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1. Introduction

1. The FAO’s Reviewed Strategic Framework 2010-19, approved at the 38th Session of the FAO Conference in June 2013, outlined five new Strategic Objectives representing the areas of work on which FAO will focus its efforts in support of Member Nations, as follows:

- Contribute to the eradication of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition (SO1)
- Increase and improve provision of goods and services from agriculture, forestry and fisheries in a sustainable manner (SO2)
- Reduce rural poverty (SO3)
- Enable more inclusive and efficient agricultural and food systems at local, national and international levels (SO2)
- Increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises (SO5)

2. At its 116th session (November 2014\(^1\)), the FAO Programme Committee endorsed the Indicative Rolling Work Plan of Strategic and Programme Evaluation 2015-17\(^2\), which proposed to present, in each Programme Committee session, one thematic evaluation related to the Organization’s Strategic Objectives. The Strategic Objective 2 is the fifth SO to be evaluated, following completed evaluations of the SO5 (2016), SO3 (2017), SO4 (2017) and ongoing evaluations of SO1 and SO2.

3. The Office of Evaluation of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) will conduct an evaluation of FAO’s Strategic Objective 2 (SO2): Make Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries More Productive and Sustainable\(^3\) in 2018.

1.1 The logic and focus of SO2 Objective and Programme

The SO2 vision and underpinning concept of sustainability

4. Sustainable development has been defined by FAO as “the management and conservation of the natural resource base, and the orientation of technological and institutional change in such a manner as to ensure the attainment and continued satisfaction of human needs for present and future generations. Such sustainable development (in the agriculture, forestry and fisheries sectors) conserves land, water, plant and animal genetic resources, is environmentally non-degrading, technically appropriate, economically viable and socially acceptable”. (FAO Council, 1989). The concept of sustainability is fully embraced in the FAO vision and the reviewed FAO Strategic Framework which recognize the urgency of transforming agriculture and food systems in a way that would meet unprecedented demand for food from rapidly increasing global population, while providing adequate livelihoods and addressing the challenges of scarce natural resources and negative impacts from climate change.

5. Within the new Strategic Framework emerging in 2013, Strategic Objective 2 (SO2) aimed at: “Increasing and improving provision of goods and services from agriculture, forestry and fisheries in a sustainable manner”. Implementation of this Objective seeks to pursue a holistic approach across sectors by promoting sustainable development practices, policies, viable governance arrangements, and evidence-based decision-making by both producers and

---

\(^1\) CL 150/5 - Report of the 116th Session of the Programme Committee, November 2014.

\(^2\) PC 116/5 - Indicative Rolling Work Plan of Strategic and Programme Evaluation 2015-17, November 2014.

\(^3\) http://www.fao.org/about/what-we-do/so2/en/
natural resource managers. The concepts of environmental, economic and social sustainability are thus pivotal to this strategic objective. Sustainable development has been defined by FAO as “the management and conservation of the natural resource base, and the orientation of technological and institutional change in such a manner as to ensure the attainment and continued satisfaction of human needs for present and future generations. Such sustainable development (in the agriculture, forestry and fisheries sectors) conserves land, water, plant and animal genetic resources, is environmentally non-degrading, technically appropriate, economically viable and socially acceptable.”

6. More recently, in 2014, the FAO built on these broad principles embodied in this definition of sustainable agriculture, to describe a vision for sustainable food and agriculture. Recognizing the current “unprecedented confluence of pressures” including poverty and hunger, inadequate diets, land and water scarcity, loss of biodiversity and the effects of climate change, the FAO described a vision based on five principles applicable across five sectors: crops, livestock, forestry, aquaculture and fisheries. This approach, developed under the Strategic Programme 2, identifies five guiding principles for sustainable food and agriculture (SFA), which balance the social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainability; and emphasize the need for multi-disciplinary actions and cross-sectoral integration:

   ❖ Improving efficiency in the use of resources is crucial to sustainable agriculture;
   ❖ Sustainability requires direct action to conserve, protect and enhance natural resources;
   ❖ Agriculture that fails to protect and improve rural livelihoods, equity and social wellbeing is unsustainable;
   ❖ Enhanced resilience of people, communities and ecosystems is key to sustainable agriculture;
   ❖ Sustainable food and agriculture requires responsible and effective governance mechanisms.

7. These principles have been endorsed in 2016 by the Committee on Agriculture (COAG), and in 2017 by the Sub-Committee on Aquaculture. These were recommended by the Committee on Forestry (COFO) to support the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. The Sustainable Development Goal 2 (SDG 2) in particular, explicitly aims at ending hunger, achieving food security and improved nutrition, and promoting sustainable agriculture, simultaneously by 2030. In addition, SO2 contributes to the SDGs indicators 6, 13, 14 and 15. FAO’s Strategic Framework identifies a clear ‘results chain’ model which links Strategic objectives and associated outcomes and outputs to the Global Goals of Members.

1.2 SO2 Theory of change

8. The theory underpinning the SO2 program suggests that the advisory and policy support, technical capacities and evidence-based knowledge channelled through FAO interventions, will ultimately promote integration of the concept of sustainable food and agriculture and related principles into the policies, strategies and practices by FAO Member States.

---

9. This development change would be supported, on the one hand, by design, formulation of *sustainability strategies and policies* to be implemented through inclusive *governance* processes that involve key stakeholders at all levels of decision-making.

10. Consequently, these strategies and policies will guide and inform the *sustainable practices and approaches* implemented by key stakeholders (government at national and local level, rural communities, farmers and farmers’ associations, etc.) towards establishing and effectively managing sustainable food and agriculture systems, which would support increased production while effectively conserving, restoring or protecting the natural resource base, ensuring the needs of future generations are not compromised and addressing key climate change challenges.

11. These activities would also be supported by establishing key elements of *enabling policy environment*, including required institutional and legal frameworks, governance arrangements and practices, infrastructure, markets, fiscal systems and incentives, etc.

12. Concurrently, relevant *data collection, analysis and knowledge products* will support *evidence-based decisions* in sustainable management of the agriculture and natural resources.

13. Based on this proposal, In the Medium Term Plan 2014-2017 FAO articulated its role towards achieving four outcomes, and twelve outputs (as represented in Appendix 3 to this document):

- **Outcome 1**: producers and natural resource managers adopt practices that increase and improve the provision of goods and services in agricultural sector production systems in a sustainable manner.

- **Outcome 2**: stakeholders in member countries strengthen governance – the policies, laws, management frameworks and institutions that are needed to support producers and resource managers – in the process towards greater sustainability of agricultural sector production systems.

