.

For further information on this report, please contact:

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

**The Follow-up report of the Management Response to the Evaluation of SPCR
February 2015**

Overall progress in the implementation of fully or partially accepted recommendations;

The overall implementation of the accepted recommendation by FAO Sudan is good with many of the recommendations having been implemented fully and some impacts have or are being realized or expected to be realized in the near future. The main challenges though are financial constraint for both FAO Sudan and GoS to scale-up some of the approaches such the Community Animal Resources Development Agents (CARDA) and the Rural Market and Small Business (RM&SB) development, the limited human and institutional capacity of the GoS and the poor rural infrastructures such as roads and markets

Follow-up report matrix

2 Each Accepted evaluation recommendations (a)	Action Agreed in the Management Response (b)	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c)	MAR score (d) *	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e)
<p>Recommendation 1. To EU on funding Implementation of complex programmes and projects by multiple organisations. EU should provide guidelines and a Framework to the implementers of projects and programmes, if these are co-implemented by multiple organisations. Compulsory cooperative fields of work and activities should be provided as well as methods to optimally combine the contribution from implementing organisations and using the specific expertise of each organisation as an added value. Parallel implementation and separate logframes should not be approved of. Since EU's strategic planning cycle has a length of only 5 years, programmes of a highly complex nature should be avoided and projects should be clearly focused.</p>	<p>Response by EU Delegation (EUD): Accepted</p> <p>SPCRP is a large agriculture programme funded by EU after the signature of the CPA and designed to facilitate long-term poverty reduction in a post conflict situation by enhancing agriculture income generating activities, livestock production and strengthening the capacity of local administrations and non-state actors. It was one of first projects the EU funded after resumption of development cooperation in Sudan and requested to address a range of problems rural population was facing also to find out "what works and what not". As a consequence the programme was "fragmentation" and implemented by many partners, sometimes isolated from each other also due to the huge</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>NA</p>

2 Each Accepted evaluation recommendations (a)	Action Agreed in the Management Response (b)	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c)	MAR score (d) *	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e)
<p>Recommendation 2. To EU to be more involved in monitoring and guiding progress of public-private partnerships. Even though incorporating public-private partnerships is currently high on the agenda, in order for them to be successful in the long run, close monitoring and guidance from the donors may be needed. In SPCR, the plants' construction should have been finalized at an earlier point in time, in order to guide the startup of the production process as well as the involvement of trained beneficiaries. It should have been ensured that a contract was prepared and signed by all relevant parties, outlining responsibilities and ownership as well as involvement of the target population and the way in which they would be able to sell their produce to the factory and be involved as employees.</p>	<p>geographical area covered.</p> <p>Response by EU Delegation (EUD): Partially accepted</p> <p>It is to be considered that SPCR Model Project component was designed to identify poverty reduction options in a very difficult post-conflict environment exploring a large number of possible income generating activities. Promoting PPP to sustain investment was initiated by the project at a late stage and following the consideration and validation of other options too. Therefore PPP was the result of a process and one cannot simplify this by saying that this should have been initiated earlier. Further to this PPP was of very limited importance in relation to the entire programme and consequently only observed by the EU Delegation without particular involvement.</p>	NA	NA	NA
<p>Recommendation 3. To EU and FAO on incorporating FFS in project and programmes Farmer Field Schools have appeared very useful extension and Empowerment approaches in various agroecosystems. In Sudan the FFS approach has also appeared relevant to the local context. In order to make FFS sustainable and ready for upscaling, further adaptation to local context are needed, including advocacy and support for creating a conducive environment with regard to access of</p>	<p>Response by EU Delegation (EUD): Accepted</p> <p>The EU recognizes the positive approach and results of Farming Field Schools. The EU will consider possible future support to FFS with regards to access to extension services, inputs credits and marketing.</p> <p>Response by FAO: Partially accepted</p> <p>SPCRP has indeed produced some</p>	<p>A concept note was prepared jointly by FAO and Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MoAI) and submitted to EU and other donors to scale up the FFS, CARDA, and RM&SB but was not funded.</p> <p>FAO Sudan continued to support the</p>	4	<p>The Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MoAI) using its own resources has adopted and is promoting the FFS approach through a major programme in rain-fed agriculture areas of the country</p> <p>The approach is also being applied by FAO's Emergency Programmes as</p>

