

2009

C 2009/4

Programme
Evaluation
Report



C 2009/4

November 2009

*Thirty-sixth Session
of the Conference*

18 - 23 November 2009

2009

Programme
Evaluation
Report

Food and Agriculture
Organization
of the United Nations
Rome, 2009

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

All rights reserved. Reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product for educational or other non-commercial purposes are authorized without any prior written permission from the copyright holders provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of material in this information product for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without written permission of the copyright holders. Applications for such permission should be addressed to the Chief, Publishing Management Service, Information Division, FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy or by e-mail to copyright@fao.org

© FAO 2009

Printed by the Internal Printing Unit, FAO

Table of Contents

	Pages
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: EVALUATION IN FAO	1
<i>Institutional and Governance Arrangements</i>	1
<i>Evaluation Processes and Methodologies</i>	1
<i>Evaluation of Extra-budgetary Work</i>	3
CHAPTER 3: UN SYSTEM COLLABORATION IN EVALUATION	4
CHAPTER 4: EVALUATION PROGRAMME OF THE ORGANIZATION	4
<i>The 2008-09 Programme of Completed Evaluations</i>	4
<i>Major Evaluations programmed for 2010-11</i>	6
CHAPTER 5: EVALUATION BRIEFS – MAJOR EVALUATIONS	6
ANNEX 1: EVALUATIONS OF EXTRA-BUDGETARY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND PROGRAMMES DURING 2008-09	

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1. The 2009 Programme Evaluation Report consists of four main sections:
 - a) new developments in evaluation – focusing on methods employed by FAO to improve stakeholder involvement; ensure consideration of evaluation recommendations; and to answer questions about the impact of FAO work at field level;
 - b) collaboration with the UN system on evaluation matters;
 - c) the evaluation programme of the Organization, which provides a listing of evaluation outputs over the 2008-09 biennium and the work plan of major evaluations for the forthcoming biennium; and
 - d) briefs on the major evaluations completed during the biennium and provided to the Governing Bodies. In the briefs, a summary of the management response to the evaluation and the conclusions of the Programme Committee are provided in addition to the evaluation itself. Each brief is cross-referenced to the complete documentation on the evaluation website.

CHAPTER 2: EVALUATION IN FAO

Institutional and Governance Arrangements

2. With the start of the biennium 2010-2011, and in accordance with Immediate Plan of Action for FAO Renewal approved at the 35th Session of the FAO Conference, the new Office of Evaluation will be established. The Office, operationally independent inside the FAO secretariat structure, will have a dual reporting line – to the Director-General and to the Council, through the Programme Committee. FAO's evaluation policy is to be incorporated in a Charter, the guidelines for which were included in the Immediate Plan of Action for FAO Renewal. A draft Charter was considered by the Programme Committee at its 100th, 101st and 102nd sessions. During the latter, the Committee indicated that the Charter would be finalized once the new Director of Evaluation would be recruited and could participate in the process. The new Director of Evaluation was appointed effective 1 September 2009. It is expected that the draft Charter will be considered by the Programme Committee at its 103rd session and subsequently by the Council for approval.

Evaluation Processes and Methodologies

3. The basic processes for conduct of evaluation in FAO have not changed from those outlined to the Conference in the 2005 and 2007 Programme Evaluation Reports. However, there has been an increased use of certain evaluation tools, as part of an on-going effort to increase the utility of evaluation as an agent for organizational improvement.

Increased Consultation with Stakeholders

4. It is commonly agreed and accepted that evaluation fulfils two main roles for an organization: it provides *accountability* – in the case of FAO to the Director-General and to the Governing Bodies and it contributes to corporate *learning*. The learning function is particularly important and needs to be carefully considered at all stages of evaluation design and implementation. For evaluation to be effective, its recommendations and the reasoning behind them must be well understood by the persons who will implement them. This implies that stakeholders must be consulted at key points. When the evaluation is designed, stakeholders should have the opportunity to ensure that the questions they feel are relevant are also asked and to suggest sources of information and evidence that should be taken into account in the evaluation process. Consultation at this early stage is considered to be the key times for building stakeholder confidence and buy-in to the evaluation process, thus facilitating eventual learning from it. During the evaluation, stakeholders serve as an important source of information. The views of

stakeholders also should be sought during and after the preparation of the draft report, i.e. before it is issued in final form.

5. The final responsibility for the content of the evaluation report rests with the independent team of evaluators, who are free to accept or reject the statements and opinions offered by stakeholders. The consultation process though should normally serve to minimize such differences, as the parties will already have a good understanding of each other's points of view.

6. Stakeholder consultation has always formed a part of FAO's evaluation methodology, but in an effort to increase and broaden it, the Office of Evaluation has increasingly made use of *consultative groups* for major evaluations. Consultative groups have usually been formed around evaluations of activities funded primarily through Trust Funds and have included representatives of the main donor countries of the programme being evaluated, the beneficiary countries and the various stakeholders in FAO. Evaluations where groups were constituted included the two Real-Time Evaluations of FAO's work on Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza and the Evaluation of FAO Cooperation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Consultative Group is a working group and its membership limited. It provides advice during key moments of the evaluation process, including on: the terms of reference, in particular the issues to be evaluated; the composition of the evaluation team; the draft report and the consideration of the management response to the final evaluation report. Depending on the length of the process, it is expected that the Consultative Group may meet 3 or 4 times during the evaluation process.

7. The Evaluation Office has been very pleased with the response to and suggestions from the Consultative Groups and looks to extend these in the future. Such Groups could serve as an effective mechanism to strengthen the reporting on evaluation to member countries. Previously, there has been only limited interaction with member countries on most evaluations, i.e. when they are suggested by the Programme Committee and when the Programme Committee reviews the final report and management response. A consultative group mechanism for major evaluations would bridge this gap and increase both accountability and learning for all parties.

More Systematic and Rigorous Evaluation Feedback

8. The Office established a formal system to track the preparation of management responses and follow-up reports. While management responses and follow-up reports for evaluations presented to the Programme Committee have been produced for many years, for individual project evaluations this was not always the case; the new system has been applied to all evaluations completed from 2008 onward. The tracking has been largely effective in ensuring that the required reports are prepared and they are systematically posted on the FAO evaluation website, along with the evaluation reports. Furthermore, management responses and follow-up reports have been added to the search function on the website.

9. The Programme Evaluation Report 2007 noted that "the Programme Committee has still found several management responses during the biennium did not meet quality standards and required elaboration". The Report further noted that "the actual use made of the findings and recommendations is highly dependent upon the extent to which the various partners to the evaluation become convinced of their validity and thus put them into effect". For this reason, the Office of Evaluation intends to work closely with stakeholders, including the Governing Bodies, to build confidence in the evaluation processes. The Office of Evaluation is also aware that good management responses are conditioned to a degree by the clarity and precision of evaluation recommendations. However, there is also a need for managers to be forthright in the *management responses* to evaluation and clear in cases where they disagree with evaluation findings and recommendations. Management responses need to be specific about the actions they will take and these actions must then be implemented. In this way, the contributions of evaluation to change and reform become evident. The Office of Evaluation will address the improvement of management responses as a priority task in the next biennium.