- **Outcome 3**: stakeholders develop, adopt and implement international governance mechanisms and related instruments (standards, guidelines, recommendations etc.) needed to improve and increase provision of goods and services in agricultural sector production systems in a sustainable manner.

- **Outcome 4**: stakeholders make evidence-based decisions in the planning and management of the agricultural sectors and natural resources to support the transition to sustainable agricultural sector production systems through monitoring, statistics, assessment and analyses.
1.3 Implementation arrangements

14. The arrangements for the implementation of the Strategic Framework were first established for the 2014-15 biennium and evolved in subsequent years, with adjustments of the delivery and monitoring processes based on emerging needs and lessons learned.

Roles

15. Work planning and resource allocation is done on a biennial basis by the Strategic Programme 2 (SP2) management team, together with technical divisions and the Office of Strategy, Planning, and Resource Management (OSP). Strategic Objective Action Plans (SOAP) initially guided the SP2 work; from 2016 these were replaced with Service Level Agreements (SLA), to more strongly link FAO's technical work to the strategic framework. SLAs link products and services of each technical division and regional office to corporate outcomes and outputs.

Responsibilities

16. The SPL is responsible for the overall implementation and delivery of work under the SP. The Strategic Programme Leader also monitors the achievements against this work plan and reports on the output indicators annually. Internally the SPL monitors the expenditure and
achievements quarterly. The overall governance of the Strategic Framework is under the Corporate Programmes Management Board (CPMB), which provides strategic direction, coordination and review of programme delivery with specific emphasis on SO Action Plans. The CPMB, which meets at least monthly, is headed by the Director-General (DG), and its standing members are: Deputy-Director General-Operations, Deputy-Director General-Natural Resources, all Assistant Director-Generals, SPLs and the Director, OSP. The functions and structure of the CPMB will be adjusted as of 2018 as described in the PWB 2018-19.

17. The overall management of each Strategic Programme and its work is led by the SPL who is assisted by a small management team. Implementation follows a new matrix approach of SO teams and technical divisional units and decentralized offices working together. A substantial part of the time of most staff in technical departments and in decentralised offices is assigned to the SLAs. Contributions of each staff to SOs are agreed between SPLs and the technical departments or decentralized offices. The SPL is the budget holder for the Regular Budget resources assigned to SO Work Plans, and jointly monitors the performance of assigned staff with the ADGs of the technical department or decentralized office hosting the staff.

1.4 Delivery mechanisms

18. The delivery of intended results corresponding to the SO2 logic described above is organized through delivery mechanisms, which include country programmes, Major Areas of Work, Regional Initiatives and corporate technical activities (CTAs). These delivery mechanisms are managed by multidisciplinary “delivery teams”, comprising staff from across FAO, who are assigned the roles of focal points and/or delivery managers.

Major Areas of Work

19. In terms of delivery mechanisms, the SO is further organized through four Major Areas of Work that focus on channeling relevant expertise, knowledge and technical services to the country offices:

- **Climate-Smart Agriculture (CSA):** Combining action to increase agricultural productivity and incomes with adaptation to climate change and reduce, when possible, greenhouse gas emissions from the agricultural sectors. CSA approaches have been developed and/or are being implemented by FAO and its partners, including, amongst others, Save and Grow, Sustainable Livestock Development, Responsible Fisheries, Sustainable Land Management, FAO-Adapt, and going beyond Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+).

- **The Blue Growth Initiative (BGI):** Supporting food security, poverty alleviation and sustainable management of aquatic resources. It aims to restore the potential of the oceans and wetlands by introducing new responsible and sustainable approaches to reconcile economic growth and food security with conservation of the aquatic resources, and create an enabling environment for people employed in fisheries and aquaculture to act not only as resource users but also as resource stewards.

- **Doing More with Less - Sustainable Intensification of Agriculture:** Increasing agricultural productivity and supporting people making the most of water, soil, energy and other resources through sustainable forestry, fisheries, aquaculture, crop and livestock practices. Supports stakeholders and enhances capacities, from community to policy level, to implement and promote more efficient and locally
adapted production systems: doing more with less. It includes programmes such as Wood Energy and Energy-Food-Water Nexus approach.

- **Ecosystem Services and Biodiversity for Food and Agriculture:** Supporting and enhancing the provision of ecosystem services in production landscapes (agriculture/livestock, fisheries, aquaculture, forestry and wildlands). Supports the management and enabling environments for production systems in agriculture, fisheries and forestry to generate not just goods (e.g. food and timber), but also a diversity of benefits such as nutrient cycling in soils, natural pest control, water quality, cultural values and biodiversity conservation. This area of work includes a number of specific initiatives, among others, on Payments and Incentives for Ecosystem Services, the Global Soil Partnership, the Forest and Landscape Restoration Mechanism, the Watershed Management Umbrella Programme and the Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems initiative.

20. These major areas of work were introduced as key delivery mechanisms from the inception of SO2 related programmes. It is important to note that while other SOs have gradually phased out these mechanisms, the SO2 continued to fund the MAWs up until the end of 2017.

**Corporate Technical Activities (CTAs)**

21. A number of initiatives of a distinct normative nature are attached to SP2 and aim to facilitate adoption and implementation of international instruments and governance mechanisms. These areas of work that are managed directly under the responsibility of specific organizational units. Resources for carrying out these activities are allocated directly to the technical unit concerned rather than by the SP2. CTAs include high visibility products (e.g. statistics, flagship publications), partnerships (e.g. the FAO Investment Centre) and statutory bodies (e.g. regional conferences).

22. Some of the Corporate Technical Activities, which relate to implementation of specific conventions and treaties, have their own institutional structures, resources and reporting mechanisms. For example, FAO jointly with UNEP maintains a Secretariat, which supports implementation of Rotterdam convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, the Stockholm convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal. This work is conducted in conjunction with coordination mechanism for enhancing cooperation and coordination among the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions, a so called "synergies decisions". By paragraph 2 of section IV of decisions BC-IX/10, RC-4/11 and SC-4/34 on, the respective conferences of the parties to the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions invited the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), in consultation with the Director General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), to establish joint management involving the Executive Secretaries of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions for joint services and joint activities through, for example, a system of rotating management or the assignment of individual joint services to a particular convention.
23. There are four major international agreements that regulate obsolete pesticides: the 2001 Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), the 1989 Basel Convention on the Control of Trans-boundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, the 1979 UNECE Convention on Long-Range Trans-boundary Air Pollution (the 1998 Protocol on POPs) and the 1998 Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals. There is also an International Code of Conduct on Pesticide Management - a voluntary instrument but constitutes one of the most important reference frameworks for appropriate use of pesticides. The Code was developed by FAO and the WHO in close consultation with UNEP, the pesticide industry and civil society organizations. It has been adopted by FAO member countries and leading associations in the pesticide industry. The Code provides guidance on the use of pesticides throughout their life cycle and promotes integrated pest management practices. As such, it serves as a key reference for any initiative aimed at pesticide risk reduction.

