

**Strengthening the coordination of social protection
and agriculture: Consultative workshop**

**17 - 18 September 2013
Accra, Ghana**

REPORT OF THE MEETING



Table of Contents

Background.....	1
Day 1: Tuesday 17 September 2013.....	1
Welcome and introductions.....	1
Keynote Address: Lamourdia Thombiano, Deputy Regional Representative, FAO Regional Office for Africa.....	2
Strengthening coordination between social protection and agricultural policy: Introduction and workshop objectives- Benjamin Davis, FAO.....	2
Coordination between social protection and agriculture: the key issues- Nyasha Tirivayi, FAO	7
Group discussions on key issues for coordinating social protection and agriculture.....	9
Day 2: Wednesday 18th September 2013	14
Welcome Back- look back on day one and overview of day two – Mary Nyamongo	14
FAO’s capacity development approach - Patrick Kalas	14
Case study on capacity development in Bangladesh: Interview with Marco Knowles (FAO) - Patrick Kalas, FAO	14
Capacity needs assessment - group discussions and feedback on the capacity needs for coordinating social protection and agriculture.....	15
Capacity needs assessment - individual responses	17
Open session: How do we move forward?	18
Way forward and closing remarks: panel discussion	18
Annex 1: List of workshop participants	20



List of Tables

Table 1 Success factors and challenges to institutional mechanisms for coordination.....	8
Table 2 Policies, legislation and strategies that support coordination in participants’ countries.....	10
Table 3 Priority capacity needs for coordinating social protection and agriculture	16

Background

The From Protection to Production (PtoP) team of the Agricultural Development Economics Division of FAO and the FAO Regional Office for Africa hosted a 2-day consultative workshop from 17-18 September 2013 in Accra, Ghana. The workshop sought to discuss and exchange ideas and experiences on coordinating social protection and agricultural policies and programmes. In addition, the workshop conducted an assessment of the capacities needed to enhance coordination.

The response to the workshop call was overwhelming. Among the participants were government officials from ministries of agriculture, social welfare and finance from eight sub-Saharan African countries - Angola, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Niger, Rwanda and Zambia. Other participants represented the African Union (AU), New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD), World Food Programme (WFP), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the World Bank, and civil society. Simply bringing together these different groups of actors, and in particular ministries of agriculture and social welfare, was an important achievement.

This is a report of the workshop proceedings, while detailed workshop presentations are available on the website <http://www.fao.org/economic/ptop/workshops/ghana-workshop/en/>

Day 1: Tuesday 17 September 2013

Welcome and introductions

The workshop began with a welcome message from the facilitator Mary Nyamongo (African Institute for Health and Development), who noted the diversity of participants both by country of origin and nature of profession. After a round of self-introductions Mary Nyamongo gave an overview of the day's agenda and introduced the workshop organizers represented by Mohammed Agbendech, Senior Nutrition Officer at the FAO Regional Office for Africa and Benjamin Davis, Senior Economist heading the From Protection to Production (PtoP) team in the Agricultural Development Economics Division of FAO Headquarters in Rome.

Mohammed Agbendech welcomed the participants to the workshop and noted that the workshop was the first organized by FAO in Africa and hopefully not the last regional consultation on the issue. He also observed that the workshop fits well with FAO's current reforms of its strategic framework. He also mentioned that the workshop was part of the many regional activities within and outside the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) framework, aimed at improving agriculture, food and nutrition security. As an example, he also informed the participants of a recent workshop on mainstreaming nutrition in national agriculture and food security investment plans in Southern Africa that was organized by NEPAD in collaboration with the FAO among other development partners.

Keynote Address: Lamourdia Thombiano, Deputy Regional Representative, FAO Regional Office for Africa

The deputy regional representative for the FAO regional office for Africa, Lamourdia Thombiano welcomed the participants to the meeting. In his address, he acknowledged the increasing use of social protection to help rural households manage risks, reduce vulnerability and poverty. He also pointed out how smallholder agricultural policies can have a social protection function by helping smallholder households reduce vulnerability and manage risks by increasing farm output, income and overall household welfare. In this context, he saw opportunities for building synergies between the two sectors, which primarily benefit rural livelihoods.

Mr Thombiano explained how FAO was in the process of reforming its strategic framework and sharpening its social protection agenda within sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). In particular, FAO's work was targeted at the nexus between social protection, agriculture, food and nutrition security and rural livelihoods. He also noted that the consultative workshop was to be the first among many more broad based consultations facilitated by FAO to bring attention to the interaction between social protection and agriculture. These activities fit well within regional-level commitments and in particular the Ouagadougou declaration (2004) and Livingstone Call for Action of 2006, both of which recognize the importance of bringing together employment generation and poverty alleviation and the Renewed Partnership to End Hunger in Africa, between the African Union, FAO and the Instituto Lula which take a similar approach.

Mr Thombiano stressed that the two-day workshop was a very important opportunity for exchanging experiences and identifying what is needed for strengthening coordination between social protection and agriculture and thereby shaping how FAO works with government and other partners on these issues.

Strengthening coordination between social protection and agricultural policy: Introduction and workshop objectives- Benjamin Davis, FAO

Benjamin Davis explained that the workshop was motivated by the intent to develop policy guidelines on coordinating social protection and agriculture and develop capacities of practitioners and policy makers in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). As such, the workshop's objectives were to discuss the policy and programmatic issues around linking social protection and agriculture in government work and conducting a capacity needs assessment.

In his presentation on the conceptual linkages between social protection and agriculture, social protection measures played four important roles i.e. preventive, protective, promotion and transformative (Devereux and Sabates-Wheeler framework). He also explained that the focus was on linkages between social protection and smallholder agricultural policies. He also explained that the PtoP team preferred to refer to interventions, for example input subsidies, as agricultural interventions that have a social protection function because they were primarily aimed at increasing output and usually do not target the poorest and most vulnerable. However, when specifically focused on the poorest and most vulnerable, they could be considered social protection interventions in their own right (and this applies to all sectoral interventions). This definition slightly differs from the one proposed by the

High Level Panel of Experts on social protection and food security, where agricultural instruments like input subsidies are termed social protection interventions.

Benjamin Davis explained that social protection and agriculture were conceptually linked as they shared the same geographic space and targeted smallholder families. However, missing and poorly functioning markets constrain economic decisions in investment, risk taking and labour allocation. In this context, social protection contributes to agriculture by improving human capital; relaxing credit and liquidity constraints and thus facilitate changes in productive assets and activities; helping households to better manage risks by being predictable and regular; relieving pressure on informal insurance mechanisms; strengthening the local economy through multiplier effects and increasing resilience.