Strengthened Evaluation of Impact

10. Over the past biennium, the Office of Evaluation has maintained a strong focus on the evaluation of the impact of FAO activities at field level. It has become a standard feature of FAO country evaluations, whereby one or more areas work in which there is a considerable volume of activity are identified for evaluation of impact. These studies are designed by the Office of Evaluation, with inputs from national and international personnel working on the activity in question. They typically use a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods to arrive at answers to key questions identified during the inception phase. As the study is seeking information about impact at farmer or producer level, methods used include tested questionnaire surveys (using local enumerators) and focus group interviews. Besides gathering information for the evaluation, the evaluations of impact have brought more national consultants into the evaluation process and have played a role in strengthening national capacity in evaluation tools and methodology. Assessing impact is one of the most challenging aspects of evaluation. Therefore, the Office is now organizing regular methodological seminars among its staff before and after recent impact studies, so that suggestions can be made to improve their design, reduce their cost and determine lessons that can be drawn from this work.

Evaluation of Extra-budgetary Work

11. Since the appointment of the Director of Evaluation, consultations have begun with the Technical Cooperation Department for implementing the Council decision¹ to establish a Trust Fund for evaluating projects of technical cooperation for development. Such a trust fund has already been established in 2007 for the evaluations of FAO's emergency and rehabilitation activities and an annual programme of evaluations is planned in consultation with relevant stakeholders and implemented against the Trust Fund budget. Since its creation, major emergency evaluations have been funded through that mechanism including among others two Real-time Evaluations of FAO's work on Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza; FAO's emergency and rehabilitation work in the Horn of Africa and FAO's response to the Tsunami.

12. The Trust Fund pool accounts allow FAO to respond to the changing face of evaluation. Over the last two decades, there has been a growth in the number of relatively small field projects, and for these, an evaluation mission of the traditional type is not the most cost-effective use of resources. Accordingly, the emphasis has shifted to the evaluation of projects within thematic clusters and country evaluations. Aside from being more cost-effective, this formula allows for ex-post evaluation and assessment of impact in a way which cannot be achieved while a project is ongoing. Evaluating projects together also facilitates lessons across projects and the examination of the relationship between the results from the extra-budgetary funds deployed and the Regular Programme of the Organization.

13. In practice, the Trust Fund will be resourced by evaluation contributions from project budgets for projects that will not be evaluated separately, i.e. most extra-budgetary projects for which the budget is under \$US 4 million².

14. Discussions were also initiated to enable the Office of Evaluation to review systematically the evaluation provisions in all project proposals above a certain monetary threshold. This is to address the issue of the low percentage of Trust Fund projects being evaluated, which was noted

¹ At its 132nd session in June 2007, the Council emphasised the importance of the systematic evaluation of the extra-budgetary work of the Organization, and endorsed arrangements for "the inclusion of a mandatory budget line for evaluation in all extra-budgetary projects on a published scale. Two Trust Fund pool accounts would be established for this purpose: one for emergency and rehabilitation projects, and another for technical cooperation for development projects".

² Some projects with budgets of less than \$US 4 million may continue to be evaluated separately, if demanded by donors or because of the particular nature of the project (e.g. pilot projects from which specific lessons may be learned for further application).

in the Programme Evaluation Report 2007. The outcome of these discussions will be reported to the Programme Committee at its 103rd session in April 2010.

CHAPTER 3: UN SYSTEM COLLABORATION IN EVALUATION

15. During the 2008-09 biennium, FAO has continued to work closely with the other evaluation offices of the UN system through the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). It has also continued its participation in the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP), which brings together evaluators from across the non-governmental and governmental humanitarian agencies.

16. UNEG works largely through voluntary task forces on themes of common interest, aiming at diffusion and harmonization of evaluation methods and best practices across member agencies. The group revised its “Principles of Working Together” at its last Annual General Meeting; it also agreed on a structure comprising a chair and a deputy chair, whereas the secretariat will continue to be hosted by the UNDP Evaluation Office.

17. UNEG was very active during the biennium on the Delivering as One (DaO) evaluability assessment of the eight pilot countries³. The 2007 TCPR asked these countries to conduct a self evaluation and an independent evaluation; UNEG has recently drafted an evaluation framework for use by the countries willing to conduct self evaluations and will support these exercises through participation in the Quality Assurance Panel. FAO will be a member of the Panel.

18. The FAO Office of Evaluation is participating actively in all UNEG work, through its own staff time and financial resources. In particular, FAO has made a significant contribution to the following initiatives:

- a) participation in the peer review of the evaluation function of the Office of Internal Oversight Services of the United Nations (OIOS); the report was published in January 2009;
- b) participation in the Steering Committee and scoping mission for the system-wide South Africa country evaluation: this evaluation assessed the relevance and effectiveness of cooperation between South Africa and the UN system within the three-tier strategic policy priorities of the country. The report was published in May 2009;
- c) participation in the peer reviewer for the fourth Overall Performance Study of the Global Environment Facility; and
- d) participation in several UNEG task forces, including: Country Evaluation; Evaluation Practice Exchange, Evaluation Quality Enhancement; Human Rights and Gender Equality; and Impact Evaluation.

19. As regards inter-agency collaboration on emergency-related evaluation work, the Office contributed to furthering of concepts and methods in particular within the framework of the ALNAP Advisory Group on Improving Impact Humanitarian Assessment and of the OCHA-led Inter-Agency Real-Time Evaluation Interest Group. It also participated in the Steering Groups of a number of inter-agency evaluations addressing systemic issues in humanitarian assistance.

CHAPTER 4: EVALUATION PROGRAMME OF THE ORGANIZATION

The 2008-09 Programme of Completed Evaluations

20. All evaluation reports and respective finalised management responses can be found on the FAO evaluation website: [HTTP://WWW.FAO.ORG/PBE/PBEE/EN/INDEX.HTML](http://www.fao.org/pbe/pbee/en/index.html)

³ Albania, Cape Verde, Mozambique, Pakistan, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uruguay and Viet Nam.

21. **Evaluations for consideration by the Governing Bodies:** During the 2008-09 biennium, the following major evaluations were presented to the Governing Bodies through the Programme Committee. For each of these evaluations, the full report is available on the FAO evaluation website, together with the management response to the evaluation and the reactions of the Programme Committee:

- a) Evaluation of the FAO Emergency and Rehabilitation Assistance in the Greater Horn of Africa 2004-2007 (evaluation brief 14);
- b) FAO's Effectiveness at Country Level: A synthesis of evaluations (evaluation brief 15);
- c) Evaluation of FAO's Work on International Instruments (evaluation brief 16);
- d) Independent Evaluation of FAO's Role and Work in Statistics (evaluation brief 17)

22. **Development projects and partnership programme evaluations:** A table summarising the individual project evaluations undertaken by independent missions during 2008-09 is provided as Annex I. Programme and major project evaluations with the direct participation of staff from the Evaluation Service included:

- a) FAO-Norway Programme Cooperation Agreement (PCA) 2005-2007, completed in August 2008;
- b) Three nationally-executed projects funded by the Netherlands in India (GCP/IND/174-175-176/NET), completed in October 2008;
- c) National Special Programme for Food Security in Nigeria, 2002-2006 (UTF/NIR/047/NIR), completed in October 2008;
- d) Projet d'appui à la lutte préventive contre le criquet pèlerin dans quatre états membres de la CLCPRO-EMPRES (GCP/INT/958/AFB), completed in May 2009 ;
- e) EC/FAO Joint Evaluation: Food Security Information for Action Programme (GCP/GLO/162/EC) and EC/FAO Food Security Programme (GCP/INT/952/EC), completed in April 2009; and
- f) Five Special Programmes for Food Security funded by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, Niger and Sudan (GCP/BKF/042/LIB, GCP/CHD/026/LIB, GCP/MLI/024/LIB, GCP/NER/040/LIB and GCP/SUD/051), completed in May 2009.