24. For countries outside the European Union, assistance in maintaining inventories and cleaning up obsolete pesticides has been granted through the PHARE programme (for South-East Europe). Additional tools for clean-up could be created in the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP), but assistance on obsolete pesticides is conditional of their being explicitly included as a priority in the bilateral agreement between the EU and each partner. There are technical plant protection officers in each of the 6 FAO regional and sub-regional offices who provide support to countries in implementing the conventions, reporting on the progress in the implementation of the national action plans, and promoting the ratification of conventions when working with non-Parties within their regions and sub-regions.

Regional Initiatives

25. The Regional Initiatives represent another type of delivery mechanisms, which aim at addressing a main theme of the SO and a related key regional priority. Regional Initiatives are delivery mechanisms that address a main theme of the Strategic Objective and a related key regional priority, by clustering the delivery of planned products and services (from within or across SOs) in a limited number of focus countries to achieve demonstrable impact in a time bound manner. By delivering planned products and services of SOs, Regional Initiatives

---

5 The Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants is a global treaty to protect human health and the environment from chemicals that remain intact in the environment for long periods. Ratified by 152 countries and entered into force in 2004, the Stockholm Convention bans the production and use of a selected number of POPs, enforcing strict import restrictions, and promoting development of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) to achieve the objectives of the Convention.

6 The Basel Convention, which regards all POPs’ wastes as hazardous waste, aims to protect human health and the environment against the adverse effects resulting from the generation, management, trans-boundary movements and disposal of hazardous and other wastes.

7 The UNECE Protocol on POPs has a somewhat different focus. It covers a list of 16 substances comprising 11 pesticides, 2 industrial chemicals and 3 by-products from the production of chemicals. The objective of the Protocol is to eliminate any discharges, emissions and losses of POP substances.

8 Rotterdam convention promotes cooperation among Parties in international trade of certain hazardous chemicals. This consists mainly of exchanging information on chemicals among Parties. It covers pesticides and industrial chemicals that have been banned or severely restricted for health or environmental reasons by Parties. There are currently 39 chemicals listed in the Convention, including 24 pesticides, 4 severely hazardous pesticide formulations and 11 industrial chemicals.
make a direct contribution to one or more corporate Outputs (of one or more SOs) as measured by the Output indicators of the FAO results framework.

26. Regional Initiatives were, in most cases, formulated in response to the requests of the FAO Regional Conferences, with subsequent identification of related programme interventions and discussion with FAO sub-regional and country offices to ensure relevance to CPFs. Resources for the RI are planned and allocated jointly by the Regional Representatives and the Strategic Objective Coordinator from the resources at their disposal (Regular Programme and extra-budgetary). The resources available to accelerate and ensure delivery are: the annual Regular Programme allotments provided to all decentralized and headquarters offices; TCP Projects; voluntary contributions in on-going projects and arising from new resources mobilized.

27. SP2 provides overall strategic oversight, support and technical guidance towards implementation of the Regional initiatives, as well as support in resource mobilization and development of strategic partnerships. SP2 also ensures that relevant support and technical assistance is available from the relevant technical divisions. Currently, SO2 has regional initiatives in Africa, the Near East and North Africa and Asia and the Pacific regions:

- Sustainable Production Intensification and Value Chain Development in Africa
- Asia and the Pacific's Regional Rice Initiative
- Asia and the Pacific's Blue Growth Initiative
- Near East and North Africa's Water Scarcity Initiative

28. While there is no distinct SO2 regional initiative designed for the Europe and Central Asia regions, there is an SO3-led regional initiative, which contributes to SP2 by focusing on sustainable management of natural resources. This RI aims at empowering smallholder and family farms.

Country programmes

29. At the national level, CPFs are the key programming frameworks, which is an agreement between the government and FAO defining where FAO should focus its activities over a period of four to five years. Most CPF which predate the reviewed Strategic Framework, were later aligned to specific strategic results (outcomes and outputs). The contributions to the achievement of these Outcomes are delivered through projects and services, which are linked to either CPF, Regional Initiative or MAW. These projects and services could be part of specific corporate Initiatives, which address thematic FAO priorities at global, regional and country level, or constitute a part of functional Corporate Technical Activities (e.g. regional conference, global knowledge products, etc.)

2. Evaluation objectives and key questions

2.1 Objectives of the Evaluation

30. The main purpose of this evaluation is to provide FAO management and governing bodies with an objective assessment of the progress made by FAO towards its Strategic Objective 2. Namely, the evaluation intends to examine the extent to which and how FAO’s work has contributed to promoting sustainable and more productive approaches to agriculture, forestry and fisheries. It will seek to provide evidence-based analysis of recent and current approaches’, which will more specifically include examining the appropriateness of design
and strategies underpinning FAO’s work pertaining to SO2; actual and emerging achievements with regard to immediate objectives set for FAO under SO2, and related factors influencing those achievements.

31. Ultimately, the evaluation will aim at shedding light on good practices identified and understanding the rationale for challenges encountered; and will formulate strategic recommendations on FAO’s strategic directions and future work in relation to sustainable agriculture. Hence, the evaluation is conceived as a formative exercise, while it will also serve as a vehicle for accountability to FAO’s Governing Bodies and member countries.

2.2 Scope of evaluation

32. The period covered by the evaluation is 2014-2017, i.e. the period since the adoption of the new strategic framework. The evaluation scope will encompass all FAO interventions that were intended to contribute to SO2 results at the global, regional, and national levels, including in particular FAO’s work undertaken under the Regional Initiatives; MAWs; the CTAs, and country-level work, as well as partnership contracted in the context of SO2.

2.3 Evaluation questions

33. The evaluation will aim to address the main questions presented below. The evaluation team may modify them during initial meetings.

I. Strategic relevance FAO’s positioning with SO2

1. Relevance to current or upcoming global challenges and strategic positioning

1.1 Does SO2 adequately position FAO to address the challenges and opportunities facing FAO member countries today and in the future, related to climate change, sustainable Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries practices, and management of natural resource?