Benjamin Davis emphasized that social protection was not a magic bullet, motor of growth and by itself would not lead to long-term and sustainable poverty reduction. Hence, social protection and agriculture need to be articulated together in a coordinated rural development strategy. However, because there is little attention paid to the interaction between the two sectors, FAO has begun work highlighting this issue through its PtoP project, which evaluates the economic and productive impacts of cash transfers in seven sub-Saharan African countries. He also explained that FAO's focus is on the interface between social protection, agriculture, food and nutrition security and livelihoods. In addition, FAO intends to facilitate policy dialogue, generate actionable knowledge on and develop capacities for coordinating social protection and agricultural activities in order to maximize synergies and minimize conflicts.

The presentation was followed by a lively discussion during which participants posed several questions and comments. Participants lauded the fact that the workshop had, for the first time for many countries, brought together people working on agriculture and social. Others urged the discourse to go beyond cash transfers as there are other relevant instruments. They agreed with the statement that social protection alone was insufficient for poverty reduction and indicated that institutional mandates that are closely aligned with sectoral objectives (e.g. incise agricultural production) can be a constraint to coordination. Some raised concerns that informal and traditional safety nets are not given sufficient attention in the social protection policy discourse. Benjamin Davis responded that informal safety nets are the first line of defence in communities but have recently been weakened and burdened by several crises that include HIV/AIDS leading to the introduction of formal social protection. However, he saw social protection as complementary to informal safety nets as noted by studies showing positive impacts of cash transfers on social networks in Ghana and Kenya.

Participants also urged governments and development partners to include local communities, civil society and farmers' organizations in coordination activities. Others pointed out that coordination processes should be mindful of the fact that most social protection measures undertaken in SSA are short term in nature. In response to questions on graduation and targeting, Benjamin clarified that social protection alone cannot facilitate graduation and this was evident in long running programmes like Oportunidades in Mexico, whose human capital benefits had not been enough to lift households out of poverty or promote social mobility. He also reminded the

participants that the workshop was a platform for sharing experiences in targeting coordinated programmes in SSA

Case studies on linking social protection with agriculture¹

Food Security Programme of Ethiopia –Berhanu Woldemichael (Director, Food Security Coordination Directorate, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development)

Berhanu Woldemichael, the director of the Food Security Coordination Directorate (FSCD) in the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural development gave a presentation on the Food Security Programme of Ethiopia. The programme was launched in 2003, in response to the level of vulnerability in the country. The programme is implemented by the government of Ethiopia, in close collaboration with development partners, under the New Coalition for Food Security in Ethiopia. FSCD is responsible for the overall coordination of the programme. Ethiopia's social protection policy has also now been formulated and submitted to the council of Ministers for endorsement.

Berhanu Woldemichael explained the key features of the food security programme. The programme is implemented in eight regions and 319 food insecure woredas/districts covering more than 6.88 million beneficiaries. The programme's objectives are to enable chronically food insecure people attain food security, and significantly improve the food security situation of the transitory food insecure people. Administrative and community targeting methods are used to enrol households that have faced continuous food shortages (i.e. 3 months of food gap or more) and households that have suddenly become more vulnerable as a result of the severe loss of assets. Graduation is described as the movement of a household from food insecurity to food security.

There are four key components of the programme:

- **Resettlement programme**: The resettlement programme aims to enable chronically food insecure households attain food security through improved access to land on a voluntary basis. Resettled households are given fertile farmlands, seed, oxen, hand tools, and food ration for the first eight months. They are also provided access to essential infrastructures (including clean water, health post, feeder roads).
- **Productive Safety Net program (PSNP)**: This programme aims to prevent asset depletion at the household level and create assets at the community level. This is done through provision of labour intensive public works and direct support in the form of cash or food transfers. PSNP beneficiaries also get access to HABP resources.

¹A representative from the Bangladesh-based international NGO Brac was expected at the meeting but was unable to attend due to unavoidable circumstances. The participants were however shown a video showcasing the interventions by Brac that had had multiple benefits for women and their households.

- Household Asset Building Program (HABP): The HABP is aimed at improving food security. It comprises a package of extension services, crop and livestock production inputs, moisture conservation and utilization, natural resource development, trainings, support for additional income generating activities, and provision of market information.
- Complimentary Community Investment (CCI): The CCI was designed to create community assets and complement household investment through creating an enabling environment.

Berhanu Woldermichael also described the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities within the programme. These include: regular monitoring reports prepared at woreda level, consolidated at regional level and then sent to federal levels; real-time data collected by the regional and federal information centres; rapid response mechanisms; and agreed studies and bi-annual impact surveys. At high levels, oversight is provided via bi-annual government-donor joint review and implementation supervision missions and joint strategic oversight committee meetings.

In response to several questions posed by the participants, Berhanu Woldermichael clarified that the Food Security Programme had faced coordination challenges due to its multisectoral components despite having one M&E system and an overarching coordination mechanism. A binding MoU was signed that defines mandates. Every two months, a joint strategy and oversight meeting between government and development partners reviews the programme. He also further explained that the government of Ethiopia had allocated 200 billion birr (USD 100 million) to the resettlement and CCI components, while donors financed the PSNP and HABP components. He cited the strong political will, involvement of regional and local governments, and performance management system rewards as the strengths of the programme. He also explained that graduation from the programme is a process that takes time and when candidates for graduation are identified they still spend an additional year in the programme. Targeting criteria is the same for all components but the interventions vary according to agroecological zones. Local communities play an integral role in targeting, monitoring and identifying priority projects. The government is also now considering moving into the urban areas.

Vision 2020 Umurenge Programme – Justine Gatsinzi (Deputy Director General, Social Protection Programme, Rwanda Local Development Support Fund (RLDSF), Ministry of Local Government (MINALOC))

Justine Gatsinzi, Deputy Director General of the social protection programme in the Ministry of Local Government gave a presentation on Rwanda's flagship programme, the Vision 2020 Umurenge Programme (VUP). The VUP was set up in 2007 in response to the realization by the government that poverty reduction rates were low and the Vision 2020 poverty reduction targets would only be achieved in 2030. The programme was established as the flagship of the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EPDRS) and it contributes to the MDGs, Vision 2020 and the 7-year programme of the government. An assessment in 2011 found that extreme

poverty had declined by 12% between 2007 and 2011, but this was still not sufficient hence, VUP was extended for a second phase.