23. **Emergency and rehabilitation:**

- a) Early Recovery Assistance for the Agriculture Smallholder and Early Recovery Assistance to War-affected, Resource-poor Livestock Keepers in Southern Lebanon (OSRO/LEB/701/UNJ and OSRO/LEB/702/UNJ), completed in December 2008;
- b) FAO's Participatory Disease Surveillance and Response Programme in Indonesia (several projects), completed in July 2009;
- c) Five emergency interventions in Iraq (OSRO/IRQ/402-403-404-406-407/UDG), to be completed in October 2009; and
- d) FAO interventions carried out under the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF), to be completed in March 2010.

24. **Evaluation of FAO's effectiveness in individual countries:** These evaluations analyse the total relevance, outcomes and impacts of FAO's work, including for emergencies in a few selected countries. A synthesis of the evaluations in countries with protracted emergencies will form part of the assessment of FAO's effectiveness at country level to be presented to the Programme Committee in the spring of 2010:

- a) FAO Cooperation in the Democratic Republic of Congo 2003-2007 (completed in June 2008);
- b) FAO Cooperation with India 2003-2008 (completed in March 2009);
- c) FAO Activities in Tajikistan 2004-2009 (completed in October 2009); and
- d) FAO Cooperation in Sudan (scheduled for completion in December 2009).

Major Evaluations programmed for 2010-11

25. **Reports for consideration by the Programme Committee:** In addition to the evaluations programmed below, further evaluations will be decided after consultation with the Programme Committee at its April 2010 session:

- a) Joint FAO and WFP thematic evaluation of information systems for food security;
- b) Evaluation of FAO's operational capacity in emergencies;
- c) Evaluation of capacity development in Africa;
- d) Evaluation of FAO's role and work related to water;
- e) Evaluation of National Medium-Term Priority Frameworks;
- f) Evaluation of FAO's Regional and Subregional Offices in the Near East; and
- g) Evaluation of gender aspects in FAO's work.

26. **Country evaluations:** At least three evaluations during the biennium, including Ethiopia and Haiti with particular attention given to emergency and rehabilitation work and funded by the Emergency Evaluation Trust Fund.

CHAPTER 5: EVALUATION BRIEFS – MAJOR EVALUATIONS

Evaluation brief 14: Evaluation of the FAO Emergency and Rehabilitation Assistance in the Greater Horn of Africa (2004-2007)

Evaluation brief 15: FAO's Effectiveness at Country Level: A Synthesis of Evaluations

Evaluation brief 16: Evaluation of FAO's Work on International Instruments

Evaluation brief 17: Independent Evaluation of FAO's Role and Work in Statistics

EVALUATION SERVICE

FAO Evaluation Web site
www.fao.org/pbe/pbee/en/index.html

Evaluation of the FAO emergency and rehabilitation assistance in the Greater Horn of Africa (2004-2007)

FAO work in the Greater Horn of Africa (2004-2007)

At the time of the evaluation, the Greater Horn of Africa was one of the most food insecure regions of the world. Its population had more than doubled since 1974, further increasing the pressure on resources. In addition, widespread insecurity in Somalia, southern Sudan and northern Uganda in the past two decades had displaced large populations, prevented access to land and services as well as undermined customary practices and institutions.

The evaluation reviewed FAO's emergency and rehabilitation programme in collaboration with Member Governments and partners in Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, southern Sudan and northern Uganda from 2004 to 2007. The programme had witnessed a threefold expansion during the period under review, amounting to USD 240 million between 2004 and 2006.

Findings and Conclusions

Programme Response: FAO had significantly increased its presence and diversified its emergency and rehabilitation response from a programme formerly dominated by seeds and tools distribution. The evaluation identified a number of components, namely: knowledge projects, including support to early warning and food security information systems, technical assistance on land tenure and land and water information management; agricultural projects mainly consisting of seeds and tools distribution, as well as cassava propagation, integrated pest management and rehabilitation and development of water resources and irrigation schemes; livestock and fisheries projects, dominated by animal health interventions but also including training of Community Animal Health Workers (CAHWs), prevention and control of transboundary diseases, support to aquaculture and fisheries, and redistribution of small ruminants; support to the livelihoods of HIV and AIDS affected households; and FAO's mandated role of coordination within the agriculture and food security sector in humanitarian emergencies.

Strategic Planning was mainly achieved through the Plan of Action (POA) for the Greater Horn of Africa intended to complement the humanitarian appeals process. It provides a strategic framework for food security which advocates for "connectedness" between emergency and development assistance, challenging conventional wisdom of donors and other international agencies to separately allocate resources to "emergencies", "recovery/transition", and "development". National POAs were under review in Ethiopia, Somalia and Uganda. contractual obligations was found insufficient.

Findings and Conclusions cont.

FAO Organizational Structure and Operational Capacity, including technical capacity, were not strengthened to match the increase in scale and diversification of projects in the region, particularly at field level. Although relationships between the FAORs and Emergency Coordination Units (ECUs) at country level were generally effective, different lines of reporting led to some difficulties and tensions. Reliance on short-term extra-budgetary support to finance ECUs undermined any long-term approach to develop operational capacity: this also led to high staff turnover, which negatively affected the quality of interventions. Key regional institutional changes were the establishment of the Regional Emergency Office for Africa (REOA) in Nairobi and the FAO Sub-Regional Office for East Africa (SFE) in Addis Ababa. The evaluation concluded that their respective roles can well be complementary, however the centralized and vertical nature of the Organization often leads to inefficiencies and at times discourages sharing of information and best practice.

Partnerships: FAO worked directly with more than 50 different international and local NGOs, mainly for input distribution but also for sectoral strategy development. A major constraint to these collaborations was the use of Letters of Agreement, a contractual tool that does not reflect partnering among equals as expected by some donors and NGOs. FAO could better link emergency operations with government services at field level as well as taking advantage of regional research centres.

Relevance, Effectiveness and Impact: With a few exceptions, the evaluation found that the emergency programme in the region focused too much on the immediate consequences of vulnerability rather than tackling long-term, deep-rooted causes of food insecurity and vulnerability. A notable achievement was the development of the Integrated Humanitarian and Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) by the FSAU Somalia: this has since been introduced to other countries by FAO. Early warning often does not translate into early response, partly due to a lack of national contingency plans and follow-up funding. Poor timeliness was a key weakness in the agricultural sector, mainly attributed to inadequate logistical and operational capacity in the field and dependence on appeals which were poorly synchronised with cropping seasons. Overall seed aid resulted in higher food production and farm incomes. Animal health interventions were found very relevant

with some shortcomings in the consistency of technical assistance. Support networks of CAHWs were also effective for nomadic herders, although they tended to be poorly connected with national animal health systems. One of the most effective actions by FAO was probably its contribution to the lifting of the livestock export ban imposed by the Arabian Peninsula.

