



联合国  
粮食及  
农业组织

Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations

Organisation des Nations  
Unies pour l'alimentation  
et l'agriculture

Продовольственная и  
сельскохозяйственная организация  
Объединенных Наций

Organización de las  
Naciones Unidas para la  
Alimentación y la Agricultura

منظمة  
الأغذية والزراعة  
للأمم المتحدة

## PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

**Hundred and Eighteenth Session**

**Rome, 2 - 6 November 2015**

**Evaluation of FAO's contribution to climate change adaptation and mitigation**

*Queries on the substantive content of the document may be addressed to:*

**Masahiro Igarashi**  
**Director, Office of Evaluation**  
**Tel. +39 065705 3903**

*This document can be accessed using the Quick Response Code on this page;  
a FAO initiative to minimize its environmental impact and promote greener communications.  
Other documents can be consulted at [www.fao.org](http://www.fao.org)*



mo710

## **I. Introduction**

1. Climate change poses some of the most serious risks to agricultural production, food security, and the state of the world's forests, fish stocks and water supply.<sup>1</sup> Smallholder producers and the poor in the developing world are particularly vulnerable to the effects of more frequent and intense weather and climate events, thus complicating global efforts to promote long-term development through food security and poverty reduction. Considering the threat that climate change poses, FAO recently stated that addressing climate change will be among the Organization's top priorities over the next four years.

2. Adaptation of the world's natural-resource and food production systems to climate change and climate variability<sup>2</sup>, without compromising food security and nutrition, will naturally have to be a large component of global development efforts. At the same time, the agriculture, forestry and land-use (AFOLU) sectors account for thirty-three percent of global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions; therefore climate change mitigation must also be prioritized by these sectors.

3. This report provides a summary of an evaluation of FAO's contributions to climate change adaptation and mitigation (CCAM) from 2009 to 2014, conducted in response to request of the Programme Committee at its 112<sup>th</sup> session, in November 2012. The purpose of the evaluation is to:

- Provide accountability to FAO's Governing Bodies on the performance and contributions of FAO in the area of CCAM; and
- Provide senior management and FAO departments, divisions and decentralized offices with findings and lessons to enhance FAO's work on the critical issue of CCAM.

4. FAO's activities on CCAM have been carried out across a wide range of departments and divisions, including at the global, regional, sub-regional and country level. The Climate, Energy and Tenure Division (NRC) has been responsible for the overall coordination of FAO's climate change efforts. Between 2009 and 2014, FAO had a portfolio of 301 projects and programmes which, according to their objectives, explicitly sought to support CCAM. The total budget for this portfolio was USD 440.7 million. In 2014, 42 percent of CCAM projects were operationally active, with a budget of USD 319.1 million.

5. The evaluation seeks not only to assess FAO's work on the issue and indicate where improvements can be made in the future, but also to constructively guide the agency's future planning by highlighting areas of strengths that can be built upon. It examines FAO's global comparative advantages in CCAM in each of its different forms of assistance and engagement (i.e. international engagement in the UNFCCC and the Global Alliance for Climate Smart Agriculture; normative and analytical work; policy and strategy development; and field-level assistance) through assessing the relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and innovative quality of FAO's work in each of the areas.

6. The evaluation assessed the Agency's initiatives with respect to six issues:

- Climate-smart Agriculture (CSA);
- The use of programmatic, multi-sectoral and transboundary approaches;

---

<sup>1</sup> IPCC, 2014: *Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Core Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and L.A. Meyer (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 151 pp. in IPCC AR5 Synthesis Report website.

<sup>2</sup> Climate variability is included here under "climate change."

- The mainstreaming of longer-term climate change adaptation in disaster risk reduction (DRR) and emergency interventions;
- Gender mainstreaming in CCAM;
- Partnerships for CCAM; and,
- The extent to which CCAM has been mainstreamed into the rest of FAO's non-climate change specific development work.