Justine Gatsinzi explained that VUP's main objective was to accelerate the reduction of extreme poverty by; i) releasing the productive capacities of the poor by offering solutions adapted to their needs; ii) improving community livelihood assets and ensuring their sustainable usage; and iii) increasing the targeting of the most vulnerable to benefit from social protection. Arrays of impacts are expected ranging from improved land productivity, financial services coverage, off farm job creation to provision of social services and development of community spirit. Geographic targeting involves ranking the poorest districts and household level targeting is done using the Ubudehe community based poverty mapping process, whereby households in the bottom 2% categories are recruited. Graduation from VUP occurs when the household is no longer extremely poor, and is sustained by access to complementary services.

The VUP has three components:

- Public Works (paid employment on productive community Assets): There are currently just over 43,000 beneficiaries. Public works programmes contribute to household and community asset stabilization and accumulation, an important path for exit/graduation. The public works activities are predominantly agricultural as they involve the cultivation of terraces, anti-erosive ditches, marshland reclamation) and the construction of infrastructure that supports agricultural production (i.e. markets, access roads, afforestation)
- Direct Support (unconditional cash transfers to labor-constrained households): This component currently has about 89,000 beneficiaries. These beneficiaries receive a monthly cash transfer, which helps in smoothing consumption.
- Financial Services (access, financial literacy and credit): About 52,000 beneficiaries are enrolled in this component, which was designed to link safety net beneficiaries to the market, on recognition that safety nets by themselves cannot cause exit/graduation.
- Community sensitization and skills development on social development issues: This component is designed to communicate to beneficiaries on all issues impacting on their livelihoods positively and negatively, as well as possible links to the market. Households are sensitized on investing safety net benefits in agriculture/food security and livestock

Justine Gatsinzi informed participants that VUP is linked to other sectoral development strategies such as land consolidation, crop intensification with corresponding extension services, and the 'one cow per poor family' initiative. He also reported that the Ministry of Local Government (MINALOC) via the Rwanda Local Development Support Fund is responsible for coordinating and harmonizing all VUP activities. Other ministries involved in the programme include the Ministries of Finance and Economic Planning, Agriculture and Animal Resources (MINAGRI), Education, infrastructure, Trade and Industry, Public Service and Labour, Gender and Family Promotion, Disaster Management and Refugee affairs, and Youth and ICT. There is also an Integrated Development Programme Steering Committee, an inter-ministerial body for oversight, with MINALOC as chair, and MINAGRI as vice Chair was

established. Sector working groups link ministries and development partners. At local government level, districts are mandated to implement all activities, and this is supervised by the Joint Action Forum for Development (JADF) at Local Government level.

However, VUP coordination mechanisms are too broad and not very specific. Between the social protection and agricultural sectors there is still some fragmented planning, independent use of the same targeting policy, different timings of social protection and agricultural components, different M&E systems and MIS, different performance contracts and weak capacities for evidence generation of synergies at central and local governmental levels. Justine also acknowledged that social protection is still perceived as a handout programme, which discourages collaboration by productive sectors.

In response to questions from participants, Justine Gatsinzi clarified that at present VUP is sustainable as it is linked to other sectoral activities. Some beneficiaries have graduated from the programme. VUP's beneficiaries are mostly women - 48% in public works, 70% in direct support and 75% in financial services. Justine Gatsinzi also acknowledged that current poverty reduction rates cannot be directly attributed to the VUP programme as impact evaluations of the programme have not yet been completed. He cited strong leadership, inclusive participation and decentralization as the key strengths of the programme.

Coordination between social protection and agriculture: the key issues- Nyasha Tirivayi, FAO

Nyasha Tirivayi gave a presentation on the organizing team's initial thoughts on the key issues affecting coordination between social protection and agriculture. The presentation was an abbreviated version of a policy paper handed out to participants. These initial thoughts were based on theory and empirical evidence, which suggest potential synergies between social protection and agriculture. In this context, coordination would help to build these synergies by reducing fragmentation, fostering policy coherence, improving targeting and graduation and raising efficiency. Nyasha Tirivayi explained that the theme of the workshop was motivated by the observation that few governments are currently coordinating the two sectors and there is little attention to this issue of coordination in policy discourse. She also acknowledged that there is no universal definition of coordination, which can simply be referred to as the basic collaboration between the two sectors. Coordination would vary by intensity, level (policy, programme, administrative) and government structures (vertical vs. horizontal or interministerial).

Nyasha Tirivayi identified the ministries of agriculture and social development, regional and local government and other line ministries as key government actors in the coordination process. Other important stakeholders to the process are non-governmental organizations, i.e. local communities, donors and civil society. She also suggested that institutional mechanisms provide an enabling environment for coordination. Mechanisms such as a policy and legal framework that define goals, mandates and objectives, decentralization and inclusive participation, and financing would influence the environment in which coordination takes place across sectors.

Several factors can also hinder or strengthen institutional mechanisms required for coordination (see table 1).

Table 1 Success factors and challenges to institutional mechanisms for coordination

<i>Success factors</i>	<i>Challenges</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strong political will ○ Clearly defined national policy and legal framework ○ Clearly defined mandates, roles, responsibilities and structures (e.g. Steering Committee) ○ Inclusive, meaningful participation (vertical coordination) with links to decentralization) ○ Strong organizational and institutional capacity ○ Financial mechanisms that create incentives for coordination ○ Facilitate information and knowledge sharing platforms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Vulnerable to centralization that may discourage innovation and responsiveness ○ Difficult if too many actors are involved, e.g. horizontally or vertically ○ Competition among mandated actors, e.g. for fiscal space ○ Contestation of power by multiple actors ○ Weak organizational and institutional capacities (including poor information sharing, lack of clear strategy, etc) ○ Insufficient human resource allocation and staff fluctuations

The choice of design and implementation modalities can lead to conflicts or synergies between social protection and agriculture. The presentation also highlighted some of the key design and implementation issues to consider when coordinating the two sectors:

- Consistency of objectives: which is required in order to maximize synergies.
- Type of instrument: This has implications on economic behavior of beneficiaries. Effects can be either positive or unintentionally negative, e.g. conditionalities may divert women’s labour from production.
- Timing of programmes and interventions: Timing can be harmonized through coordination, which allows for simultaneous or sequenced interventions depending on which groups are targeted.
- Seasonality: Seasonal variation in agricultural labour demand and food prices mediates the impacts of social protection and agricultural interventions, e.g. public works may divert from household farm labour requirements during the planting season, while high food prices can reduce the purchasing power of a fixed cash transfer.
- Targeting: Coordination allows for the deployment of unified targeting and MIS which improve monitoring, efficiency but it is also vulnerable to errors or failure.