2. Comparative advantage and value added

2.1 What are FAO’s areas of comparative advantage/added value relative to other organizations that strive for sustainable agriculture, forestry and fisheries and the conservation of natural resources and climate change?

3. SO2 conceptual clarity and design appropriateness

3.1 Is FAO’s role under its SO2 clearly defined?

3.2 Have evolutions of the SP2 function or structures over time supported increased clarity and design appropriateness?

3.3 To what extent has SP2 been leveraging areas of convergence and creating linkages with other SOs in defining its work programme, to optimize its deliverables in relation to other SOs, and to minimize negative externalities?

3.4 To what extent has the SP2 design integrated the cross-cutting themes relevant to its mission; i.e. climate change, gender, nutrition, governance?

I. Effectiveness and contribution to results

4. Progress towards intermediary results

4.1 What intermediary results has FAO reached through its work under SP2 under the four outcome areas?

5. Integration of Cross cutting themes
5.1 What is the progress towards results in mainstreaming FAO’s cross cutting issues (gender, nutrition, governance and climate change) in SP2?

6. Effectiveness of partnerships

6.1 To what extent have external partnerships contributed to SO2 results?

II. Efficiency of implementation modalities and approaches

7. Implementation modalities

7.1 To what extent has the M&E system supported the effectiveness of the SP2?

7.2 How effectively has SO2 been communicated in-house? Considering the specific need for SO2 to break down old territorial habits, has there been enough efforts to promote sharing and thinking of activities in a more integrated manner?

8. Performance of SP2 delivery mechanisms

8.1 To what extent has the existence of Corporate Technical Activities supported FAO’s work towards its outcomes?

8.2 To what extent has the existence of Regional Initiatives supported FAO’s work towards its outcomes?

8.3 To what extent has the existence of MAWs supported FAO’s work towards its outcomes?

3. Methodology

3.1 Evaluation design

34. Addressing the key questions underpinning the evaluation will require breaking down each question into more detailed sets of questions. An Evaluation Matrix will be formulated in line with the Evaluation Questions, to elaborate on how each of the sub-questions will be addressed, specifying: the criteria and indicators to be used, possible benchmarks if available, data collection tools to be used and related sources of information, as well as any triangulation plan. The data and information that will be uncovered through the evaluation inquiry will build the evaluation evidence based, to form findings, from which conclusions and recommendations will derive as appropriate. The evaluation matrix will thus serve as a central tool guide the inquiry throughout the Evaluation.

35. The evaluation will seek to present the results of its inquiry and analysis with clear reference to evidence gathered and ensure findings, conclusions and recommendations logically derive from one another. The evaluation will generally seek to reach international norms and quality standards for evaluation, as defined by the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) and applied by the FAO Office of Evaluation (OED). In addition, independence and rigour of analysis will underpin the whole evaluation process: the team members will apply their own technical judgement in the assessment of the work.

36. The credibility of evaluation findings will also hinge on a constant effort to validate the evidence gathered through the systematic triangulation of information sources, founded on explicit endeavours to consult with various stakeholders, to ensure the assessment is based on a comprehensive understanding of diverse perspectives on issues, performance and outcomes.
37. Evaluating a complex and wide-ranging subject such as FAO’s contribution to sustainable agriculture calls for examining some of the various elements at play independently, as well as in relation to the whole. This will call for using a variety of methods, both qualitative and quantitative in nature and in relation to these, various data collection tools and sources.

38. The main building blocks of the evaluation design are presented in the following section.

3.2 Review of secondary data

39. The evaluation will attempt to take advantage of existing data as an initial source of information; and will thereby draw from FAO information systems; publications and reports availed by relevant FAO divisions, including evaluation reports; and from other relevant documentation sources. This will be useful to inform all evaluation questions.

40. In particular, the following desk–based data sourcing and analysis is envisaged:

1) **Mapping of the SP2 portfolio**, to provide a general overview of the SO2 coverage, and of the resources and the modalities of implementation attached to it;

2) **Mapping of data on results achieved** from monitoring and reporting systems at HQ, regional and country level (including Service Level Agreements and Office of Strategic Planning SO reporting);

3) **Country desk studies** to support understanding of achievements at country level for countries where sufficient secondary information may be available

4) **Synthesis of evaluation findings** relevant to SO2 for evaluations undertaken by OED (or others) between 2013 and 2016;

5) **Use of on-going evaluations** of relevance including Country Programme Evaluations;

6) **Desk review of significant projects** as preparation or in complement to country visits, to support understanding of achievements

7) **Case study of Regional Initiatives** as a delivery mechanism;

8) **Case studies of sample of Corporate Technical Activities (CTA)** including: FAO-facilitated conferences; technical committees (COFO, etc); international and regional fora, possibly selected based on the extent of financial investment of which they have been the subject, to contribute to the assessment of FAO’s role and contribution to global and regional debates in SO2-relevant areas of work;

9) **Case study on Major Areas or Work** as a mechanism, to understand the value they may have had within the SO2 scope, and the rationale for their dismantling;

10) **Case study of emerging Global Knowledge Products**, both in relation to their relevance and potential effectiveness, based on their initial set-up.

3.3 Primary data collection: interviews of FAO stakeholders, counterparts and partners

41. Based on the identified areas of inquiry that may not be adequately covered through the analysis of secondary data, the evaluation will need to collect primary data from stakeholders
who are directly involved or indirectly connected to SP2, and from relevant counterparts and partners of FAO’s work at national and international levels.

42. The evaluation will conduct **semi-structured interviews** to further refine the team’s understanding of the modalities of implementation of the programme and collect evidence of that may inform the evaluation findings on the programme’s strategic positioning, emerging results, and implementation dynamics. Interviews will be carried out through teleconferencing, when feasible and most appropriate; and face to face when possible.

43. Face-to-face interviews will take place at **FAO headquarters** and in a **sample of countries** where FAO has country, regional or sub-regional offices. The selection of countries visited for in depth data collection was guided by the necessity to cover a variety of sectors and delivery mechanisms encompassed by SP2, as well as a need for contextual diversity. Appendix 1 provides further details related to the selection of countries selected for visits.

44. The criteria for country visits selection included the following elements:

- Number of interventions linked to SP2 programme;
- The size of programme resources linked to SO2 in the country programme
- Representation of different SO2 focus areas (linkages to different outcomes/outputs)
- Presence of a specific SO2 related initiative (regional, global, international conventions work)
- Representation of the five regions covered by FAO work under SO2

45. The evaluation team’s visits to countries will be complemented by visits to some of the FAO **Regional or sub-regional bureaus**, when practical and appropriate. These visits will offer an opportunity to examine FAO programme implementation and collect views at the regional level.