7. While the evaluation covers FAO's work from the global to the local level, it is devoted in large part to examining the results of the organization's work at country level, where the desired changes are ultimately needed. In doing so, it assesses FAO's contributions from two perspectives: (i) FAO's work on CCAM; and (ii) how the agency has contributed to country-level CCAM readiness (i.e. the various policies, governance arrangements, knowledge systems, finance arrangements and implementation arrangements that, according to scholarship, FAO documents and global CCAM M&E practitioners, a country needs to have in place to effectively adapt to and mitigate climate change).

8. Finally, the report explains how some of the key challenges to FAO's future work on climate change are rooted in certain organizational factors of performance, including the agency's strategy and vision on CCAM, coordination activities, and degree of efficiency and resource mobilization.

## **II. Methodology**

9. The evaluation used a variety of methods for data collection and analysis to gather evidence, although primarily qualitative tools and methods were used, including semi-structured interviews; review of documents; use of team technical knowledge; surveys; and past evaluations.

10. Based on their vulnerability to climate change, size of FAO's CCAM-related portfolio and other factors, 11 member countries were visited in the regions of: Sub-Saharan Africa (Malawi, Zambia, Kenya), Asia and the Pacific (Bangladesh, Vietnam, Philippines, Vanuatu), the Near East and North Africa (Morocco), and Latin America and the Caribbean (Peru, Bolivia, St. Lucia). A sample of focus projects were reviewed in detail during the country visits. The team interviewed in total over 500 relevant stakeholders during the evaluation process. A survey of member countries and a survey of partner organizations were also conducted. Extensive documentation review and expert analyses of FAO's global engagement in climate change negotiations, especially with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and of FAO's engagement with the private sector on issues relating to CCAM, were also undertaken as part of the evaluation.

11. An internal reference group (IRG) of FAO staff was established for the evaluation, consisting of key managers and technical officers across the different sectors working on CCAM. The IRG was consulted during the development of the Terms of Reference, on evaluation methods, and on the draft evaluation report. An External Panel of three academic, research and independent experts reviewed the draft Terms of Reference and the final draft report, and was consulted on the evaluation methodology.

12. Perhaps the greatest challenge to the evaluation has been the lack of a clear understanding within FAO of what constitutes an intervention for CCAM and what does not. A wide range of measures exist, including various emergency response measures to climate-related disasters, DRR interventions, and those targeted or contributing to or indirectly supporting climate change adaptation. The evaluation found that FAO has lacked a conceptual framework to distinguish among these different types of interventions. It has also lacked clear criteria to differentiate between

projects that are designed primarily to address climate change and those which might make an indirect contribution to CCAM. As a result, the full extent and precise delimitations of FAO's portfolio on CCAM remains unclear.

### **III. Findings and Conclusions**

#### **1. FAO Comparative Advantages**

**Finding 1: FAO has a number of unique strengths with which to address CCAM. At the same time, important shifts in the organization's way of working are required to optimize FAO's approach to CCAM and its impact on food security and the agriculture sector.**

13. The evaluation found that FAO has a number of unique strength in CCAM. Its comparative advantages include: i) providing member countries with highly valued technical support, information and tools; ii) helping government agencies and other partners to harmonize climate change and DRR policies and strategies; and iii) acting as a trusted facilitator and neutral source of technical data among global climate-related institutions and forums. However, the evaluation also found several areas that could be improved to increase the effectiveness of FAO's own CCAM efforts, as well as its ability to assist and influence member countries and other international stakeholders. The findings on the most salient strengths and weaknesses are summarized below.

#### **2. FAO Representation Engagement at Country Level**

**Finding 2: It is through engaging with Government at country level that FAO can bring the greatest contributions on CCAM. However, the engagement of FAO Representations with governments and development partners on climate change as it relates to the agricultural sectors and food security has overall been modest due to capacity limitations on climate issues in FAO Country Offices.**

14. Generally speaking, and although there have been important exceptions and significant improvements in Country Office engagement over the evaluation period, Country Offices have not proactively and substantively interacted with Ministries of Agriculture to understand and propose solutions to national climate change issues as they relate to agricultural systems, and they have engaged even less with Ministries of Environment, the lead government agencies on climate change, and with other relevant public agencies. This is due largely to the limited expertise of FAO Representations on climate-related issues and has been particularly the case in Small Island Developing States (SIDS).