2 Each Accepted evaluation recommendations (a)	Action Agreed in the Management Response (b)	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c)	MAR score (d) *	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e)
<p>farmers to inputs, credits and marketing. Furthermore, the implementation period at field level needs to be at least two seasons and possibly longer. A more facilitative and bottom-up implementation of the approach should be ascertained. As long as the government will not be able to plan and sustain the FFS, one has to seek other solutions. Since many other donors are interested in using the FFS approach, a combination of efforts</p>	<p>concrete results with Farmer Field Schools as an effective extension approach and further efforts are required to support sustainability and up-scaling. Some government support seems to have been mobilized particularly at state level. State FFS teams, created by the SPCRCP can play a key role in linking with other donors for expanding and strengthening state level FFS programmes</p> <p>The statement “A more facilitative and bottom-up implementation of the approach should be ascertained” gives the impression that this was not the case in SPCRCP. The FFS component did indeed follow a bottom up and participatory approach that engaged local communities throughout the process.</p> <p>After a slow start up in the first phase of the project a very intensive FFS training programme was designed and delivered. However, some of the FFSs were only able to complete one growing cycle before the closure of the programme. Therefore, with regard to the implementation period at field level it is agreed that ideally an FFS group would need to continue for 2 cycles of learning.</p>	<p>Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MoAI) in seeking funding from other donors such as USAID, DFID etc., to scale-up the FFS, CARDA and RM&SB, but with little success, except through the TCP.</p>		<p>well as by some NGOs.</p> <p>Farmer and pastoral field schools (FFSs) group-based approach to adaptive agricultural research and participatory learning and agricultural extension, especially for IPM, on-farm water management, agro-forestry and disaster risk reduction (DRR) are also part of the new joint Resilience programme implemented in Kassala (FAO-UNICEF-WFP)</p> <p>The impact of the approach is effective delivery of agricultural support services leading to increased agricultural production and productivity</p>
<p>Recommendation 4. To development actors including EU and FAO on</p>	<p>Response by FAO: Accepted</p>	<p>The Country Programming Framework (CPF) was review and revised and the</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>All the three documents have been officially</p>

2 Each Accepted evaluation recommendations (a)	Action Agreed in the Management Response (b)	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c)	MAR score (d) *	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e)
<p>Coordinating efforts in Sudan. Efforts should be undertaken to coordinate development interventions in Sudan. Currently, most development actors are implementing independently their own programmes and projects, without clearly addressing duplications or gaps at a nationwide level. Even EU funded programmes, despite good intentions phrased at the design stage, fail to coordinate their activities and make use of each other's accomplishments, even though opportunities are clearly available. Not only should existing efforts be incorporated at the design stage of projects and programmes, development actors should also have regular coordination meetings at capital level, which do not only focus on humanitarian actions and come up with clear action plans.</p>	<p>FAO acknowledges the coordination challenges in the context of Sudan and stands ready to work with the EU and development actors to enhance coordination and collaboration.</p>	<p>Plan of Action (PoA) of FAO Sudan was prepared as well as the Sudan CAADP-COMPACT. These documents were prepared in full coordination and collaboration between FAO Sudan and GoS/MoAI</p> <p>FAO in 2014 developed and started implementing a number of joint programme with other UN agencies funded by different donors. This is the case with the Joint Resilience Programme in Kassala funded by DFID and implemented by FAO-UNICEF-WFP and the Programme under Pillars I and II of the DDS developed respectively with UNDP/UNHABITAT and UNOPS.</p> <p>FAO, through PoA and NAIP of CPF, would facilitate partnerships for food security, nutrition and agricultural development between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - government agencies (e.g. Higher National Councils, MoAI, MoLFR, MoEFPD, Ministry of Water and Electricity and Ministry of Health, and their respective corporations and State Ministries of Agriculture and Animal Resources, and Darfur Regional Authority) and local authorities; - civil society (e.g. academic and research institutions, NGOs, CBOs and men and women farmers'/pastoralists' unions and co-operatives); 		<p>launched and the joint implementation of the actions is already strengthening the coordination and collaboration between GoS/MoAI and FAO Sudan</p>