Nyasha also emphasized the importance of M&E in enhancing coordination, especially when it is clearly defined, consistent, comprehensive, unified and is designed to measure or detect synergies. She concluded that there is no universal approach to coordination. It is a dynamic process that takes time and is influenced

by the initial context and political will. Consequently, countries must tailor coordination that is suited to its context and capacities.

Group discussions on key issues for coordinating social protection and agriculture

Building on the country presentations (Rwanda and Ethiopia) and the presentation by Nyasha Tirivayi on *'the key issues on coordination between social protection and agriculture,'* (and drawing from the issues discussed in the May 2013 meeting at FAO) the participants were divided into 5 groups (5-8 people per group) to deliberate on several questions. Below is a summary of the feedback received from the groups, on key issues and questions.

1. Why is it important to coordinate social protection and agriculture?
 - Provides an opportunity for graduation from social protection
 - Optimizes synergies between the two sectors and maximizes value for money
 - Minimizes conflicts between the two sectors
 - Both sectors usually have the same beneficiaries
 - Both sectors pursue similar goals, e.g. poverty alleviation, household food security, income generation
 - Fosters greater ownership by communities and key stakeholders
 - Increases human capital through knowledge sharing

2. Policies, legislation, strategies and guidelines
 - a. What national policies, legislation, strategies and guidelines exist in your countries that support coordination between social protection and agriculture? Table 2 summarizes the policies and strategies identified by the group.

Table 2 Policies, legislation and strategies that support coordination in participants' countries

<i>Poverty Reduction Strategies</i>	<i>Social Protection Policies</i>	<i>Food security, nutrition and hunger reduction policies</i>	<i>Other</i>
Rwanda, Ethiopia	Ghana, Rwanda, Niger, Kenya, Malawi	Ethiopia, Kenya, Angola (ENSAN), Malawi	Youth in agriculture strategy (Ghana) Permanent secretariat for coordination of rural development policies (Burkina Faso) National agricultural policy (Malawi) National resilience strategy (Malawi)

The key legal instrument identified by the participants was the national constitution that makes provisions on the welfare of citizens. Other legal instruments for intersectoral coordination that were discussed include Disaster Management Committees, Food and Nutrition Security Council and National Food Reserves. In Ethiopia, there are guidelines on the selection of beneficiaries and graduation that are used for both agricultural and social protection programmes. In Rwanda, guidelines are documented in a user-friendly handbook for implementing the social protection strategy. Box 1 lists some of the examples of linking social protection with agriculture in participants' countries.

Box 1. Examples of programmes linking social protection with agriculture in participants' countries

- One cow per poor family in Rwanda
- Home grown school feeding programmes in Kenya, Ethiopia, Ghana and Rwanda
- 3N initiative in Niger
- No hunger programme or “njaa marufuku” in Kenya
- The national accelerated agricultural input (NAAIAP) programme in Kenya

b. What are the gaps in policies, strategies, legislation and guidelines?

Participants noted that in some cases, there were too many policies, strategies and guidelines, which were not coordinated or harmonized. Another gap is that there is a lack of specialized technical skills in social protection in addition to the lack of functional skills (policy formulation and implementation, facilitation, etc). Participants also mentioned that policies were poorly funded and implemented and were insufficiently focused.

3. Coordination mechanisms

Some of the coordination mechanisms that are in place at national, decentralized and community levels in countries include steering committees, sector working groups, management committees, joint action forums, and social sector committees. The groups also affirmed that central and local governments together with civil society, donors and communities were the key actors involved in multisectoral coordination. In Ethiopia, the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development is responsible for coordinating the Food Security Programme.

However, participants also identified challenges to the coordination mechanisms, such as weak decentralization, funding limitations, lack of institutionalization of participatory mechanisms (Niger), and social protection not integrated into food security strategies (Niger). Among the actors involved in coordination, participants stated that mistrust, poor information sharing and restrictive mandates were some of the factors impeding coordination.

4. Instruments

- a. Among existing programmes/instruments in agriculture and social protection which ones present opportunities for building synergies? And why?

Participants suggested the following instruments:

- Cash transfers since they increase the purchasing power of beneficiaries
- Land reform which is a factor of production and can provide the collateral needed to access credit
- Agricultural extension which not only transfers knowledge but can improve social capital development
- In-kind support in the form of livestock and seeds
- School feeding that promotes local purchases of food
- Public works programmes
- Cooperatives as they can facilitate the purchase of seeds
- Listeners' clubs and community radio as they help disseminate information in local communities, e.g. in Congo and Niger

Some of the instruments, such as school feeding, cooperatives and listeners clubs, provide opportunities for promoting women's empowerment. Participants also mentioned that coordinating social protection and agriculture also provides opportunities for positive discrimination in favour of women and hence contributes to **gender equality**. This is because women who comprise the majority of rural smallholder farmers in SSA would stand to benefit from such programmes.

5. Evidence

The groups identified several forms of evidence needed to support the coordination of social protection and agriculture. Evidence such as the impacts of social protection on agricultural production, investments and the local economies and how agriculture helps households to manage risks and reduce vulnerability. Participants also

recommended the generation of evidence on the synergies from combining social protection and agricultural interventions. They also recommended the collection of baseline data such as vulnerability profiles, dietary diversity and food security, profiles of markets and traditional networks, intrahousehold dynamics and governance indices.

In addition, they expressed interest in establishing indicators for assessing coordination during the implementation process, e.g. the establishment of MoUs for collaboration, joint planning and the design and deployment of unified targeting systems. Participants reiterated that what matters is how the evidence is used for coordination. They agreed that governments should take leadership in the generation of evidence with the support of other actors (CSOs, research institutions, and local communities). Independent evaluators would also be enlisted to ensure transparency and accountability.

6. Challenges

The participants were asked to discuss and identify some of the challenges that could emerge during targeting, design and implementation of coordinated social protection and agricultural programmes. They also discussed the potential conflicts between various stakeholders. Box 2 presents a summary of the challenges and conflicts identified by the participants.

Box 2. Challenges and conflicts during coordination

Targeting, design and implementation

- Insufficient human resources
- Lack of technical and functional skills
- Different target groups for social protection and agriculture
- Sustainability is difficult when interventions are short term measures
- Fragmentation of activities

Conflicts among actors

- Lack of political will
- Overlapping and conflicting mandates
- Lack of macro policy to define responsibilities
- Competition for often limited resources

Participants suggested the following mitigation measures to some of the challenges and conflicts:

- Governments should ensure there is an overarching macro policy that clearly defines roles, mandates and responsibilities of the implementing partners;
- A common M&E system is needed for successful coordination;
- Actionable evidence on synergies should be generated to support coordination;



- Joint multisectoral planning and budgeting by social protection, agricultural and other development sectors; and
- Performance-based incentives to reward or motivate coordination efforts.