15. Many other development organizations, including those with far greater resources than FAO, have engaged directly with governments in country on climate change and the agricultural sectors much more so than FAO has, and member countries continue to develop their own capacities in these fields. In this context, however, FAO has not clearly defined its expertise and the assistance it can provide, and it is thus losing ground as a partner of Government on climate change as it relates to the agricultural sectors and food security. Governments, other partners as well as the evaluation team regard FAO as having strong comparative advantages in some areas of assistance, but also see that there has been a need for the organization to be more assertive in bringing proposals to the table, rather than being purely demand-driven and passive, and to be more outwardly oriented to other partners and the market.

### 3. The International Engagement of FAO in the UNFCCC and the GACSA

**Finding 3: In the UNFCCC, FAO has brought greater attention to the role of the agricultural sectors in CCAM through the knowledge it has provided at the sessions. Negotiators, however, have not benefited as much from their brief interactions with FAO as they would from in-depth information events outside the meetings. In the Global Alliance for Climate-smart Agriculture and the UNFCCC, there have been misunderstandings among some members about FAO's motivations behind promoting mitigation under the CSA approach. If left unaddressed, this could affect the agency's image as a neutral technical body.**

16. Assessing the impact of FAO on UNFCCC outcomes is challenging, as stakeholders view FAO's role as informing the meetings rather than influencing them. As a neutral observer to the UNFCCC, FAO has provided technical information at the sessions, in meetings, side events and documents. While this knowledge has been of use, and FAO is regarded as a trusted body, negotiators and other member country officials would benefit more if FAO provided additional detailed information to them on climate change issues relating to the agricultural sectors in regional and national workshops to help developing countries better understand complex matters under discussion in the UNFCCC, as well as aid the development of their negotiating positions. Regarding funding possibilities through the UNFCCC, a significant lost opportunity has resulted from FAO not having obtained accreditation for the Adaptation Fund, though it is currently seeking it for the Green Climate Fund.

17. Some developing member countries in the UNFCCC and the Global Alliance for Climate-smart Agriculture (GACSA) remain unclear regarding FAO's reasons for promoting Climate-smart Agriculture, specifically the pillar for mitigation, when the priority of members has been adaptation and mitigation is seen as potentially constraining their development. Most members regard FAO's position on CSA as sound and balanced, but the agency's espousal of it in these forums has concerned some stakeholders that FAO is adopting more of a political role in the UNFCCC and GACSA. If FAO does not clarify its approach to CSA in relation to those of other members of the forums, it will run a risk to its reputation. Generally, members believe that the Agency's most valuable contribution on CSA and mitigation in the forums would be to serve as a knowledge-provider and furnish evidence-based information on the potential for mitigation in the agriculture sector.

### 4. Normative Work and Analysis and Strengthening Member Country Data and Knowledge

**Finding 4: The analytical support, tools and data provided to member countries by FAO have been of substantial quality and have strengthened national knowledge and data systems for CCAM. While FAO has a clear comparative advantage in this area, it has not sufficiently sought to develop the capacity of member countries in CCAM analysis and knowledge generation.**

18. FAO's analytical tools, data and approaches on CCAM achieved a much wider impact where they have been among the most sophisticated and innovative of the agency's products, have been tailored to country contexts and needs, and supported and up-scaled by development investment partners. Generally, and with some important exceptions, FAO's knowledge-oriented assistance on CCAM has consisted of the agency carrying out the analysis or producing the data, with minimal participation of the member countries and the development of their capacities in these areas. This is especially noteworthy considering that capacity development in CCAM data and knowledge

generation is a high priority for member countries according to a survey conducted of them for the evaluation.