Gender and Equity: A number of activities or opportunities were identified where women and female-headed households could be targeted. However, there was no systematic attempt to mainstream gender throughout project cycles. Targeting inputs is difficult to achieve effectively in the Horn of Africa. The evaluation acknowledged the tensions that can result from targeting, which communities try to avoid, and considered it only worthwhile when distributing costly items.

Recommendations

■ Information Systems and Knowledge Projects:

Institutional coherence in food security information systems for emergencies and development as well as stronger links between food security and livestock related information systems need to be sought. Information systems that are of value for both emergency and developmental understanding should be further supported. Early warning and information systems should make greater use of indigenous knowledge in order to become more relevant to local decision-making. In addition, there is a need for the development and improvement of methodologies for food security assessments to ensure timeliness, quality and relevance.

■ **Resource Mobilization:** Advocacy for a greater proportion of humanitarian funding to focus on livelihood interventions should be continued. Active engagement in developing medium-term strategies determining priorities in addressing chronic food insecurity is recommended. The mobilization and coordination of resources at regional level should continue. Also, in order to ensure timely and appropriate responses to livelihoods crises in the region, coordinated response analyses, emergency preparedness plans, contingency funding mechanisms and strategic reserves of key equipment should be promoted.

■ **Programme Response:** A thorough analysis of production and livelihoods systems should be conducted to study the long-term, root causes of food insecurity in the Horn of Africa, and promote the use of livelihood information in programme response. Comprehensive need assessments rather than mere seed need assessments should be the basis of FAO and other agencies' interventions. Agricultural inputs should be distributed when truly necessary, supplied sooner and through more efficient distribution processes. Where they are distributed regularly, procurement should be handled locally in order to support the local economy. Water interventions should be expanded. A review of the various CAHWs networks should be conducted to re-enforce existing networks through training and better integration into national animal health systems.

■ **Partnership and Coordination:** Partnerships should be developed more strategically, particularly with government partners that have technical competences,

which FAO can strengthen or draw upon. Technical capacities at regional level should be engaged with more extensively. Partnership agreements with NGOs should more accurately reflect respective contributions and obligations. Also, the FAO lead coordination role should be capitalized on through promoting more sharing of sound analyses and good practice between countries and actors in the region.

■ **Institutional Capacity and Priorities:** Regular funding for the core functions of "stand alone" ECUs needs to be secured over the long term. The Sub-Regional Office for East Africa (SFE) must be mandated to provide technical support and clearance for field operations, and staff composition should reflect the characteristics of the region. The Regional Emergency Office for Africa (REOA) should support ECUs and its role and composition should be reviewed annually by TCE, Emergency Coordinators, FAORs and decentralized offices. A review of human resources required by FAO in each country, reflecting national priorities, should be conducted in order to develop a more diversified skill and gender base in ECUs. National staff should form part of management and have a greater decision making and coordination role than is currently the case. To ensure that livelihoods, gender and HIV analysis contributes to the design of all programme interventions, internal guidelines, training materials and best practice should be applied.

Management response to the evaluation

Management accepted, although with some caution for some, almost all the recommendations made by the Evaluation and was pleased to note some were already being implemented. Management largely agreed with the findings, stressed that continued efforts will be necessary to comply with many of the recommendations and highlighted that in the response to an emergency, donors still favour funding immediate impact actions, such as the provision of seeds and tools.

The Programme Committee appreciated the quality and clarity of the evaluation, and recognized the difficulty of working in post-conflict environments as well as the importance of integrating the political and practical dimensions in analysing the complexity of the situations and the role that FAO can reasonably play. The Committee felt that some of the recommendations were not fully realistic, particularly as too many had financing implications that the Organization was not in a position to fill. Longer-term institutional arrangements to strengthen this area of work should take voluntary funding models into consideration, as nearly all of FAO's emergency and rehabilitation work is funded by extra-budgetary support.

It was also noted that the Organization had made solid improvements in its activities in the Horn of Africa, among which a more strategic approach through Plans of Action, systematic fielding of emergency coordinators, active partnerships with NGOs and a commitment to address transboundary issues. More emphasis should be given to consolidation and sustainability of results, preparedness and safety net mechanisms to address chronic poverty and vulnerability, as some of the countries are moving toward rehabilitation and development. If FAO's work is to be diversified and expanded and timely technical support is to be delivered, appropriate expertise will be required in the region.

FAO Governing Bodies' conclusions (Programme Committee)

References

Evaluation of the FAO Emergency and Rehabilitation Assistance in the Greater Horn of Africa (2004-2007). Final Report.

Available at: <http://www.fao.org/pbe/pbee/common/ecg/363/en/HoAEvaluationReport.pdf>

Summary report for the Programme Committee. PC 99/3 a).

Available at: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/meeting/013/k2131e.pdf>

Management Response. PC 99/3 a) Sup. 1.

Available at: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/meeting/013/k2366e.pdf>

Report of the Ninety-Ninth Session of the Programme Committee. Rome, 28-20 May 2008. CL 135/4.

Available at: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/meeting/014/k2757e.pdf>

EVALUATION SERVICE

FAO Evaluation Web site
www.fao.org/pbe/pbee/en/index.html

FAO's effectiveness at country level

FAO's effectiveness at country level: a synthesis of evaluations

The FAO Programme Committee assigned high priority to the evaluation of FAO's effectiveness at country level in the Indicative Rolling Work-plan for Strategic and Programme Evaluations in the period 2006-2009 at its Ninety-third session in May 2005.

Country evaluations represented a new dimension for FAO as they examine the totality of the Organization's work at country level, including national projects, national participation in regional and global projects, use made of normative products by national organizations and performance of the FAO country representation. Key considerations in these are the utility of the Organization's work to the member country and the extent to which this draws on FAO's comparative advantage.

At the Ninety-seventh session of the Programme Committee (May 2007) it was proposed that a report should be submitted synthesizing the country evaluation work undertaken thus far, namely Mozambique (March 2006), Sierra Leone (February 2007), Cambodia (September 2007), Honduras (November 2007), as well as the two evaluations previously presented to the Committee at its Ninety-second session in September 2004

Methodology

The selection of countries to undergo an evaluation was conducted by using a set of criteria agreed at corporate level, namely that selected countries should be LIFDCs and have a relatively high percentage as well as a high absolute number of under/malnourished people; the FAO portfolio (excluding emergency assistance) should be of a reasonable size; and there should be a good technical mix of FAO inputs.

The four country evaluations were conducted in a similar three-phase process, which was highly participatory throughout: data gathering at headquarters, regional office and country level; impact studies; final full evaluation mission

Ensuring full coverage of FAO's country level work proved to be a challenge, in particular because the activities of global and regional projects were not easily accessible. Impact studies formed an essential part of the process and yielded interesting assessments of the contribution of FAO projects to food security, incomes and livelihoods of beneficiaries compared to non-participants.

Findings and Conclusions

FAO Representation: the FAO country office is a key point for interaction between the Organization and most countries and its work is a key element of the Organization's performance at national level. All country evaluations examined the effectiveness and efficiency of this office, its interactions with government and other development partners as well as the respective roles played by the Sub-regional and Regional Offices and FAO headquarters in the delivery of services.

Findings and Conclusions cont.

