

## "FICHE CONTRADICTOIRE"

**Evaluation of the European Union's Approach to building resilience to withstand food crises in African Drylands.  
Sahel and Horn of Africa (HoA) 2007-2015**

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Joint response of EU services (DEVCO, ECHO and EEAS) – December 2017</b>	<b>Joint response of the services on follow-up (one year later)</b>
<i>For full details of the recommendations please refer to the Main Report</i>	<i>The services give their position on each of the recommendations by expressing their agreement or disagreement with the recommendation and, in the latter case, the reason why they disagree and as appropriate they include in the answers the actions to be taken to implement the recommendations.</i>	<i>The services reply on the follow-up on the responses provided one year ago to see to what extent and how planned actions have been carried out.</i>
<p><b>R.1 The approach to building resilience to withstand food crises should be adapted to the specificities of different contexts. This should include clarifying the respective roles of DEVCO, ECHO and the EEAS in operationalizing the approach to building resilience depending on root causes</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Senior managers of DEVCO, ECHO and EEAS should acknowledge that different contexts will lead to differentiated approaches and differentiated levels of responsibility for building resilience to food crises</li> <li>2. Livelihoods based approaches to building resilience<sup>1</sup> should be concentrated in countries where: (i) there are recurrent food emergencies, (ii) driven by weather-related or economic shocks, and (iii) national institutions and systems possess a minimum of commitment and capacity for building resilience to food crises. In such contexts the comparative advantages of DEVCO in leading the process should be acknowledged.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A typology of crises, including conflict aspects, is being developed by DEVCO C1, with the support, amongst others, of FAO. This should lead to the development of guidance to better address crises according to their nature and context according to the mandates and the comparative advantage of the EU services, and will allow to better implement the Joint Communication on Resilience – 2017, and its 10 guiding principles.</li> <li>2. DEVCO responses (el Nino e.g.) are indeed based on the Pro-Resilience Action (PRO-Act) methodology while the building of resilience is included in the National Indicative Programmes (NIPs) through the concentration on Food and Nutrition Security and Sustainable Agriculture (FNSSA) sectors in more than 60 countries, and particularly in the Sahel and HoA. 2017 Mid-Term reviews of the geographic programmes confirmed the choice of the sector as a key element to ensure resilience to food crisis.</li> </ol> <p>ECHO's response is based on needs, risks and vulnerability assessments (INFORM) and is linked to identified shocks. ECHO's response should</p>	<p>Regarding adaptation to the specificities of different context, a Global Report on Food Crisis is released every year in March.</p> <p>The report looks into all ongoing food crisis and details their intensity and causes.</p> <p>It is a tool to help decision makers orienting the funding and in particular it allows to prioritise the annual PRO-ACT envelops.</p> <p>The Food &amp; Nutrition Security and Sustainable Agriculture envelop in the Country Multi Year programmes 2013-2020 is now over 90% committed and aims at building or consolidating the resilience of rural people to food crises.</p> <p>Since 2017, the EU is piloting a triple nexus approach in six countries. Significant progress was made in all countries with the drafting of six nexus</p>

<sup>1</sup> Should read "resilience to food crisis"