19. Based on the views of other knowledge organizations working on CCAM and the agricultural sectors of FAO's contributions in this area, the agency should also move more towards being a "knowledge aggregator", where it reaches out to other knowledge organizations that have more CCAM expertise in some areas, gathers and synthesizes their analysis, data and tools, and uses its close relationships with governments to channel the relevant information to them to inform policies, strategies, information systems and practices. While FAO has used the knowledge and data of other expert institutions for its CCAM work, its assistance to member countries, from the global to the country level, would benefit if it were to do so to a greater extent.

### **5. Assistance for Developing Country Enabling Environments, Including through Coordinating Stakeholder Institutions**

**Finding 5: One of FAO's greatest comparative advantages lies in its expertise-based alignment of the strategies of different ministries and departments involved in CCAM and DRR in agriculture. The agency's work in this area has brought about notable advances in the enabling environment at country level.**

20. FAO's contributions to policy and strategy development to address climate change in the agricultural sectors have been relevant and innovative in some countries. In others, FAO has not been invited to policy processes on climate change and agriculture, is not viewed as having strong expertise in this area or the sustainability of the effort was a concern.

21. While developing policies for CCAM should remain an important goal for FAO, its highest valued added lies in aligning and harmonizing the climate change and DRR strategies, policies and systems of government agencies and other partners. This is due in part to the changing global landscape on knowledge and governance on CCAM, as well as FAO's neutrality which is valued by both member countries and development institutions. There is much need for such work at the national level in member countries and at the sub-national one (where under decentralized political systems CCAM strategies are to be developed and capacities to address the issue improved) which FAO has an opportunity to address in the future, particularly in the SIDS.

### **6. Technical Assistance and Field-level Interventions**

**Finding 6: FAO's community-level projects produced some solid contributions to CCAM and climate-related DRR for small producers. However, overall these interventions do not reflect the agency's comparative advantage.**

22. The agency's community-level projects on CCAM and DRR generally demonstrated relevance to local needs, were participatory and benefited underprivileged groups, especially when non-governmental organizations played a large role in their design and implementation. However, few of these interventions were designed to address longer term climate change adaptation in an innovative way. Given the financial limitations of the Organization, they also had limited geographic reach, only a small subset of community-level projects used information on climate projections and evidence of adaptation or mitigation success, and showed upscaling prospects and influence on policy.

## 7. FAO Contributions to Country-Level CCAM Readiness

**Finding 7: FAO's contributions to national-level CCAM readiness systems have been largely in the areas of governance, policy and strategy, and knowledge and data, thus supporting the conclusions above on the agency's comparative advantages.**

23. While the agency has brought value in the areas of climate finance and implementing practices as well, there is room for improvement, particularly in strengthening institutions' capacities to implement climate change and DRR activities. An analysis of FAO's Strategic Objectives (SOs) 2 and 5, under which the agency's CCAM and climate-related DRR work largely falls, finds that according to various evidence sources the SO Outputs align to the elements needed for national-level CCAM readiness in the area of knowledge and data, and to some of those for governance, policy and strategy. However, the Outputs do not reflect important and more CCAM-specific policy and strategy elements that would be important to capture for assessing the agency's achievements on climate change.

## 8. Climate-smart Agriculture

**Finding 8: Climate-smart Agriculture has served FAO well as a high-level concept framing its work on CCAM, considering the agency's diverse portfolio on adaptation and mitigation across the different agricultural sectors, and the clear priority that member countries place on adaptation over mitigation. At the field level, only a small set of FAO's projects have reflected a pursuit of the Climate-smart Agriculture approach and they have done so somewhat imperfectly.**

24. FAO has largely pursued adaptation and mitigation separately from one another in its range of CCAM interventions. Member countries, while being interested in how mitigation and adaptation can benefit each other, have done the same and placed greater priority on adaptation. Hence using CSA as a flexible, overarching framework that encompasses all of FAO's CCAM work, rather than as an approach that member countries might perceive as on which necessarily includes mitigation, has been useful in this regard. Moreover, the Climate-smart Agriculture (CSA) approach, which consists of three pillars of improved agricultural productivity or incomes, adaptation, and mitigation where possible, has not properly reflected the context and issues related to climate change in the other natural resource sectors, such as forestry and fisheries. At the operational level, there were few field-level projects that could truly be categorized as "climate-smart" and which addressed food security adequately. Furthermore, the market-access dimension of food security and livelihoods was not fully addressed.