Day 2: Wednesday 18th September 2013

Welcome Back- look back on day one and overview of day two – Mary Nyamongo

Mary Nyamongo, the facilitator, welcomed the participants to the second day of the workshop. In a recap, she reminded participants of the main issues discussed during the first day of the workshop. During day one participants reached a consensus that coordinating social protection and agriculture was pertinent to rural development but that there was a limited awareness about the issues. There were also some concerns that informal safety nets are being ignored in the policy discourse. The participants identified political will, financing mechanisms and inclusive participation, particularly that of local communities and farmers organizations, as some of the key elements necessary for the successful coordination of the two sectors.

FAO's capacity development approach - Patrick Kalas

Patrick Kalas provided an overview of the principles of good capacity development practice. Patrick Kalas explained that capacity development is more than training individuals. It encompasses three dimensions namely the individual, organizational and institutional/enabling environment that need to be addressed interchangeably in order to achieve more sustainable and impactful results. In order to improve capacity development practice, it is recommended to first **Assess** (i.e. conducting a participatory capacity needs assessment across the three CD dimensions), **Design** (define most appropriate CD interventions such as individual learning events, organizational performance strengthening or enhancing multistakeholder participation to formulate and implement policies) and **Track** (defining indicators and monitoring approach based on a baseline from the capacity needs assessment).

Patrick Kalas introduced FAO's capacity needs assessment methodology consisting of three critical and interlinked steps. The first is to conduct a comprehensive situation analysis with tools such as the problem/objective tree analysis to get the root causes of the actual challenge (what is the challenge?). The second step is to conduct a stakeholder mapping and analysis (who are the actors?). The third step is to conduct a capacity needs assessment across the three CD dimensions addressing the questions on whose and what capacities need to be developed/strengthened. Patrick Kalas explained that implementing this approach in a participatory manner builds ownership of the process, ensures that the starting point is based on existing capacities, provides a baseline to track progress and the basis to prioritize capacity development interventions for the implementation stages.

Case study on capacity development in Bangladesh: Interview with Marco Knowles (FAO) - Patrick Kalas, FAO

To illustrate the conceptual overview, Patrick Kalas conducted an interview with Marco Knowles (FAO) to gain insights and lessons learned in a process aimed at strengthening capacities across ministries, in implementing the national food policy of Bangladesh.

Bangladesh's National Food Policy of 2006, unlike the one set up in 1988, adopted a more comprehensive approach to food security that cuts across 13 different ministries. With this new approach and improved policy framework, additional institutional and human capacities were needed for coordinating across ministries, formulating and implementing policies and investment plans and carrying out knowledge-based decision making. Since 2006, the Government of Bangladesh, FAO and development partners have been working together in formulating the National Food Policy Capacity Strengthening Programme.

Marco Knowles highlighted some of the achievements of the capacity strengthening programme. They include the institutional reform of the Food Planning and Monitoring Unit (which is the technical agency responsible for providing food security policy advice to the government) so better enable it to facilitate inter-ministerial collaboration and coordination on food and nutrition security. FAO assisted the government of Bangladesh in broadening the mandate of the Food Planning and Monitoring Unit to not only monitor and advise on food availability but also on access to food and nutrition. In addition, the unit set up new directorates to reflect its broader mandate and multi-sectoral coordination on nutrition and food security. The National Food Policy Capacity Strengthening Programme also builds individual technical and functional capacities by sponsoring postgraduate studies abroad, providing on the job support as well as short-term training in-country and abroad. Training is provided on technical issues, such as nutrition analysis, monitoring of policy and investment frameworks as well as on more generic but still very important skills like results based management.

FAO has contributed to the programme by supporting training, food security research, institutional reform, providing direct policy advice to government and development partners and facilitating partnerships and convening meetings between the government and UN agencies, donors, CSOs and research institutions.

Marco Knowles explained that there are lessons that can be derived from the Bangladesh experience and applied to the coordination of social protection and agriculture. A comprehensive approach for developing capacities that takes into account the policy setting and institutional and human capacities is a crucial factor for successful coordination. However, actors should bear in mind that capacity development takes time and a minimum critical mass of support.

Capacity needs assessment - group discussions and feedback on the capacity needs for coordinating social protection and agriculture

Building on the presentation on FAO's capacity development approach and the case study on capacity development in Bangladesh, participants were divided into groups of two to three countries and tasked with identifying the critical capacities needed to facilitate the coordination of social protection and agricultural sectors. This effort was complemented with an initial individual capacity and learning needs assessment.

The groups were asked to answer the following questions.

For more effective coordination in designing and implementing social protection and agriculture at national level, the participants were asked to respond to the following questions:

1. What are the critical capacity needs?
2. Further specify the capacity needs in terms of:
 - a. Technical capacities (e.g. conducting a vulnerability analysis) and functional capacities (e.g. facilitation/effective project implementation);
 - b. Organizational capacities (i.e. clear mandate, intersectoral coordination mechanisms, multi stakeholder participation); and
 - c. Enabling environment and institutional capacities (e.g. political will, budget allocation, power structures).
3. Among all the capacity needs identified, what are the critical three priorities to be addressed?

Table 3 highlights the feedback from the group sessions.

Table 3 Priority capacity needs for coordinating social protection and agriculture

<i>Technical and functional capacity needs</i>	<i>Organizational capacity needs</i>	<i>Enabling environment and institutional capacity needs</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harmonized evidence generation/ impact assessments • Limited knowledge, awareness and understanding of social protection by other sectors • Limited knowledge of linkages between SP and agriculture • M&E and impact evaluation • MIS and targeting • Policy formulation and implementation • Negotiation and advocacy skills • Partnering skills (establishing MoUs) • Facilitation and coordination skills • Leadership and management skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear mandates • Inter-sectoral coordination mechanisms • Leadership and management (incentives) • Clarification of roles and responsibilities (TORs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harmonized policy and legal frameworks • Political will and commitment • Financing mechanisms (including budgetary allocation mechanisms, innovative financing models beyond tax revenue) • Policy interference • Multi-stakeholder dialogue platforms for meaningful participation and inclusion • Reforming legal frameworks (i.e. recognize farmers as workers)

Regional bodies and development partners formed their own group where they answered a specific set of questions relevant to their capacities and mandates. Development partners agreed that there was also need to develop their own technical and organizational capacities regarding the linkages between social protection and agriculture. The development partners identified several areas in which they could contribute to the capacity development of governments:

- Coordination of policy dialogue at national, regional and global levels
- Convening power

- Fostering political will
- Capacity development
- Evidence sharing
- Advocacy
- Systems approach to SP
- Technical assistance
- Financing programmes linking SP and agriculture (P4P, PAA)

Participants urged development partners to harmonize their financial support in a way that creates incentives to bring social protection and agriculture together. Participants also encouraged donors and development agencies to build on existing capacities, embrace government priorities and avoid imposing their own interests but rather facilitate demand driven capacity development. Participants agreed that a bottom up comprehensive capacity development was required at both national, regional and local government levels, based on the clear identification of needs and priorities while being driven by multi-sectoral and holistic national development.