FAO Representative (FAOR): Country evaluations confirmed that the Representative is the primary figure influencing the image of FAO in the country, more so than headquarters or the Regional Offices. However, the FAO Representation is considered by headquarters as a delivery point for services, often leading to FAOR posts being left vacant. The evaluation considered that Representatives must have the background, experience and capacity to fully participate in representative fora, as well as the knowledge to tap required sources of expertise within FAO and ability to drive the development of FAO's activities in the country. In addition, FAORs need to be given access to adequate and appropriate technical support in order to exercise their function, thereby providing an operational environment that does not hinder their ability to perform. Where these conditions were met, FAO was found to be a highly respected member of the UN family and a trusted partner to government.

Resources and Office Staffing: The amount of work required from the Representations has increased significantly since 2001, when the FAOR became budget holder for all national projects. This new burden of administrative and operational tasks is unfunded. In addition, the number of Chief Technical Advisers in countries has been decreasing, further enhancing the workload. There are significant resource constraints affecting the capacity to complete given tasks. Salaries are generally at a lower level than those of other organizations, significantly reducing the pool of qualified individuals. Personal Service Agreements (PSA), intended for short-term assignments, are increasingly used particularly in countries with a large number of projects: they are less costly for the Organization yet are disadvantageous for staff, thereby having negative effects on morale.

Programme Management: National projects are managed under the responsibility of the FAOR, regional projects fall under the responsibility of the Regional and Sub-regional Offices and inter-regional and global projects are managed from headquarters. Therefore, in a practical sense the FAOR has no authority over activities without a strictly national orientation and scope, often leading to activities being implemented and missions visiting without the FAOR's knowledge.

Procedures and Internal Management: Internal management issues were a concern in all countries evaluated, especially in those with high levels of project

operations. In general, the evaluations found that the decentralization of operational responsibilities that has taken place since 2001 was not accompanied by the necessary delegation of authority and streamlining of operational, administrative and financial processes. A high amount of time is spent within Representations on administrative issues, providing ample evidence for the need for improved procedures. FAORs have less delegated authority than many of their in-country counterparts often putting them at a disadvantage in negotiations.

Technical Assistance: The evaluations identified a number of issues with respect to quantity and timing of technical assistance as well as responsibilities for directing this support. Although services were acknowledged to be of good quality, timeliness was too often affected by internal bureaucracy. The capacity of FAO Representations to deliver technical assistance in addition to projects varied and depended on the availability of funds to recruit good quality national consultants. No Representation can be expected to house all expertise required in-country, yet some countries have advantages as to the expertise available. Technical support from Regional Offices was often found to be more ample for regional projects, with the purpose of country visits tied to the concerns of the regional project rather than country priorities.

Priority Frameworks: In two out of four evaluations, little time had been spent by FAORs on planning and programme development. This is now changing as National Medium-term Priority Frameworks (NMTPFs) are being prepared. However, within those already formulated, priority areas were often broad and the number of interventions large beyond what FAO could support. In order for NMTPFs to be effective, they should be re-examined and revised every two years.

Findings and Conclusions cont.

- **Regional Projects:** There are various types of regional projects, where the involvement at national level varies. Quality and utility of all typologies was very case-specific. Generalizations are difficult as relevance and effects were variable.
- **TCP:** An overall assessment of the TCP ranged from very positive to weak. Where assessments were positive, project selection was complimented as most TCPs were either clearly tied to other ongoing initiatives or an initial step in a defined process. Nevertheless, a worrying trend previously identified in the review of TCP in 2005 remained, where TCPs are used for development projects as other sources cannot be found, disregarding that the facility is not appropriate for certain types of projects. In least developed countries, where government resources are limited, effective TCP follow-up depends on the involvement of another external donor. Prospects for this are greatly enhanced if the potential donor is identified and expresses interest at the outset.
- **SPFS** was considered a valuable programme when it worked with a representative sample of farmers at various levels, included good levels of technical support and had an appropriate up-scaling strategy. The existence of a credit and savings mechanism was identified as an important factor for success.
- **Emergencies:** FAO's best responses to crisis were those that were part of a comprehensive approach in which root causes of insecurity and vulnerability to disasters and work with the most affected populations were informed by a developmental perspective.
- **Normative role of FAO:** Beyond a few well-known programmes, there was a limited knowledge of FAO's normative outputs in the countries evaluated. Although capacities, lack of access and limited knowledge of local FAO offices were constraints, findings suggest there is a need to focus more attention on the utility of normative products for the member countries.
- **Telefood:** In most cases, projects were found to be implemented largely in isolation and did not benefit from strategic linkages with other FAO programmes, international development partners or with government. The evaluation confirmed the findings and recommendations of the corporate Telefood Evaluation: initiatives should be linked to other activities in order to be more relevant and have better access to forms of technical advice.
- **Gender issues:** On the whole, the Organization was found to be playing an active role in promoting women's visibility and in raising their role inside their communities. However, there is still room for institutional strengthening and to extend the results of positive experiences, especially in emergency and rehabilitation activities.

FAO Governing Bodies' conclusions (Programme Committee)

The Programme Committee appreciated the quality of the synthesis and found the document to contain many good lessons that reinforced the findings and recommendations of the IEE. The Committee felt the synthesis would have benefited from general recommendations drawn from the country evaluations, as well as a Management Response to these.

The importance of the FAOR was stressed, noting that too many posts were vacant. Also, the Committee stated that FAO Representations must have adequate resources and an appropriate level of technical support. Efforts should be made to increase the exposure of normative products at country level, including making them available in local languages. The Committee agreed that FAO needs to better define its objectives at country level and the NMTPFs could be useful for this. Noting their shortcomings, the Committee reiterated its decision in September 2007 that a process evaluation, examining the plans developed so far, should be a priority.

Country evaluations should continue as a regular evaluation activity, in future focusing on countries at different levels of development. Synthesis reports should be presented every 2-3 years, taking into account the Committee's observations

References

FAO's Effectiveness at Country Level: A Synthesis of Evaluations. PC 99/3 b).

Available at: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/meeting/013/k2177e.pdf>

Report of the Ninety-Ninth Session of the Programme Committee. Rome, 28-20 May 2008. CL 135/4.

Available at: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/meeting/012/k0095e.pdf>

EVALUATION SERVICE

FAO Evaluation Web site
www.fao.org/pbe/pbee/en/index.html

Evaluation of FAO's work on international instruments

FAO work on international instruments

Strategic Objective B-1 calls for "Promoting, developing and reinforcing policy and regulatory frameworks for food, agriculture, fisheries and forestry [through] international instruments concerning food, agricultural, fishery and forestry goods." The evaluation also examined some directly connected elements of Strategic Objective B-2, with regard to the application of "national policies, legal instruments and supporting mechanisms that respond to domestic requirements and are consistent with the international policy and regulatory framework." A body of work such as "international instruments" encompasses a wide range of tools, from documents such as international conventions, agreements and other binding instruments, non-binding instruments, all created and adopted at different levels in different ways.

Over 50 binding instruments and at least 15 non-binding instruments were identified as being part of Strategic Objective B-1, covering a broad range of topics and substantive sectors, each utilizing the instruments in different ways. In addition, a considerable percentage of FAO's work within B-1 is done through specialized bodies, created and governed through processes that can sometimes be characterized as "international instruments".