25. As FAO no longer focuses solely on assisting member countries to increase agricultural production in the traditional sense, the CSA concept has not entirely reflected its work. There are also opportunities and challenges for CCAM in food systems that FAO could better address. Given their importance for producers and consumers, vulnerability to climate change and sizeable contributions to GHG emissions, there is significant scope for FAO to increase its focus on value chains and food systems rather than merely food production, if it wishes to be more effective in pursuing adaptation, mitigation, and food security.

## **9. Programmatic, Multi-sectoral, Landscape, and Transboundary Approaches**

**Finding 9: FAO has adopted relatively few programmatic, multi-sectoral, landscape and transboundary approaches, which are essential for meeting the current and future challenges posed by climate change to the agriculture, forestry and fishery sectors.**

26. Longer term, broader programmatic approaches (rather than isolated, short-term projects of limited scope) that are key for meeting the challenge of climate change have yet to fully emerge in FAO's CCAM work, but can be seen in some countries and sectors. Similarly, multi-sectoral and landscape level approaches are also missing, due mainly to the need for better coordination and communication among FAO's technical departments. Few and small transboundary approaches were found, although increased region-wide programmes would be particularly relevant for SIDS.

## **10. Mainstreaming Long-term Climate Change Adaptation into DRR and Emergency Programmes**

**Finding 10: Longer-term climate change adaptation measures have been mainstreamed into FAO's emergency response and climate-related DRR interventions to a partial degree, and the agency's country-level UN cluster coordination on DRR has also promoted adaptation. A key challenge in this regard has been the lack of conceptual clarity and guidance on the differences among emergency, DRR and long-term adaptation interventions.**

27. In the three countries examined for mainstreaming of longer-term climate adaptation in emergency response and DRR (Bolivia, Kenya and the Philippines), climate change adaptation was integrated to the extent that sustainability measures, livelihood diversification and some climate-oriented technologies were included as adaptation practices. The agency has also moved emergency and DRR measures further in the direction of long-term adaptation in these and other countries through the coordination of and influence on coordination clusters that are typically set up in emergency responses. In Africa, FAO has provided guidance for mainstreaming CCAM into programmes at the regional and sub-regional levels. In the Haiyan response, mainstreaming adaptation was difficult due to the sudden onset of the disaster, short-term nature of the projects, and lack of clarity on how the resilience concept was to be applied at field level, but was achieved to a notable degree.

28. There has been a significant lack of clarity within FAO on the meaning of climate change adaptation as it applies to projects for emergency response, DRR and incremental climate change. The agency will need to achieve a greater understanding and consensus on climate change adaptation if it is to be more effective in supporting it. Distinguishing among interventions in terms of how much they contribute to resilience versus climate adaptation would be difficult if not unproductive, but field projects need some guidance of how the interventions are different and what the best practices are to develop effective climate adaptation interventions in specific contexts.