3.4 **Quality assurance**

46. **Internal peer review from OED**: an OED Officer external to this evaluation will peer review the Evaluation and provide advice at different stages of the process including the present TOR and the Draft Evaluation Report.

47. **External peer review**: The quality of the evaluation, including the technical soundness of the evaluation preliminary findings will be submitted for examination by external and independent senior experts combining relevant regional and technical expertise and with ascertained credibility, and identified during the evaluation preparation phase. It would be required to offer an impartial technical judgement on the zero draft evaluation report of the team and provide recommendations for the report’s finalization. The external peer reviewers’ inputs would most likely be provided remotely, in the form of a synthetic note on the draft report, in their defined areas of work.

48. **Advisory Group**: a selection of FAO senior managers will also be requested to advise the evaluation team at key evaluation milestones, to support the evaluation’s relevance and utility. This will entail providing feedback on the evaluation approach, through comments on the draft Terms of Reference and on emerging findings presented to them.

49. **Conflict of interest**: The OED management has been very attentive to select independent experts that had no potential conflict of interests, looking in particular at any prior work they
may have undertaken with FAO of relevant nature. It should be noted that, considering the central role often played by FAO in relation to the topics at stake, most experts with relative seniority have somewhat had some contacts with the Organization. The OED management has selected the team based on a clear understanding that team members would be able to offer an independent view on the work, and will be attentive to assign responsibilities in a way that any prior collaboration of the experts with FAO does affect the team’s impartial judgement.

4. Management arrangements

4.1 Roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team

50. The evaluation will be undertaken by a team led by a senior evaluation officer of FAO assisted by several other evaluation officers, and supported by the technical contributions of several independent experts collectively covering the technical sectors that SP2 encompasses.

51. The OED team of evaluators will bear the responsibility for designing and organizing the evaluation, including defining the roles of technical experts and managing the team. OED evaluation officers will take part in the evaluation data collection and will lead the analysis and evaluation report drafting process, based on the contributions of team members, as agreed during the inception phase. The main responsibility for the report content will ultimately lie with the OED senior evaluation officer.

52. Independent experts will contribute to the evaluation from its inception phase, initially providing technical expert advice on the evaluation design, including on the evaluation data collection tools (interview guides). They will participate in the data collection phase by taking an active part in the interviews and some of the desk review work, as per assigned responsibilities during the preparatory and inception phases. All team members will not be travelling to all countries visited by the evaluation, and each will be expected to cover other areas of work for which she/he does not have the lead during missions when the lead expert is not part of the mission. Ultimately, experts will provide technical contributions to the overall analysis based on the evidence gathered, and offer written contributions on defined areas of inquiry, also assigned during the preparatory and inception phase. The division of labour between technical experts will only be possible once the team is identified.

53. The team selection has been guided by the intention of assembling experts with extensive and proven experience at international level, and familiar with development issues, programmes and policies related to sustainable agriculture and natural resources conservation. The team will collaboratively have solid understanding of the on-going debates and major issues relevant to the areas they will cover in the evaluation.

54. The main areas of work covered by SO2 has helped define the technical competences that the team should collectively cover/. Some technical areas, acknowledged as central to the comprehensive understanding of SO2, have led to the identification of “core” experts, who will be required to engage more deeply in the evaluation process than others. Technical areas covered by the team members, in addition to evaluation, include:

- Crop production and protection
- Natural resource conservation including climate change
• Forestry management
• Livestock production and health
• Fisheries management
• Governance
• Gender

55. In addition to above-mentioned areas, preference will be given to experts with experience in cross-sectoral work, agroecology, innovative policies and production practices, integrated agricultural production systems, landscape/territorial management and restoration, environmental economics, etc. Specific responsibilities of each technical expert will be defined in the individual job descriptions of each expert once the team is formed.

4.2 Stakeholder engagement

56. The evaluation team will ensure key stakeholders of SP2 are consulted at various key stages of the evaluation process, to make the most of their internal knowledge and understanding of the programme and offer them opportunities for ensuring the evaluation may provide the most valuable results to their work.

57. An Advisory Group formed of the FAO senior managers will also be consulted at the initial and intermediary stages of the evaluation. They will be requested to provide their guidance to the evaluation team about the evaluation focus and express suggestions to enhance the evaluation value to FAO.

4.3 Deliverables

58. The evaluation will produce the following main products, including some intermediary documents:

• ToRs and related evaluation tools;
• Short notes synthesizing key information drawn from meetings and team discussions at the end of the inception meeting;
• Overview of SP2 portfolio– 2014-2017;
• Evaluation briefs highlighting key SO2-related findings;
• Report on case study of major partnerships in support of SP2 areas of work;
• Report on case study of global CTAs;
• Report on case study of Regional Initiatives;
• Report on case study of MAWs;
• Report on case study of global GKPs;
• Country and RO/ SRO visit reports;
• Reports of institutional/ partners interviews;
• Technical papers as appropriate;
• Final Evaluation Report.

4.4 Evaluation timeline

59. The evaluation will be organized according to the following sequenced phases of work:

9 Some of the above products will be public documents once the evaluation is finalized.
60. **Preparation and organization of the evaluation.** During this phase, ending with the finalization of the present TOR, the evaluation management team will work on identifying and hiring the team members; organizing country visits in liaison with FAO country stakeholders; arranging labor distribution within the team; continuing the background research on SO2 and desk review work; developing and refining evaluation tools and developing reporting formats.

61. **Evaluation inception and main data collection.** The inquiry phase of the evaluation will start with an inception meeting whereby the team will gather in the FAO headquarters to get a common understanding of the evaluation subject, objectives and approach, and organize the data collection work. This will be followed immediately after by interviews of key stakeholders of SP2 in SPMT and TDs.

62. The inquiry phase following will comprise the main part of the data collection work. It will include desk reviews of specific areas of work, country and institutional visits and interviews of key informants. The evaluation team will separate into smaller teams who will be assigned to various visits and tasks, and report according to the templates provided.

63. **Analysis and validation.** Once the data collection will be done, the teams will gather again into one in FAO headquarters to undertake required follow-up meetings, seeking to validate some of the evidence gathered in the field of through the interviews; and start assembling the evidence together into evaluation findings, and emerging conclusions and recommendations.