Findings and Conclusions

Strategic View: FAO has no process for compiling, analysing or deciding organization-wide strategic policy for B-1 tools on a consistent basis, and there is no central comprehensive record of its international instruments. Further, there is no coordination of the Organization's work across the individual instruments regarding positions, policies and concepts.

Financial Commitments: Whether binding or non-binding, global, regional or sub-regional, every international instrument can only meet its objective with appropriate financing. Virtually none of the instruments examined appeared to be fully financed; in many cases funding appeared to be inadequate for needs and expectations. Moreover, both FAO and individual member countries incur significant additional expenses for each international instrument, beyond their contribution to the Secretariat and other administrative costs.

Process and Governance: The evaluation focused on questions of process and governance and identified issues and challenges common to FAO's work in most or all of the international instruments examined.

- **Initiation of new instruments and proposals:** The effect of existing perceptions, often distorting reality, regarding the value of binding and non-binding instruments was identified as a concern. FAO has generally had productive instances with both hard and soft instruments: it appears that success is more dependent on the nature

Findings and Conclusions cont.

and intensity of implementation and dissemination by the Secretariat rather than on the type of instrument. Another issue relates to the structure of the relationship between FAO and the instrument itself which is often complex. The evaluation concludes that there are different models applying to different situations and the nature of the relationship should be clarified early in the initiation stage. There appears to be no need for formal mechanisms to promote compliance, determine liability and enable dispute resolution.

- **Entry into force:** A “key date” in an instrument’s life is the ratification and entry into force, wherefore the factors delaying national ratification are very important. For almost all instruments which impose national legislative obligations it is often a question of capacity that hinders a country from confidently initiating the detailed political process of ratification.
- **Operation and amendment:** This evaluation identified many common concerns about international-level operations of a binding instrument: the role of national focal points and delegations to governing bodies and other processes; the manner in which decision-making processes are undertaken; the relationship between those processes and the technical support bodies; and the collection and sharing of national reports and other information. The operation of FAO’s standard-setting processes was also considered and two primary issues emerged: an inability of many developing countries to apply the standards to imports and domestic issues and a proliferation of separate nationally adopted standards.
- **National implementation:** Although the evaluation could not obtain a complete picture of national expectations and implementation, in general the indication was that national implementing agencies perceive the benefits of FAO’s international instruments and the benefits provided by FAO to be interlinked. International instruments in some areas are increasingly viewed as promoting highly desirable regional and global goals. With regard to national implementation, a great number and variety of projects are undertaken to promote policy, legislative and administrative development, but political issues and weak capacity may affect their effectiveness at times. In some sectors implementation was found to be closely coordinated with the international instruments and their respective administrations, but not in all.
- Two **cross-cutting issues** of special importance to the effective operation of Strategic Objective B-I relate to all

aspects of process and governance: i) the challenges of participation in international instrument processes, including the ability of national delegations comprising technical experts, to attend relevant meetings: funding appears to be the primary restricting factor; ii) at the regional level, the important contribution of many actions by regional bodies, FAO Regional Offices, and other regional organizations, was noted.

The evaluation also examined FAO’s contribution to the “international regulatory framework”. Work in international instruments depends increasingly on inter-sectoral coordination and support. Greater coordination is needed in several instances: among sectors and units within FAO; through integrating external sectors, observers and agencies in FAO processes for international instrument development and operation; and determining a unified “FAO position” for purposes of advocacy and participation in other fora through internal FAO processes.

As an overall assessment of FAO’s work under Strategic Objective B-I, the evaluation noted that FAO had performed well in its role in providing a forum for policy debate and for the servicing of international instruments. Different appropriate tools have been used in support of B-I, although these instruments may face serious challenges to fair and effective cooperation, particularly in participation and national implementation. Other recent challenges need to be addressed in the areas of international standards, as well as special needs relevant to the integration of FAO’s international instruments and processes with those of other fora, along with the continuous need of building member country capacity toward a more effective participation.

Recommendations

- In order to improve overall B-I performance FAO should develop an ongoing strategic process to ensure that the Organization's strategy and approach remain up-to-date and well analysed. Any new instrument in negotiation should determine whether FAO's role will be promoting coordination and consensus among sectors or providing the strongest advocacy position on behalf of its core sectors. Also, a process should be created for setting authorized advocacy and expert positions to be presented in non-FAO fora.
- New and existing international instruments need to be placed on a firm financial footing to ensure fair and effective operation. Financial analysis, particular in the creation of new instruments needs to take into consideration complete costs, long-term costs for the instruments operation and an awareness of the Organization's total ongoing commitment to international instruments.
- The precise FAO-instrument relationship should be clarified in the text of any new instrument to avoid future confusion. Formal mechanisms for compliance are not considered a priority and should only become one in the case of need or if successful examples are proven effective and adopted in other instruments.
- FAO's Members and Secretariat should focus on enabling countries to feel confident of their ability to participate effectively, remove capacity barriers, and increase the awareness of the instrument's value. The level of demand imposed on national focal points needs to be reconsidered and special attention should be given to the prompt development and operation of information-sharing systems and programmes for support to reporting processes.
- Furthermore, FAO should continue to develop mechanisms for encouraging and supporting observer participation, particularly that of NGOs and CSOs from developing countries. Also, cooperation with regional bodies and organizations with international instruments is recommended.

Management response to the evaluation

Management welcomed this evaluation and accepted all recommendations insofar as they were directed at Management and FAO. Regrets were voiced that the evaluation did not provide firm guidance on the inter-relationship between treaty autonomy and FAO's oversight. The importance accorded to non-binding instruments was appreciated. Management agreed that FAO's activities in relation to the many international instruments are unconnected, and noted that this lack of coherence may arise from the failure of designating one coordinating unit to oversee the Organization's activities. Management proposed that the Legal Office be entrusted with the lead role of ensuring that this core function is carried out in a coordinated manner throughout FAO.

The Programme Committee commended the quality of the evaluation and the comprehensiveness of the Management Response. The complexity of evaluating a strategic objective and particularly assessing impact of such a dispersed area of work was recognized. Concern was expressed about the limited representativeness of the selected sample of countries and in future more attention should be given to geographical and social-economic representation in the setting up of evaluations, both in terms of sample countries and the choice of external experts.

The Committee agreed that FAO needs to take a strategic view to define its engagement in legal instruments relevant to its work and to strengthen the coordination among the various instruments in order to facilitate implementation. Management's proposed role of the Legal Office was acknowledged, yet the need for coordination was noted and the full involvement of senior management and concerned departments was stressed. Addressing funding issues of international instruments was noted as important and financial issues should be duly taken into account during the negotiation of a new instrument.

Stress was placed on the need to address the issue of low participation of developing countries, particularly LDCs, in the meetings concerning international instruments. However, the Committee agreed with Management that the issue is complex and largely depends on the effectiveness of participation of the developing countries in the negotiation and debate. Enhancing the role of developing country national institutions in this process was stressed. Lastly, the Committee was pleased by the emphasis given to capacity building in developing countries, and noted that in international instruments it depended mainly on voluntary contributions and was almost always underfunded. Greater coordination and funding of capacity building efforts among the various units of the Organization is also required.

FAO Governing Bodies' conclusions (Programme Committee)

References

Evaluation of FAO's Work on International Instruments. PC 101/5 a).