2 Each Accepted evaluation recommendations (a)	Action Agreed in the Management Response (b)	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c)	MAR score (d) *	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the private sector (i.e. consultants, consultancy firms and veterinary doctors and input suppliers, traders, food processors, wholesalers and retailers, exporters, etc of food value chains); – South-South Co-operation (i.e. deployment of short and long-term specialists from countries such as Brazil, China, Egypt, India and South Africa to facilitate the exchange and uptake of development solutions and promote platforms for knowledge networking to develop national and institutional capacities); and – Development partners (i.e. IFIs, donors and agriculture and rural development agencies/implementing partners, some of whom are listed below). – FAO Sudan initiated monthly Tripartite Coordination meeting with the Ministries of Agriculture and Livestock, to review progress of on-going programme and plan medium to long-term development initiatives. 		
<p>Recommendation 5. To FAO on project design. In the design stage of a programme or project, particular attention should be paid to incorporation of sustainability throughout and to the final handover of tasks in order to ascertain government is ready and capable of continuing after the project's ending. In the last year of the project or programme</p>	<p>Response by FAO: Accepted</p> <p>While this recommendation is accepted, it must be noted that sustainability factors are generally systematically considered and incorporated in the design of FAO projects. However there is a need to install checkpoints for monitoring</p>	<p>The design of the on-going Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme (FSPS-CBP) include the establishment of sustainability structures and measures. These include the establishment of State Food Security Technical Secretariats (SFSTSs) and the building of the capacities of the Non-State Actors</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>State Food Security Technical Secretariats (SFSTSs), have been established providing the much needed evidence-based food security and nutrition information for inclusive decision making in the four states targeted</p>

2 Each Accepted evaluation recommendations (a)	Action Agreed in the Management Response (b)	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c)	MAR score (d) *	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e)
<p>government counterparts should already have allocated budget lines and take upon them part of the activities which were implemented by the project. If government would not be capable to take upon them all tasks after the project ending because of multiple pressing priorities, the search for additional funding from outside donors should be started before the last year of the programme or project, demonstrating the government's planned contribution.</p>	<p>sustainability factors, and the government's readiness to takeover and continue after the project.</p> <p>SPCRP conducted a Sustainability Study in April-May 2011 that aimed to provide a number of recommendations for smooth handover of the programme to the government. Implementation of these recommendations was beyond the scope of SPCR.</p>	<p>(NSAs). In addition, coordination mechanisms established for key stakeholders to discuss food security and nutrition</p>		<p>by the project.</p> <p>There is strong political will from governments of the four target states as such, they have begun the process of legalizing the SFSTs as units in the line ministries and allocating funds for their operations</p>
<p>Recommendation 7. To FAO Sudan on advocating with the Government of Sudan on incorporating new livelihood approaches In order to incorporate livelihood and agricultural approaches which have proven successful like FFS, FAO should advocate with the Government of Sudan to develop a clear plan at State level. A time path should be provided for introducing or upscaling such approaches, including responsibilities at all levels and an in-depth cost-calculation. Mechanisms to achieve upscaling should be clearly outlined and opportunities for funding from State or Federal level or external funding should be identified at an early stage.</p>	<p>Response by FAO: Accepted</p> <p>Advocacy with the Government of Sudan (GoS) is required for the development and implementation of state level action plans as a means of sustaining and scaling up successful approaches.</p>	<p>FAO is engaged in advocacy with the GoS through the on-going Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme (FSPS-CBP) building of the capacities of the Government of Sudan and Non-State Actors (NSAs).</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>The revised Country Programming Framework (CPF) of FAO Sudan, the Plan of Action and the Sudan CAADP –Compact has been officially launched by FAO and GoS and being used as important documents for sustainable development in Sudan.</p>
<p>Recommendation 8. To FAO Sudan on advocating with the Government of Sudan on policy and strategy development. FAO Sudan should advocate for agriculture and livestock related policies</p>	<p>Response by FAO: Partially accepted</p> <p>The implementation of the innovative CARDA concept took some time due to the participatory and inclusive</p>	<p>A concept note was prepared jointly by FAO and Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MoAI) and submitted to EU and other donors to scale-up the FFS, CARDA, RM&SB but</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>The capacities of the 4 State Governments and NSA; Farmers, Fisherman and Pastoralist Unions are being developed, to</p>