64. **Preparation of report.** While the final report is ultimately the responsibility of the team leader, drafting the report will be a collaborative team endeavor. Each team member will therefore provide inputs to the overall report, as per the responsibilities they will have been assigned at early stages.

65. A more detailed **tentative timeline** is provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and organization of the evaluation</td>
<td>Final TOR, tools and reporting formats</td>
<td>Up to End January 2018:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of evaluators</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec 2017-January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Team hire</td>
<td></td>
<td>February 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation inception</td>
<td>Data collection tools: evaluation matrix, interview guides, analysis frameworks, reporting templates</td>
<td>February-March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main data collection, missions in countries and regions</td>
<td>Country reports, case studies, meta-evaluation</td>
<td>March-April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and validation</td>
<td>Draft findings and debriefing presentation</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up interviews and report writing</td>
<td>Draft evaluation report</td>
<td>June-July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders review and debriefing</td>
<td></td>
<td>End-July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalization of report</td>
<td>Evaluation report</td>
<td>July-August 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Appendices

Appendix 1. Country case study selection

(Note: In addition to country visits listed below, evaluation team will also visit Regional/Sub-regional Offices, based in Ghana, Chile, Egypt, Hungary and Thailand)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Main study scope</th>
<th>Field visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghana (RAF)</td>
<td>FAO regional office</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Country Portfolio</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Country portfolio</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Country portfolio</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Country portfolio</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand (RAP)</td>
<td>FAO regional office</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>Country portfolio</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Country portfolio</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Country portfolio</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary (REU)</td>
<td>FAO regional office</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
<td>Europe &amp; Central Asia</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile (RLC)</td>
<td>FAO regional office</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Country portfolio</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Country portfolio</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Country portfolio</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt (RNE)</td>
<td>FAO regional office &amp; use of prior Country Evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Country portfolio</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2. Evaluation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main question</th>
<th>Sub-Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Tools and Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Strategic positioning and relevance:</strong> Has FAO’s global positioning, policy influence and advocacy in areas related to SO2 objective been relevant to the needs of member states?</td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Correspondence between SO2 main objectives and key <strong>global</strong> priorities and opportunities identified since 2013</td>
<td>Desk Review: PWBs / MTPs incl. new MTP 2018-21 &amp; SO2TOC; Regional conferences proceedings; CPFs; GKPs; thematic publications (global scope), SSI/FGD: FAO CO, RO &amp; TDs staff; partners/IOs; NCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Relevance to current or upcoming global challenges and strategic positioning</td>
<td>1.1 Does SO2 adequately position FAO to address the challenges and opportunities facing FAO member countries today and in the future, related to climate change, sustainable Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries practices, and management of natural resource?</td>
<td>b. Correspondence between SO2 main objectives and key <strong>regional</strong> priorities and opportunities identified since 2013</td>
<td>Desk Review: PWBs / MTPs incl. new MTP 2018-21 &amp; SO2TOC; Regional conferences proceedings; CPFs; GKPs; thematic publications (global scope), SSI/FGD: FAO CO, RO &amp; TDs staff; partners/IOs; NCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Correspondence between SO2 main objectives and key <strong>country</strong> priorities and opportunities identified since 2013</td>
<td>Desk Review: PWBs / MTPs incl. new MTP 2018-21 &amp; SO2TOC; Regional conferences proceedings; CPFs; GKPs; thematic publications (global scope), SSI/FGD: FAO CO, RO &amp; TDs staff; partners/IOs; NCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. Demonstrated existence of appropriate <strong>mechanism(s)</strong> to feed assessed priorities into work panning (at each level)</td>
<td>Desk Review: PWBs / MTPs incl. new MTP 2018-21 &amp; SO2TOC; Regional conferences proceedings; CPFs; GKPs; thematic publications (global scope), SSI/FGD: FAO CO, RO &amp; TDs staff; partners/IOs; NCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Comparative Advantage</td>
<td>2.1 What are FAO’s areas of <strong>comparative advantage/</strong> added value relative to other organizations that strive for sustainable agriculture and the conservation of natural resources and climate change?</td>
<td>a. Perceptions by FAO of own areas of comparative advantage / gaps</td>
<td>Desk Review: PWBs / MTPs incl. new MTP 2018-21 &amp; SO2TOC; Regional conferences proceedings; CPFs; GKPs; thematic publications (global scope), SSI/FGD: FAO CO, RO &amp; TDs staff; partners/IOs; NCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Perceptions by FAO partners and counterparts of FAO’s areas of comparative advantage and gaps</td>
<td>Desk Review: PWBs / MTPs incl. new MTP 2018-21 &amp; SO2TOC; Regional conferences proceedings; CPFs; GKPs; thematic publications (global scope), SSI/FGD: FAO CO, RO &amp; TDs staff; partners/IOs; NCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SO2 conceptual clarity and design appropriateness</td>
<td>3.1 Is FAO’s role under its SO2 <strong>clearly defined</strong>?</td>
<td>a. Understanding of SO2 TOC by FAO staff and external stakeholders</td>
<td>Desk Review: PWBs / MTPs incl. new MTP 2018-21 &amp; SO2TOC; Regional conferences proceedings; CPFs; GKPs; thematic publications (global scope), SSI/FGD: FAO CO, RO &amp; TDs staff; partners/IOs; NCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Existence of documents clarifying SO2 mission/TOC</td>
<td>Desk Review: PWBs / MTPs incl. new MTP 2018-21 &amp; SO2TOC; Regional conferences proceedings; CPFs; GKPs; thematic publications (global scope), SSI/FGD: FAO CO, RO &amp; TDs staff; partners/IOs; NCs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicators:**
- a. Correspondence between SO2 main objectives and key **global** priorities and opportunities identified since 2013
- b. Correspondence between SO2 main objectives and key **regional** priorities and opportunities identified since 2013
- c. Correspondence between SO2 main objectives and key **country** priorities and opportunities identified since 2013
- d. Demonstrated existence of appropriate **mechanism(s)** to feed assessed priorities into work panning (at each level)
- a. Perceptions by FAO of own areas of comparative advantage / gaps
- b. Perceptions by FAO partners and counterparts of FAO’s areas of comparative advantage and gaps
- a. Understanding of SO2 TOC by FAO staff and external stakeholders
- b. Existence of documents clarifying SO2 mission/TOC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main question</th>
<th>Sub-Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Tools and Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Have evolutions of the SP2 function or structures over time supported increased clarity and design appropriateness?</td>
<td>a. Evidence of roles definition changes over time since 2013</td>
<td>Doc review: PWB/ MTPs until 2018; 2013 SF and other SO2 defining documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Perception by FAO staff on evolving clarity of respective roles</td>
<td>SSI / FGD: FAO SPLs; CO; RO; TDs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 To what extent has SP2 been leveraging areas of convergence and creating linkages with other SOs in defining its work programme, to optimize its deliverables in relation to other SOs, and to minimize negative externalities?</td>
<td>a. Perception of SO cross-fertilization / missed opportunities by FAO staff</td>
<td>SSI / FGD: FAO SPLs; FAO management and staff in HQ, RO, CO;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Examples of SO cross-fertilization in field programmes (CO and RO level), e.g. joint SPL missions</td>
<td>Case studies of CO programmes; Project evaluations, Doc review: evaluation synthesis, SSI: FAO TDs/ SP2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Processes in existence to promote SO linkages</td>
<td>Doc review: SOPs/tools for SP programme planning, implementation, reporting; SFA principles (on concept), SSI / FGD: FAO SP2, TDs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 To what extent has the SP2 design integrated the cross-cutting themes relevant to its mission; i.e. climate change, gender, nutrition, governance?</td>
<td>a. Extent of integration / missed opportunities as perceived by FAO staff</td>
<td>SSI / FGD: FAO SPLs; FAO management in HQ, RO, CO;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Examples of integration as per project documents, PIRES data, and evaluations</td>
<td>Doc review: project documents; evaluations synthesis, CO programmes, Case studies: Project evaluations,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Effectiveness and contribution to results. To what extent have the SP2 interventions, approaches, strategies and conceptual frameworks been effective in contributing to the achievement of strategic results?