Capacity needs assessment - individual responses

Complementing the group assessment, an initial individual learning needs assessment was conducted via a self-administered questionnaire. The following questions were asked:

- In your opinion, list some key challenges to more effectively coordinate social protection and agriculture?
- Which of the challenges you have identified are most critical to be addressed?
- What are your current roles, responsibilities and job tasks regarding coordinating social protection and agriculture?
- What are your current gaps in knowledge, skills and competencies that could hinder more effective coordination between social protection and agriculture?
- Which of these knowledge, skills and competency gaps are most critical to be addressed?

The responses indicate that there are gaps in individual awareness, understanding, knowledge of linkages between social protection and agriculture. There are also skills and competency gaps that need to be addressed at individual and country levels. A combined assessment of the individual and group responses shows that:

- (a) there is a need to increase awareness and foster common understanding among stakeholders of the linkages between social protection and agriculture;
- (b) addressing organizational (mandates, information sharing, roles, procedures, incentives, etc) and institutional (political will, policies, legal framework) capacities seems higher in immediate priority than addressing individual needs; and
- (c) individual knowledge, skills and capacities still need to be developed, and future approaches could focus on technical (learning about social protection

issues) and functional capacities (facilitation, programme implementation, M & E, etc).

As a caveat, these findings require an in-depth country-level analysis in order to design appropriate capacity development interventions.

Open session: How do we move forward?

In an open session, participants made recommendations on how to proceed with the coordination of social protection and agriculture within countries and in SSA. Participants agreed that the modalities of future capacity development interventions would depend on the target groups. Others called for a further exploration on how to strengthen institutional capacities. Participants also agreed that coordination mechanisms require political will, sustainable financing and inclusive participation and should be context specific and be responsive to the policy context within countries (as some countries have advanced policy frameworks and some do not). Brazil and Niger were cited as examples of where political will had driven the multi-sectoral coordination processes.

Participants also recommended “home-grown” comprehensive capacity development interventions in order to move towards increased synergies and coordination between social protection and agriculture. Participants called for further sensitization on the issue of coordination through national and regional meetings. One suggestion was for FAO and development partners to piggy-back on the African community of practice for cash transfers by using it as a platform for learning activities. Other participants recommended policy discussions to pay attention to rural employment issues and to frame social protection and agriculture as risk management strategies.

Way forward and closing remarks: panel discussion

Laila Lokosang, (African Union), Ablo Mawutor (Government of Ghana), Natalia Winder Rossi (UNICEF), Mohammed Agbendeche (FAO RAF), Benjamin Davis (FAO) addressed the meeting during the final session.

Laila Lokosang of the African Union (AU) gave an overview of how social protection had been embraced by the AU through various declarations and adoptions, and as reflected in the CAADP Pillar III framework. The Renewed Partnerships for a Unified Approach to End Hunger in Africa by 2025, also presents an opportunity for the adoption of social protection as a key policy response to hunger and vulnerability. Laila Lokosang pointed out that the AU had committed budget lines for social protection. As a way forward, Laila Lokosang recommended the development of an African strategy on capacity development in social protection and production, the recognition and rewards of countries that achieve coordination, policy dialogue on what would be the ideal social protection measures, and the development of regional and national policy strategies and work plans.

Natalia Winder Rossi of UNICEF called for more consultations to understand linkages between social protection and agriculture. She also explained that UNICEF had an

interest in the topic given its work on children and vulnerabilities. The main message from UNICEF's recently released Global Strategy on social protection was that children face multidimensional vulnerabilities, which need a comprehensive response through social protection systems that are linked with health, HIV/AIDS prevention, economic productivity and agriculture. UNICEF is also helping countries develop social protection systems that would be linked to health or agriculture, and has identified social protection and income diversification as some of the strategies that can foster resilience. Natalia Winder Rossi also reminded the participants that in collaboration with partners, UNICEF is already a key player in supporting impact evaluations of cash transfers through the Transfers Project and the PtoP project. Natalia Winder Rossi recommended further deliberations on how to operationalize coordination processes and incentivize policy frameworks. She also urged further discussions on whether ideal instruments for coordination can be identified or they would need to be context specific. She concluded her remarks by emphasizing that UNICEF will take advantage of its strong presence within countries to support countries in identifying linkages between social protection and agriculture and building analytical evidence bases.

Benjamin Davis of FAO told participants that FAO would set up a mailing list that includes the workshop participants. The mailing list would be used to disseminate news, experiences and latest information on the linkages between social protection and agriculture. Knowledge sharing and exchanges from the list serve would be used by FAO to plan activities for the next two years.

Mohammed AgBendeche of FAO hailed the workshop for helping to improve understanding on the linkages between social protection and agriculture. He told participants that there are regional opportunities for promoting this issue further and these include CAADP processes, upcoming resilience programmes and scaling-up nutrition initiatives. He also called for the development of a social protection agenda for urban areas.

Ablo Mawutor from the Government of Ghana called for FAO to collaborate with other UN agencies in utilizing a holistic approach for poverty reduction that links all development sectors (health, education, agriculture, etc). He identified FAO's SO3 regional initiative in Ghana as an example where the Ministry of Agriculture was collaborating with FAO and other ministries to reduce poverty in 18 rural communities. He lauded the workshop for bringing together social protection and agricultural practitioners. He concluded by expressing gratitude to the participants for attending the workshop and to FAO for organizing the event and particularly choosing Ghana as the host country.