Available at: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/meeting/016/k4601e.pdf>

Management Response. PC 101/5 a) Sup. 1.

Available at: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/meeting/016/k4700e.pdf>

Report of the Hundred and First Session of the Programme Committee. Rome, 11-15 May 2009. CL 136/9.

Available at: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/meeting/016/k4879e.pdf>

EVALUATION SERVICE

FAO Evaluation Web site
www.fao.org/pbe/pbee/en/index.html

FAO role and work in statistics

Evaluation of FAO's role and work in statistics

FAO's work in collecting and disseminating statistical information on food and agriculture is a core element of its mandate. The aim has been to maintain the best possible capacity to process, validate, harmonize and analyse incoming data and generate accurate and timely information. An important priority within this has been improving the quality, transparency and coverage of FAO's statistical data, as well as access to it. Another priority has been enhancing national governments' capacities to develop and use their statistical system. While several organizations provide data on agriculture, forestry and fisheries, none of them in such a wide range of areas as FAO. The Organization's global statistics are continuously quoted and used for external global analyses by academics, research institutions, governments and the private sector.

The Independent External Evaluation (IEE) of FAO advocated for a greater priority to be given to the provision of basic data and statistics as well as the necessity for a 'fundamental rethink' of statistical activities which would involve users more. This evaluation mandated by the Programme Committee benefited from an expert panel throughout the process, which produced "An Ideal FAO 21st Century Statistical System" that served as the analytical framework against which FAO's work in statistics was assessed.

Findings and Conclusions

The FAO Statistical System. The collection and dissemination of statistical information covers almost all sectors from agriculture, livestock, forestry, fisheries and land and water. Major producers of statistical data are the Statistics Division (ESS), divided among the Global (ESSG) and Country (ESSS) Services, the Forest Assessment and Reporting Service (FOIM) the Fisheries and Aquaculture Information and Statistics Service (FIES) and to a lesser extent the Land Tenure and Management Unit (NRLA) and the Water Development and Management Unit (NRLW). ESS has a 'data assembly role', as well as being responsible for collecting crop and livestock statistics, and other services play a similar role in their respective sectors. The main statistical series produced are contained in FAOSTAT. Statistical activities are not limited to these units, in fact many units have their own specialized databases in their specific technical subject areas. Given the fragmented nature, some coordination mechanisms would be expected, yet the evaluation found no evidence of any corporate mechanism providing coordination or oversight across the statistics system.

Findings and Conclusions cont.

FAO's Statistics Programme's stakeholders can be found worldwide, both as providers and users of data and clients of its technical services. A certain amount of confidence is vested by its user community in the Organization's Statistics Programme as an unbiased body of reliable and relevant global statistics. Users generally value FAO data and utilize it to conduct work and decision making. Furthermore, the Organization is generally responsive to statistical needs of the member countries and has contributed to strengthening permanent statistical capacities. However, these positive perceptions contradict a rapidly deteriorating statistical environment.

National statistical capacity has been in decline, particularly in agricultural statistics as a result of a lack of donor interest in capacity building and a consequent decline in priority and resources allocated at the national level. This is particularly the case in Africa where only one in four countries is reporting basic crop production data. This trend might be directly tied to a lack of institutional capacity, with inevitable consequences for the data in FAO's global statistical system. The evaluation team concluded that this can be attributed to a few inter-related circumstances, among which: lack of country capacity for basic agricultural data collection following a period of overall deterioration of national statistical capacity; low priority by FAO given to work on quantity and quality of data submissions by countries; and limited field presence and poor networking with member countries and partners. As a result, a lot of data is based on estimates with obvious implications for quality

Quality. The evaluation concluded that the FAO Statistics Programme suffers from extensive quality issues. This ranges from the quality of collection methods, over to the quality of data as it comes from the national source, to the quality of how data reaches the user.

Resources. The ability to develop new methods and techniques for use in national statistics systems and provide support to member countries is affected by critical human and financial resource limitations. A trend in resource and priority reduction in basic statistics collection has been evident from donors and national governments, with FAO following a similar path. Not only have there been declines in appropriations for Statistics with the Organization's declining budget, but smaller and smaller shares of appropriations for technical work has been received for Statistics. Some of the FAO's Statistics Programme's key activities are on the verge of collapse, if there is not a significant re-direction of resources.

Recommendations

- **National Statistical Capacity** is the most pressing concern and most significant quality issue affecting the FAO Statistics Programme. The improvement of member country capacities for the collection and dissemination of country data should witness a re-direction of resources. Country submissions should be improved through enhanced communication, training and dialogue with national statistical offices. In addition, countries should also be assisted in developing gender responsive statistics.
- **CountryStat** was identified as holding the potential to raise national and regional capacity to collect, analyse and disseminate food and agricultural statistics, while at the same time increasing national ownership of the data. Through this countries will be empowered by gaining a better understanding of their agricultural sector and the issues related to food security providing the possible 'sustainability' element of FAO's renewed statistical capacity building programme.
- **Visibility and Leadership:** FAO maintains visibility in the international statistics community, especially at the working level where it partners with other organizations on aspects of data collection and dissemination. However, there is a noticeable vacuum in leadership of agricultural statistics at international level, wherefore FAO should take the action to regain global leadership and set up a plan with major partners and donors for statistical capacity building.
- **Strategic Planning and Prioritization:** FAO lacks a set of principles of good practice for the collection, processing and dissemination of international statistics. Therefore a corporate quality framework, which includes a set of statistical standards and "best practices", should be developed. In addition, a corporate mechanism to coordinate and provide oversight across the FAO Statistical System is missing. The position of Chief Statistician for FAO with the mandate to lead all of the FAO Statistical System into the 21st century should be established. Also, a corporate Statistics Programme Strategic Planning Process should be implemented and a biennial Statistical Programme of Work should be produced. In order to reflect this prioritization at regional and country level, regional statistician posts should be filled through rotation with ESS, allowing for those in Asia and Africa to be expanded, as well as involving FAO country offices more directly..
- **A User-oriented Strategic Approach to Integration of Statistical Systems:** FAO should develop a strategy for integrating statistical systems, based on a strong user perspective and identified user requirements, and provide full and free access to all of its data and statistics.
- **In-house need for training and skills enhancement:** In-house teams will require a programme of continuous training on statistical methods and applied statistics to maintain theoretical knowledge and raise skills, so as to be effective in their dual task of capacity building and country assistance in data collection.
- **Scenarios Proposed:** The measures recommended in order to improve and bring coherence to FAO's Statistical System will only be effective if they are supplemented by re-directed resources. Three scenarios were formulated:
 - I. Status quo:** It assumes that no additional resources will be allocated in 2008-09 to Statistics;
 - II. Recovering Lost Ground:** It assumes that resources are increased by 33 percent, through higher allocation to staff and non-staff. While recognizing that more than these resources would be required to achieve a full-fledged FAO statistical system for the 21st century, the team recommended this as a feasible option: it would allow FAO to be considered a credible partner and player.
 - III. Partially Recovering Lost Ground:** Resources would be increased but less than in Scenario II.