4. Progress towards intermediary results

<p>| What progress can be measured toward intermediary results that FAO has contributed to so far through its work under SP2 under the four outcome areas?? | Demonstrated achievement against each intermediary result proposed by the evaluation (cf. adapted ToC) in relation to: a. Practices, policies and governance at national level (Outcome# 1&amp;2) | Desk Review: actual vs planed outputs and subsequent results. (Each TM to develop individual matrices with key questions under a/b/c/ related to effectiveness in their areas of work); |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main question</th>
<th>Sub-Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Tools and Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>b.</strong> Global initiatives’ impact in countries; FAO’s perceived influence on global agenda through convening role and communication strategies (Outcome #3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Desk Review: evaluation synthesis; corporate outcome reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c.</strong> FAO’s perceived contribution to global knowledge (Outcome #4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Case studies of CO programmes; Project evaluations, CTAs, RiS, MAWs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Cross cutting themes</strong></td>
<td>What is the progress towards results in mainstreaming FAO’s cross cutting issues (gender, nutrition, governance and climate change) in SP2?</td>
<td>a. Cases of SP2 contribution to gender-related objectives [+ add possible indicators from TORs/indicators used by other SP evaluations re gender]</td>
<td>Desk reviews: evaluation synthesis, CPFs review; Country Gender Assessments and Regional Gender Assessments; OSP database analysis; Review of a sample of projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Extent of integration of nutrition, governance and climate change in SP2</td>
<td>SSI: FAO Gender teams (HQ, Regional and Country Gender, Nutrition FP). [See other SP Eval tools]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Effectiveness of partnerships</strong></td>
<td>To what extent have external partnerships contributed to SO2 results?</td>
<td>a. key partners and main types of partnerships (mapping ) incl. importance of partnerships in various areas of work</td>
<td>SSI / FGD: FAO SP2; HQ TDs management and staff; CO; RO IOs / partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Reported appreciation of FAO collaboration by partners / gaps / weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. (Reported ) evidence of partnerships engaging the private sector</td>
<td>SSI / FGD: FAO SP2; HQ TDs management and staff; CO; RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. (Reported) evidence of missed opportunities in partnering with the private sector</td>
<td>SSI / FGD: CO SP2; IOs / partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main question</td>
<td>Sub-Questions</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Tools and Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. (Reported) evidence of FAO promoting partnerships with the private sector to national counterparts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Implementation modalities and efficiency: How efficient and appropriate were the approaches, strategies and implementation modalities utilised by the SP2 interventions?

7. Implementation modalities

7.1 To what extent has the M&E system supported the effectiveness of the SP2?

a. Identification and reported performance of M&E system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools and Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doc review: relevant SOP/ M&amp;E system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSI / FGD: FAO SP2; HQ TDs management and staff; CO; RO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 How effectively has SO2 been communicated in-house? Considering the specific need for SO2 to break down old territorial habits, has there been enough efforts to promote sharing and thinking of activities in a more integrated manner?

a. Perception of FAO staff in CO/ RO on SO2 approach clarification
b. Evidence of communication initiatives to rollout SO2 messages / approach (SFA..)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools and Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSI/FGD: FAO SP2; HQ TDs management and staff; CO; RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc review: communications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Performance of SP2 delivery mechanisms

8.1 To what extent has the existence of Corporate Technical Activities supported FAO’s work towards its outcomes?

a. Contribution of CTAs as a delivery mechanisms to the SO2 agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools and Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case study on CTAs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2 To what extent has the existence of Regional Initiatives supported FAO’s work towards its outcomes?

a. Contribution of RIs as a delivery mechanisms to the SO2 agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools and Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case study on RIs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3 To what extent has the existence of MAWs supported FAO’s work towards its outcomes? (Case study on principle, role, process of introduction, utility, weakness that led to cancelling MAWs)

a. Performance of MAWs as a delivery mechanism against SO2 agenda
b. Analysis of MAWs management and weakness that led to cancelling them (probe: was is mainly related to the process whereby they were introduced?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools and Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case study on MAWs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3. SO2 results framework

## Indicators (and source) of achieving Objective

### Production and productivity
- Crops net per capita production index number (2004-2006 = 100), including fibre; Livestock net per capita production index number, including wool (2004-2006 = 100); Fish production per capita (tonne/cap) (both capture and aquaculture); Roundwood production per capita (m3/cap); Agriculture value added per worker (constant 2,000 USD); Total factor productivity (TFP) growth in agriculture has remained stable or increased, since the last reporting period (source of all above: FAOSTAT); Area with improved agricultural productivity and crop suitability in agriculture (Source: Global AgroEcological Zones – GAEZ)

### Environment
- Area of moderately and severely degraded land, as share (%) of total agricultural land and forest cover (source: FAO Global Land Degradation Information System [GLADIS/LADA]); Soil nutrient balances (source: FAOSTAT); Percentage of fish stocks in safe biological limits (source: FAO); Forest area p.a. growth (percentage) (source: FAOSTAT); Forest area primarily designated for provision of environmental and social services (source: FRA); GEF benefits index (GBI) for biodiversity (source: World Bank)

## OUTCOME 2.1: Producers and natural resource managers adopt practices that increase and improve agricultural sector production in a sustainable manner.