Annex 1: List of workshop participants

Angola

Mr. Alfredo Armindo Francisco da Cunha
Leader of Agricultural Production
National Directorate of Agriculture and Livestock
Ministry of Agriculture
Largo Antonio Jacinto, Luanda, Angola
Cell : (244) 925 11 44 15
aa-dacunha2@yahoo.com.br;
alfredoarmindo34@gmail.com

Mr. Berhanu Woldemichael Washie
Director, Food Security Coordination Directorate,
Ministry of Agriculture, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Tel.: 251 0913 54 46 31
E-mail: birhanuw@dppc.gov.et
Berhanuw@yahoo.com

Brazil

Mrs. Darana Castilho De Souza
PAA Africa Coordinator WFP CoE
WFP Centre of Excellence Against Hunger/PMA Centro
de Excelência Contra a Fome
United Nations World Food Programme/Programa
Mundial de Alimentos das Nações Unidas
Brasilia, Brazil
Phone: +55 61 2030-2550
E-mail: darana.souza@wfp.org
www.paa-africa.org
facebook.com/PAAafrica

Mr. Firdu Ayele Mesfin
House of People Representative
House of People Office, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Tel: 0911 86 4993
25191 1864993 / 251111241032
Firdu_ayele@yahoo.com

Ethiopia

Mrs. Alemtsehay Gebreyes Beza
Senior Expert / Officer in charge
Agriculture Sector Budget Appraisal
Administration and M&E, Federal Budget
Appraisal and Administration Directorate,
Ministry of Finance and Economic
Development (MOFED)
P. O. Box 1037, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Tel: 251 1 1 552543
Mobile 0911 14 85 56 , Office 0111 55 25 43
E- Mail address- alemtsehaig@yahoo.com

Mr. Lailà Barnaba Lokosang
Food and Nutrition Security Adviser (CAADP)
Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture
African Union Commission
CAADP Pillar III Adviser | Rural Economy and
Agriculture Department, African Union Commission
P. O. Box 3243, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia,
Tel: +251-11-5517700 / +251-11-518 2877
E-mail: Lokosangl@africa-union.org

Ghana

Mr. Peter Ragno
UNICEF, Accra, Ghana
Tel: 2247 679041
E-mail: lragno@unicef.org

Mr. Michael Campbell Burnside
Food Security Officer
World Food Programme
N. 7, 7th Rangoon Close, Cantonment
Accra, Ghana
Tel: 024 363 0706
E-mail: Michael.burnside@wfp.org



Nguyen Duc Hoang
Head of Programme Unit
United Nations World Food Programme
Accra, Ghana
Tel.: : (233-302) 773540
Fax: (233-302) 773835
Mobile:(233-24) 4313772
VSAT: 1350-2400
E-mail: nguyenduc.hoang@wfp.org

Ms. Christabel Sefa
Social Protection and Health Specialist
The World Bank - Ghana Country Office
Accra
Email: csefa@worldbank.org
Tel: 233 302 214117
Cell: 233 27 8066294
Dama: 5337 4117

Ms. Eva Esselba Mends
Director, Budget Preparation
Ministry of Finance & Economic Planning
P. O. Box Accra, Ghana
Tel.:
E-mail:esselba1@yahoo.co.uk

Mr. Richard Twumasi-Ankrah
Deputy Director
Directorate of Crop Services
Ministry of Food and Agriculture
P. O. Box M.37, Accra
Tel.:233 302 665506 / 0506320058
E-mail: rickytwumasi@yahoo.co.uk

Mrs. Edna Baffoe-Bonnie
Economics Officer, Real Sector Division
Ministry of Finance, P. O. Box M40, Accra, Ghana
Tel: 0244633739
E-mail: eofosuamoah@gmail.com
EOfosu-Amoah@mofep.gov.gh

Ms. Doris Abena Yeboah
Monitoring and Evaluation Officer
Ministry of Fisheries & Aquaculture Development
P. O. Box GP 680

Accra
Tel: 233 242 774 779
E-mail: ncusflpgh@yahoo.co.uk

Mr. Mawutor Kwaku Ablo
Director - Social Protection,
Ministry of Gender, Children & Social Protection
Accra, Ghana
Tel: 233 20 8164216/+ 233 24 2628598
E-mail: mawutorablo@yahoo.co.uk

Mr. Mr. Kodwo Ennin Fynn
Animal Production Directorate
M Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MOFA)
P. O. Box 5779, Accra North, Ghana
Tel.: 233 (0) 243556200 / 233 (0) 261 28 7020
E-mail: kefynn@hotmail.com

Mr. Hayford Agbekpornu
Assistant Agricultural Economist
Fisheries Department
P. O. Box GP 630
Accra, Ghana
Tel.: 0244983250
E-mail: hayfodgadry@yahoo.com

Kenya

Natalia Winder Rossi
Senior Social Policy (Social Protection) Specialist
UNICEF, Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office
(ESARO), UN Gigiri
P.O. Box 44145 – 00100, Nairobi, Kenya
Tel.: +254 (0) 20 762 2350
Fax: +254 (0) 20 762 2678/2679
Mobile: +254 (0) 71 58 33 714
Skype: [nwinder.unicef](https://www.skype.com/user/nwinder.unicef)
Email: newinderrossi@unicef.org

Mr. David Ombalo Otieno
Principal Agricultural Officer
Policy and External Relations Department, Agricultural
Policy Coordination Division
Ministry of Agriculture Livestock and Fisheries
P. O. Box 30028 - 00100, Nairobi, Kenya

Tel.: +254 718870-9/716665/719043
Office Tel: No. +254 20 2718870 Ext: 556
Cell: +254 711-170726
E-mail: dombalo@yahoo.com
Ms. Esther Ndirangu,
Deputy Chief Economist
Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Services
P. O. Box 16936 00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 0722 588 557
E-mail: endirangu84@yahoo.com

Ms. Mary Amuyunzu-Nyamongo
African Institute for Health and Development
P. O. Box 45259 – 00100,
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel.: 254 722 850401
Email: mnyamongo@aih dint.org

Ms Rose Marienga
Regional Manager
National Social Security Fund (NSSF)
Ministry of Labour Social Security and Services
P. O. Box 30599 – 00100, Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 022 729911
Mob.: +254 736560696
E-mail: marienga.r@nssfkenya.co.ke

Malawi

Dr. Esmie Tamanda Kainja
Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Welfare
Acting Director for Social Protection Services
Private Bag 330, Lilongwe, Malawi
Cell: 0997044924
E-mail: esmie.kainja@gmail.com ; ekainja@yahoo.com

Ms. Christine Chifoniro Mtambo
Deputy Director
Department of Crop Development
Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
P. O. Box 30145, Capital City, Lilongwe, Malawi
Tel.: 265 888 503 980
E-mail: ccmtambo@gmail.com