<p>3. In fragile states where the root cause of food crises are related to conflict the approach to building resilience to food crises should prioritize political action, led by the EEAS with its' comparative advantages. In addition, development and humanitarian actions in these contexts should be conflict sensitive.</p> <p>4. Based on an understanding of the drivers of food crises in a specific context the roles and responsibilities of DEVCO, ECHO and EEAS should be agreed at the country level. The three services should consider the inherent limitations to collaboration due to the different mandates, priorities and principles of each service. Consequently, there may be contexts where it should be accepted that integrated political-development-humanitarian collaboration is</p>	<p>include a shock responsive element, be nutrition sensitive and complementary to that of DEVCO and other development actors. This is ensured via existent coordination mechanisms in countries.</p> <p>3. The EU has developed its conceptual approach to situations of fragility, forced displacement and protracted crises much further in the past years, e.g. in EUGS, "Lives in Dignity", "Joint communication on Resilience", etc. An important process is the aim to operationalise the humanitarian/development nexus (Council Conclusions of May 2017). In a set of six pilot countries<sup>2</sup> a more aligned approach of humanitarian, development and political/diplomatic actors will be tested. The objective is to increase the effectiveness of the EU's efforts to overcome situations of fragility, forced displacement and protracted crises, and thereby to pave the way toward long-term sustainable development. Tools such as the Global report/network are also meant to increase the quality of dialogue amongst various actors and decision-makers coming from a wider and complementary spectrum.</p> <p>4. Since 2015, there has been an increased understanding about roles and responsibilities between various EU services, including on the provision of principled humanitarian assistance to the most in need. EU inter services collaboration - at EUD, ECHO offices and HQ levels - to address protracted and recurrent crises is enhanced via the operationalisation of the 2017 Communication on Resilience. It must be reminded that an integrated political-development-humanitarian analysis is always</p>	<p>Action Plans following the organisation of workshops. This process allows portraying good practices of coherent programming and joint advocacy between EU services and MS. Constant sharing of information and joint missions are more and more becoming a practise. As far as the peace element of the nexus is concerned, initial lessons learnt are rather positive. We are collecting more lessons, especially for situations where a triple nexus approach would not be beneficial or others where a triple nexus would add value to humanitarian work.</p> <p>In line with the EU commitment to the Humanitarian Development Peace nexus, a high level event is being organised in April 2019 around "working better together for long term solutions to "Food and agriculture in times of crisis"</p> <p>Regarding the clarification of conceptual interlinkages between the approach of building resilience to food crisis and the contribution to manage migration, migration is increasingly mainstreamed in the formulation of programmes. Specific guidelines are being developed by DEVCO with IOM.</p>
---	---	---

<sup>2</sup> Chad, Iraq, Myanmar, Nigeria, Sudan and Uganda

<p>not appropriate.</p> <p>5. DEVCO, EEAS and ECHO technical Units should clarify the relevance of the approach to building resilience to food crises as a contribution to manage migration, clarifying the conceptual interlinkages between the two.</p> <p>6. Where possible DEVCO, ECHO and EEAS should strengthen inter-service collaboration through improved routine interaction between staff at country level</p>	<p>appropriate, and is the sole mean to adequately respond according to causes, needs and EU services' mandate, also reflecting actors and decision-makers coming from a wider and complementary spectrum.</p> <p>5. Migration is far too generic a concept. Movements of people are linked to a wide range of reasons that can be of socio-economic-climatic reasons and/or be of conflict nature, in the latter inducing forced displacements. The building of people's resilience to food crisis rests with different actors and methods depending on the root causes of the crisis, and it must be adapted and context specific.</p> <p>6. Inter-service collaboration at country level is already a reality through e.g. the definition of EU multiyear programmes, joint humanitarian-development frameworks, ECHO regular coordination with EUDs, etc., and will be reinforced through the implementation of the nexus approach. Additionally, the deployment of shared posts between ECHO, and DEVCO or NEAR in Delegations is under study. It should be noted that it is not possible to transfer contractual staff between DEVCO and ECHO at country level due to statutory reasons.</p>	
<p><b>R.2 Strengthen the process for developing collaborative, inter-Service, country level EU strategies to build resilience to food crises (See details in Main Report recommendations)</b></p> <p>7. Clarify the approach to and accountability for joint analysis of the root causes of food security</p>	<p>7. Within the new Single Country Assessment methodology that will shortly be tested by EEAS together with other services, food sector analyses will have a prominent role. Existing analyses will be used. Starting point should be a joint context analysis of all actors, including the political sections of Delegations and Member States on the ground.</p> <p>Through the CRPs (country resilience plans) developed in the Horn of Africa under SHARE and</p>	<p>The Single Country Assessment methodology is not being proposed in the end as a fixed methodology.</p> <p>What remains valid is the need to include sector analyses such a food and nutrition security ones in EU nexus joint analysis. This was demonstrated in five of the six nexus pilot countries.</p> <p>The need to integrate cross-sectoral</p>