### Indicators of Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target (end 2015)</th>
<th>Target (end 2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.A</td>
<td>Number of countries reporting an increase in area under Sustainable Land Management (SLM), as a share (%) of total agricultural and forest area, since the last reporting period.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.B</td>
<td>Number of countries where the crop yield gap has decreased since the last reporting period.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.C</td>
<td>Number of countries where the human-edible protein balance in livestock production (output/input ratio) increased or remained stable, since the last reporting period.</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.D</td>
<td>Number of countries with an increase in area of forests under Forest Management Plans, as share (%) of total forest area, since the last reporting period.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.E</td>
<td>Number of countries that have improved sustainable fisheries/aquaculture practices [as reported in the Code of Conduct of Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) questionnaire].</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.F</td>
<td>Number of countries where the area of natural vegetation and protected ecosystems lost to agricultural expansion has decreased since the last reporting period.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outputs

2.1.1 Innovative practices for sustainable agricultural production (including traditional practices that improve sustainability, such as those listed as Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems) are identified, assessed and disseminated and their adoption by stakeholders is facilitated.

2.1.2 Integrated and multi-sectoral approaches for ecosystems valuation, management and restoration are identified, assessed, disseminated and their adoption by stakeholders is facilitated.

2.1.3 Organizational and institutional capacities of public and private institutions, organizations and networks are strengthened to support innovation and the transition toward more sustainable agricultural production systems.
OUTCOME 2.2: Stakeholders in member countries strengthen governance – the policies, laws, management frameworks and institutions that are needed to support producers and resource managers – in the transition to sustainable agricultural sector production systems.

Indicators of Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target (end 2015)</th>
<th>Target (end 2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of countries with high-level strategic planning/policy documents that foster sustainable, agricultural production and natural resources management, measured by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- extent to which the main national development programme addresses agricultural sector production systems in an integrated and balanced way across the related sub-sectors or disciplines</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- extent to which the main national development programme promotes increased agricultural production in an environmentally sustainable and socially equitable manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- extent to which a specific national policy, plan or framework on gender equity, equality and/or mainstreaming exists and considers gender within agricultural production intensification strategies (i.e. crops, livestock, fisheries and aquaculture, forestry, other natural resources).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.A

- Number of countries with improved public service organizations and interorganizational mechanisms for the formulation and implementation of national policies, strategies and legislation that foster sustainable agricultural production and natural resources management, measured by:
  - extent to which political will and finances are adequate for increased agricultural production in a sustainable manner
  - extent to which adequate mechanisms exist at national level for coordination, management and monitoring of the implementation of national strategic plans, policies and laws related to sustainable, integrated and equitable agricultural sector production systems
  - extent to which national agricultural sector policies/strategies that were developed or revised during the last 2 years were done so in a transparent, participatory, and evidence-based manner

2.2.B

| Target (end 2015) | Target (end 2017) |

Outputs

2.2.1 Countries are supported to analyse governance issues and options for sustainable agricultural production and natural resources management.

2.2.2 Countries are supported to strengthen national governance frameworks that foster sustainable agricultural production and natural resources management.

2.2.3 Public service organizations and inter-organizational mechanisms are supported for the implementation of national policies, strategies and legislation that foster sustainable agricultural production and natural resources management.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2
INCREASE AND IMPROVE PROVISION OF GOODS AND SERVICES FROM AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY AND FISHERIES IN A SUSTAINABLE MANNER

OUTCOME 2.3: Stakeholders endorse/adopt international (including regional) instruments and support related governance mechanisms for sustainable agricultural production systems.

Indicators of Outcomes

| Target (end 2015) | Target (end 2017) |
Number of countries that have demonstrated a strong level of commitment/support to selected FAO international instruments, measured by:

- whether the country has issued a formal ratification, accession, acceptance, or signature of the FAO binding instruments
- whether the country has made any official declarations to endorse implementation of the FAO nonbinding instruments

### 2.3.A

Number of countries that demonstrate a strong level of support/commitment to selected FAO governance mechanisms, measured by:

- number of countries or contracting parties that met mandatory contributions of the mechanisms

### 2.3.B

Number of countries that have enhanced their national legal frameworks by integrating provisions of selected FAO international (binding and nonbinding) instruments.

### 2.3.C

**Outputs**

**2.3.1** Stakeholders are supported to participate in, update existing and develop new international (including regional) instruments and mechanisms under the auspices of FAO.

**2.3.2** Stakeholders are supported to enhance recognition and consideration of the agriculture sectors in international instruments, governance mechanisms, processes and partnerships that are relevant to FAO’s mandate, yet not under the auspices of FAO.

**2.3.3** Stakeholders are supported to facilitate implementation and application of international (including regional) instruments and the recommendations/requirements of related governance mechanisms.

### OUTCOME 2.4: Stakeholders make evidence-based decisions in the planning and management of the agricultural sectors and natural resources to support the transition to sustainable agricultural sector production systems through monitoring, statistics, assessment and analysis.

#### Indicators of Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Outcomes</th>
<th>Target (end 2015)</th>
<th>Target (end 2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of countries with improved response rates and/or quality of contributions to the global collection of data on agriculture and natural resources, during the reporting period, measured by:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- average response rates to a defined set of global data collection exercises on agriculture (crops, livestock, fisheries/aquaculture and forestry) and natural resources that were conducted during the reporting period (selected annual and data questionnaires issued by FAO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- average quality ratings for the data sets submitted as part of a defined set of global data collection exercises on agriculture (crops, livestock, fisheries/aquaculture and forestry) and natural resources that were conducted during the reporting period (selected annual data questionnaires issued by FAO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.4.A
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### Outputs

#### 2.4.1
Relevant data and information is assembled, aggregated, integrated and disseminated, and new data is generated through analyses and modelling, jointly with partners.

#### 2.4.2
Methodologies, norms, standards, definitions and other tools for the collection, management, aggregation and analysis of data are formulated and disseminated.

#### 2.4.3
Capacity development support is provided to institutions at national and regional levels to plan for and conduct data collection, analyses, application and dissemination.

| 2.4.C | Number of countries that use statistics moderately or extensively in policymaking processes pertaining to agriculture and natural resources management since the last reporting period, according to expert opinion. | 71 | 79 |