Mr. Winston Nyasulu
Ministry of Finance

Malawi
Tel.: 0994 303 532
E-mail: wnyasuluwinston@yahoo.com

Mr. Winston Kaponmbe Nyasulu
Ministry of Finance
P. O. Box 30049, Lilongwe, Malawi
Tel.: 265 1 789355
E-mail: wnyasuluwinston@yahoo.com

Niger

Mr. Mahaman Sani Abdou
Ingénieur Agronome
Directeur des Etudes et de la Programmation
Ministère de l'Agriculture, BP 12091 Niamey
République du Niger
Tél.: +227 90 10 22 61/99 22 50 79
E-mail: mahamansania@yahoo.fr

Mr. Bassirou Dogari
Macro-économiste à la Direction des réformes
financières, Ministère des Finances
b. P. 389, Niamey, Niger.
Tel.: 227 96 50 12 72 ou 227 20 72 41 38
E-mail: dbassirou2002@yahoo.fr

Mr. Ibrahim Saley Yacouba
Directeur de la Prévoyance sociale
Ministère de l'Émloi du Travail et de la Sécurité,
Niamey, Niger
Tel. : 227 96 59 91 69 ou 227 90 34 06 03 ;
2073 22 31 2073 2242
E-mail : yac_is74@yahoo.fr

Rwanda

Mr. Justine GATSINZI
Deputy Director General,
In charge of Social Protection Program,
Rwanda Local Development Support Fund (RLDSF)
Ministry of Local Government (MINALOC)
P. O. Box 7305, Kigali, Rwanda
Cell Phone: +250 788307442
Email: gatsinzi2@yahoo.co.uk

Mr. Otto Vianney Muhinda
Coordinator
Food Security and Nutrition Programme
Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources
P. O. Box 621, Kigali, Rwanda
Tel: +250 788 501 785
ottomuhinda@minagri.gov.rw; and
ottovianney@yahoo.fr;

Ms. Fridah Abera
Professional In charge of Community Development and
Project Analyst, Ministry of Local Government
Rwanda
Tel +250 788750126
fridah.abera@yahoo.com;

Senegal

Mr. Cisse Al Hassan
Oxfam International Regional Food Security Advocate
Coordinator
Based in Oxfam GB - West Africa Regional Center
Point E Avenue Birago Diop
BP 3476, Dakar CP 18524, SENEGAL
Tel: 00 221 33 859 37 00
Mobile: +221 77 542 49 25
E-mail: ALCisse@Oxfam.org.uk

Mr Cheikh Mouhamady Cissokho
Président d'honneur et membre - Réseau des
Organisations Paysannes et des Producteurs Agricoles
pour l'Afrique de l'Ouest (ROPPA) et Conseil National
de Concertation des Ruraux (CNCR)
Bamba-Thialène Koumpentoum, Dakar, Senegal
Tel.: +226 503608 25
E-mail: souso.sora@gmail.com
Aoppa2000@yahoo.fr(Ouaga)

South Africa

Ms. Mariam Sow
NEPAD-CAADP,
Midrand, South Africa
Tel.: +27 (0) 11 0755017
E-mail: mariams@nepad.org

Zambia

Mr Cosmore Mwaanga
Chief Policy Analyst
Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock
4th Floor, Mulungushi House
P. O. Box 50197
Lusaka, Zambia
Tel: +260 977 211 735 / 260 211 250 532
E-mail: cbbmwaanga@yahoo.com

Mr. Nicholas F. Mwale
Senior Economist
Policy and Planning Department
Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock
Lusaka, Zambia
Tel: +260 977 856 770
E-mail: nfmwale@gmail.com

Mr. Stanfield Michelo
Director, Ministry of community Development
P.O. Box 31958, Lusaka, Zambia
Tel.: +26097809900
E-mail: stanmichelo@yahoo.com

Ms. Sheila Nkunika
UNICEF
4th floor, UN House
Alick Nkhata Road
Lusaka, Zambia
Tel: +26 0977 410625
E-mail: snkunika@unicef.org

Resource Persons

Ms. Francoise Rolle
FAO Representative in Malawi
Lilongwe 3
Evelyn Court 13/31
Tel: 08888 22 853
E-mail: Florence.rolle@fao.org

Mr. Amadou Saley
Assistant FAO Representative in Niger
Tel.: 00227 96965190



E-mail: FAO-NE@fao.org
Amadou.saley@fao.org

Ms. Ana Paula De La O Campos
Policy Analyst – Gender
FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy
Tel: 346 095 7876
E-mail: anapaula.delaocampos@fao.org

Mr. Mohamed Ag Bendeck
Senior Nurtion Officer\FAO Regiona Office for Africa
Accra, Ghana
Tel.:
E-mail: Mohamed.Agbendeck@fao.org

Mr. James Tefft
Senior Policy Officer
FAO Regional Office for Africa
Tel.:
E-mail

Mr. Benjamin Davis
Senior Economist
FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy
Tel.: 39 3450338983
E-mail: Benjamin.Davis@fao.org

Ms. Juliana Nyasha Tirivayi
Social Protection Specialist
FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy
Tel.: +39 065 7055012
E-mail: Nyasha.tirivayi@fao.org

Mr. Patrick Kalas
Capacity Development Officer
FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 6 57056271
Patrick.kalas@fao.org

Mr. Marco Knowles
Economist, Policy and Institutions
FAO Headquarters
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Roma, Italy
Tel: + 39 06 570 54100
Marco.knowles@fao.org

Ms. Joyce Mulila Mitti
Crop Production and Protection Officer
FAO Regional Office for Africa
P. O. Box GP 1628, Accra, Ghana
Tel: +233 5414 99773
E-mail: joyce.mulilamitti@fao.org

Mr. Cheikh Ly
Animal Production and Protection Officer
FAO Regional Office for Africa
P. O. GP Box 1228, Accra
Tel.:
E-mail: Cheikh.Ly@fao.org

Mr. Adama Taoko
FAO/SFW-Consultant
FAO Regional Office for Africa
P. O. GP Box 1228, Accra
Tel.:
E-mail: Adama.Taoko@fao.org

Ms. Joan Nimarkoh
Special Assistant to DRR
FAO Regional Office for Africa
P. O. GP Box 1228, Accra
Tel.:
E-mail Joan.Nimarkoh@fao.org

Mr. Jean Kabahizi
Policy Assistant – Consultant
FAO Regional Office for Africa
P. O. Box GP Box 1228, Accra
Tel.:
E-mail: Jean.kabahizi@fao.org