Management response to the evaluation

Management accepted and broadly agreed with all recommendations, fully endorsing the Evaluation's major conclusion identifying the most pressing 'emerging' data need, which actually is a 're-emerging' need, as the need to improve member country capacity in the collection and dissemination of country data. Furthermore, management support Scenario II 'Recovering Lost Ground' in order to re-establish FAO as the global leader in agricultural statistics.

The Programme Committee complimented the high quality of the evaluation and found it to be useful and timely in justifying statistics as a core function of FAO and an Impact Focus Area (IFA) within the new results-based framework. The need for an FAO strategy that would set priorities in its work in statistics was stressed. The Committee agreed that, as the evaluation had recommended, the Organization should seek an increase in resources for priority areas in three ways: i) reallocation within the Statistics Division in accordance with the new strategy; ii) an increased allocation within the Regular Budget; and iii) extra-budgetary funding, i.e. through an IFA. Inadequate extra-budgetary support was noted with concern. The evaluation's recommendation to give priority focus to greater support within countries through capacity building and improved communication was fully supported by the Committee. In addition, emphasis was given to the fact that, as the task ahead is rather large, FAO cannot act alone and should seek partnerships, in particular with governments and the relevant institutions as well as multilateral organizations. The recommendations for organizational arrangements to improve coordination within FAO as well as the establishment of the position of a Chief Statistician found support

FAO Governing Bodies' conclusions (Programme Committee)

References

Independent Evaluation of FAO's role and work in Statistics. PC 100/3 a)..

Available at: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/meeting/014/k2921e.pdf>

Management Response. PC 100/3 a) Sup. 1..

Available at: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/meeting/014/k3042e.pdf>

Report of the Hundredth Session of the Programme Committee. Rome, 6-10 October 2008. CL 135/5.

Available at: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/meeting/014/k3498e.pdf>

**ANNEX 1: EVALUATIONS OF EXTRA-BUDGETARY DEVELOPMENT
PROJECTS AND PROGRAMMES DURING 2008-09**

EVALUATIONS OF EXTRA-BUDGETARY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND PROGRAMMES DURING 2008-09		
Global and Inter-Regional		
	EP/GLO/201/GEF	Reduction of environmental impact from tropical shrimp trawling, through the introduction of by-catch reduction technologies and change of management
	EP/GLO/502/GEF	Land degradation assessment in dry lands (LADA)
	GCP /GLO/162/EC	EC/FAO Food Security Programme
	GCP/INT/945/ITA	Information products for decisions on water policy and water resources management in the Nile Basin - Follow-up to GCP/INT/752/ITA
	GCP/INT/952/EC	EC/FAO Food Security Programme (Phase II) - Account 3 EC/FAO Food Security Main Programme
	GCP/INT/958/AFB	Projet d'appui à la lutte préventive contre le criquet pèlerin dans quatre états membres de la CLCPRO- EMPRES
	GCP /INT/959/NET	Africa Stockpiles Programme - Netherlands contribution
Africa		
Regional	GCP/RAF/388/GER	Protecting and improving food and nutrition security of orphans and HIV/AIDS affected children (Phase I: Lesotho and Malawi)
Burkina Faso	GCP/BKF/042/LIB	Programme spécial de sécurité alimentaire au Burkina Faso - Phase I
Ethiopia	GCP/ETH/071/EC	Support to food security information system in Ethiopia
Chad	GCP/CHD/026/LIB	Programme spécial de sécurité alimentaire au Tchad - Phase I
Mali	GCP/MLI/024/LIB	Programme spécial de sécurité alimentaire au Mali - Phase I
Malawi	GCPS/MLW/030/NOR	Enhancing food security and developing sustainable rural livelihoods
Niger	GCP/NER/040/LIB	Programme spécial de sécurité alimentaire Phase I au Niger
Nigeria	UTF/NIR/047/NIR	The National Special Food Security Programme, Nigeria
Sudan	GCP/SUD/051/LIB	Special Programme for Food Security Phase I in Sudan
Sudan	OSRO/SUD/620/MUL	Sudan Institutional Capacity Programme: Food security information for action (SIFSIA) in Northern Sudan

Asia and Pacific		
Regional	GCP/RAS/209/NOR	The FAO Inter-Country Programme for the development and application of integrated pest management (IPM) in vegetable growing in South and Southeast Asia, Phase II
Regional	GTFS/RAS/198/ITA	Support to the regional programme for food security in the Pacific Island countries
Afghanistan	GCP/AFG/039/GER	Supporting the improvement of household food security, nutrition and livelihoods in Afghanistan
India	GCP/IND/176/NET	Andhra Pradesh water management project
India	GCP/IND/175/NET	Andhra Pradesh farmer-managed groundwater systems
India	GCP/IND/174/NET	Promoting livelihood improvements in dryland farming on the Deccan Plateau
Indonesia	OSRO/INS/601/ARC	Rehabilitation and sustainable development of fisheries and aquaculture affected by the tsunami in Aceh Province, Indonesia
Myanmar	GCP/MYA/009/EC	Support for sustainable agriculture and rural livelihoods in Northern Rakhine State of Myanmar
Philippines	GCP/PHI/050/ITA	Environmental animal health to redress emerging insect-borne and other disease constraints to smallholders' livestock production
Viet Nam	GCP/VIE/029/ITA	Integrated management of lagoon activities in Thua Thien and Hue Provinces
Latin America and the Caribbean		
Guatemala	GCP/GUA/012/SPA	Restauración de activos de las familias vulnerables pobres afectadas por la tormenta Stan en las cuencas del lago de Atitlán y río Naranjo
Guatemala	OSRO/GUA/601/SWE	Restauración de activos de las familias vulnerables pobres afectadas por la tormenta Stan en la cuenca del río Coatán y la parte alta de la cuenca del río Suchiate
Near East		
Iraq	OSRO/IRQ/402/UDG	Improvement of drainage conditions in major agricultural areas - Hilla-Hashimia Main Drain
Iraq	OSRO/IRQ/404/UDG	Assessment and emergency maintenance and rehabilitation community irrigation schemes
Iraq	OSRO/IRQ/406/UDG	Restoration of veterinary services in Iraq
Iraq	OSRO/IRQ/407/UDG	Restoration and development of essential livestock services in Iraq
Iraq	OSRO/IRQ/602/UDG	Community livelihoods and micro-industry support project in rural and urban areas of North Iraq
Lebanon	OSRO/LEB/701/UNJ	Early recovery assistance for the agriculture smallholder
Lebanon	OSRO/LEB/702/UNJ	Early recovery assistance to war-affected, resource-poor livestock keepers in Southern Lebanon
Somalia	OSRO/SOM/604/EC	Support to the Food Security Analysis Unit - Understanding livelihoods in Somalia - FSAU Phase V

Somalia	OSRO/SOM/702/USA	Nutrition information project, Food Security Analysis Unit, Somalia (Year 2007)
Somalia	OSRO/SOM/510/EC	ARDOPIS -Agricultural rehabilitation and diversification of high-potential irrigation schemes in Southern Somalia in Lower Juba and Shabelle River Basin (Jamama, Agfoi and Balad Districts)
Somalia	OSRO/SOM/511/EC	Agricultural rehabilitation and diversification of high-potential irrigation schemes in Southern Somalia (ARDOPIS) in Merka and Qoryooley districts (Somalia - Lower Shabelle)
Somalia	OSRO/SOM/608/EC	Support to pastoral livelihood development