2 Each Accepted evaluation recommendations (a)	Action Agreed in the Management Response (b)	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c)	MAR score (d) *	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e)
<p>to be developed or adapted and offer technical assistance to accomplish this. The proposal for the national agricultural extension strategy should be further developed and finalized. The livestock policies should also contain details on the CARDA approach and other animal services related issues. Financial and other responsibilities and mechanisms should be clearly outlined and quality control as well as the management of drug provision should be described in this policy. The role of community associates and veterinary services should be clearly outlined. Situations which require action from Federal level like vaccinations to prevent an epidemic should also be clearly described.</p>	<p>approaches required for getting all stakeholders and decision makers to adopt it. Besides, efforts were made to involve the target community associates, veterinary and animal production services in the design and implementation of the CARDA approach. The idea was to pilot the CARDA approach on a small scale before expanding to other areas and eventually including it within the broader livestock policy and strategy</p>	<p>was not funded. However, the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MoAI) using its own resources has taken ownership and the lead in promoting the FFS approach through a major programme for rain-fed agriculture in the country The adoption and scaling up of the CARDA is limited due to lack of appropriate policy and financial constraints</p> <p>In June 24-26th 2014 FAO brought to the attention of the Government of Sudan and its international partners on the internationally recognized Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests (VGGT) that guideline the necessary reforms to its land tenure governance policies, guide its actions to solve land based conflicts and attract responsible investment that leads to food and nutrition security.</p> <p>In 2014 FAO organized two training courses on Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS) for the government staff, FAO and NGOs in Sudan. The first training course took place in Zalinge in Central Darfur during 4-6 December 2014 while the 2nd training course was held in Wadmedani in Jazira state during 17-19 December 2014. The total number of the trainees was 48 distributed as follows: Central</p>		<p>actively participate in policy development and advocate for appropriate/enabling policies</p>

2 Each Accepted evaluation recommendations (a)	Action Agreed in the Management Response (b)	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c)	MAR score (d) *	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e)
		Darfur (19) , South Darfur (5), North Kordofan (2), South Kordofan (3), West Kordofan (3), White Nile (2), Blue Nile (3), Sennar(2), Kassala (4) Gedarif (2) and Red Sea state (3). The main objective of the training was to mainstream LEGS in the Emergency livestock programme and projects in Sudan so as to improve their delivery		
<p>Recommendation 9. To FAO Sudan on supporting the Government of Sudan on funding and continuation of the Capacity Building. FAO Sudan should support the State and Federal government to continue working on the results that the project has created jointly with its stakeholders and beneficiaries. Support from international donors aimed at the continuation of the most promising SPCRPs should be actively sought. FAO may support development of a proposal, which should also contain a well-planned budget and policies and strategies in order to determine and ensure the Government's role and contribution in such future programme. NGOs should be enlisted in pursuing, particularly, the further expansion of the FFS.</p>	<p>Response by FAO: Partially accepted</p> <p>FAO has supported the development of capacities - at state level - that can carry over the work and maintain the results of SPCRPs and a follow up capacity building programme funded by the EU is being launched.</p> <p>FAO can assist the government in developing follow-up proposal/s for consolidating and scaling up of SPCRPs results, and mobilizing donor funding for implementation.</p>	<p>The Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme (FSPS-CBP), which is not exactly a follow-up project to SPCRPs, but SIFSIA was launched on November 06, 2012 covering two of the four states (Red Sea and Blue Nile) where SPCRPs was implemented. Through the follow-up programme, the capacities of line ministries and NSA are being developed, to actively participate in policy and strategy development and advocate for appropriate and enabling policies.</p> <p>FAO fully engaged the GoS in advocacy through the preparation of the following important documents; Country Programming Framework (CPF) and the Plan of Action of FAO Sudan, the National Agriculture Invest Plan (NAIP) and the Sudan CAADP –Compact.</p>	4	<p>The human and institutional capacities built by SPCRPs are being used in two (Red Sea and Blue Nile) of the four states covered by the on-going new programme, FSPS. For example the TSUs offices and personnel in these two states are those built and trained, respectively under SPCRPs.</p>