<p>8. Establish a requirement to prepare a Joint Humanitarian Development Framework (JHDF)</p> <p>9. Establish clear and transparent linkages between these analytical processes and the EU country strategies</p>	<p>the PRPs (priority resilience pays) in the Sahel under AGIR, there already exists both an analysis of the root causes of food insecurity in the concerned countries and a resilience plan making host government and development partners more accountable on their responses to food crises. In addition, plans such as the one proposed for the Sahel by President Macron and Chancellor Merkel (Alliance pour le Sahel) have clear milestones and will be reported upon by the MS and the European Commission.</p> <p>8. In line with the latest communications of the EU, the requirement is now to go <i>beyond</i> the sole JHDF, to introducing on-going and regularly updated processes to analyse, plan, programme, respond and monitor according the humanitarian-development nexus and also to include issues linked to peace, security and migration when appropriate. Six pilot countries are being tested and will provide lessons to be used at wider level.</p> <p>9. Analytical processes such as those leading to PRPs or CRPs have been conducted with the participation of all EU services at country level and are supported by EU funds (geographic or thematic) in a number of countries. Through the Global Report on Food Insecurity and the Global Network, initiatives such as AGIR, the close strategic collaboration between DEVCO and FAO and others, this will be reinforced firstly in the second tranches of the current NIP and further developed under the next multiannual framework 2021-2028.</p>	<p>assessments is a key recommendation for the nexus pilot process.</p>
--	--	---

<p><b>R.3 Strengthen the monitoring, evaluation and learning of the EU contribution to building resilience to food crises</b></p> <p>10. DEVCO, ECHO and EEAS should develop indicators and frameworks to monitor the process and outcomes of building resilience to food crises:</p> <p>11. DEVCO, ECHO and EEAS should develop and implement a common (inter-service) learning strategy on building resilience to food crises</p> <p>12. DEVCO should consider supporting research to establish the comparative effectiveness of different sectoral investments in resilience to food crises, including safety nets and social protection</p>	<p>10. See point 1: A typology of crisis and responses has not been developed by the present evaluation and is being elaborated by DEVCO C1 using inter alia the Global Report. This will allow providing further guidance to EU services.</p> <p>A range of tools already exist for measuring impacts of EU action as well as the building of resilience to food crisis: the global report, the Integrated Phase Classification (IPC), Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis (RIMA) are some example of what is already being developed by DEVCO and its partners; they are intensely used to monitor crisis, design responses and are continuously refined and expanded; both at HQs and country levels.</p> <p>The development of results accountability frameworks should in principle form part of any Action Plan of current nexus pilot countries.</p> <p>11. This is an ongoing process and it was expected from this evaluation that directions are provided to the EU services. Additional work therefore needs to be done for putting together a mapping allowing the analysis of both crisis and responses.</p> <p>12. See point 11. Under the aegis of DEVCO and in collaboration with ECHO and NEAR, a guidance package on "Providing social protection across the humanitarian-development nexus" is being developed. It includes peer support, expert support, trainings and a resource package.</p>	<p>In relation to monitoring, evaluation and learning, the Global Report on food crisis is now well up and running and provide a worldwide analysis of the crisis which can be complemented on regular and ad hoc basis all year round.</p> <p>The typology is still being fine-tuned under the Global Report.</p> <p>The reference document # 26, "Social Protection across the Humanitarian-development Nexus" has been finalised in February 2019. It is being disseminated to ECHO field offices, EUDs and partners' offices, and should support stakeholders in ensuring that vulnerable populations and regions are more resilient to food crisis.</p>
---	--	--

**R.4 Improve inter-donor co-ordination, with specific attention to co-ordination between Member States, in building resilience to food crises**

13. Member States should develop a co-ordinated approach to covering the priority sectors of intervention necessary to build resilience to food crises within the framework of the joint programming process. This co-ordination process should consider how best the expertise and resources across the EU can be integrated to provide a comprehensive multi-sector approach.

13. The implementation of the 2017 Joint Communication on resilience and the Council Conclusions on Operationalising the Humanitarian/Development nexus shall allow the EU and its member states to coordinate more efficiently their analysis and their response according to each partner's comparative advantage.