## **11. Addressing Gender Inequalities in FAO's Climate Change Work**

**Finding 11: A substantial gap in mainstreaming gender in FAO's climate change work exists though women as project recipients have benefited in a small number of CCAM projects. FAO recognizes that globally climate change will have greater impacts on women, but this was not always reflected in the Agency's operations in this area.**



29. Significant efforts have been made by FAO's gender specialists to mainstream gender into the organization's climate change-related activities. However, there remain substantial gaps in gender mainstreaming, particularly at country level, due largely to the limited resources the agency has devoted to it and the weak understanding of gender by technical staff. As a result, the consideration of the impacts on women and gender relations in project designs has been uneven or unclear. In some projects women have benefited, though the effects on gender relations are unknown. In some cases, there has been a positive influence on women's empowerment, participation, decision-making and control over resources. Globally, FAO recognizes that climate change will adversely affect women more than men, but only one project in the 11 focus countries visited focused on addressing the specific issues that women face and developed their abilities in decision-making. This focus was possible in part due to NGO partner knowledge on the issues. Focusing more on gender will be necessary not only for the sake of women's equality, but also because their empowerment is generally positively associated with poverty reduction, child nutrition, education and governance.

## **12. Partnerships for CCAM**

**Finding 12: FAO pursued relatively few strategic partnerships with NGOs, other knowledge organizations and the private sector for CCAM to, respectively, disseminate best practices, draw on advanced expertise and data, and influence global food systems. While its partnership with other UN entities has brought some important achievements, FAO's relationship with development investment institutions has enabled its expertise to have a much wider impact.**

30. The evaluation found few partnerships with knowledge organizations at country level, in which FAO drew on the broader intellectual capacity of research institutions or universities with equal or greater skills. This was a missed opportunity for FAO to strengthen its work in-country and develop member country capacities.

31. Despite the activity of several NGOs at field level and of CSOs representing small producers, there was little strategic partnership with them for assisting communities on climate change adaptation or climate-related DRR, or sharing of FAO best practices for their implementation in the field. Such collaboration would be useful in helping FAO beneficiaries overcome the barriers to adopting climate adaptation practices. Where NGOs have led important climate change knowledge and advocacy networks involving other major stakeholders, FAO has not participated although its information on the subject could be useful to them.

32. Through the Investment Centre, FAO has contributed its technical expertise to a large portfolio of CCAM and climate-related DRR projects of multilateral development institutions, as well as provided advanced tools and approaches that the institutions have supported, and this has served to significantly increase the impact of FAO's expertise. However, FAO's ability to influence the priorities of the investment partners is limited.

33. Although inter-UN agency partnerships for CCAM through Joint Programmes have produced some good results (such as the global UN-REDD), FAO and other agencies have worked largely in silos. There have also been inefficiencies due to the different systems used by each agency, as well as competition among agencies, which member countries have found challenging.

34. While the private sector's motives may differ from FAO's, it has invested heavily in "greening" supply chains and ensuring their resilience to the effects of climate change. Considering the central role of the private sector in agriculture and value chains, there have been insufficient FAO partnerships with the sector on climate change. Formal partnerships, subject to due diligence, are not the only option and informal partnerships have been encouraged. The agency is well positioned to work with the sector, based on its previous experience with it, in harmonising diverse systems for sustainability assessment which include CCAM, and then to assist member countries in regulating private-sector value chains to be sustainable and climate-friendly. In terms of formal partnerships with the sector for CCAM financing, which will be necessary to meet global climate-related challenges, FAO has developed a few recent initiatives and is exploring additional opportunities.

### **13. Climate Change Mainstreaming in FAO's Development and Ecosystem Services-Related Work**

**Finding 13: FAO has mainstreamed CCAM into its regular, non-climate specific development work to a modest extent overall, and guidance and processes for a systematic mainstreaming of climate considerations in the agency's projects and programmes have not been developed.**

35. In order to test the view, prevalent in FAO, that much of the agency's non-climate change specific work contributes in some manner to climate adaptation, the evaluation reviewed 22 food security, poverty reduction, value-chain development and ecosystem-based management projects and regional programmes in the 11 focus countries; these were assessed against mainstreaming criteria developed from academic and development organization literature. Ultimately, this view could not be validated: CCAM mainstreaming in FAO's agricultural development and food security activities is overall mixed, and dependent upon the knowledge and motivation of individual staff. FAO lacks clear mainstreaming criteria for climate change. Given the threat of climate change to agriculture and food security, a minimum degree of CCAM mainstreaming in FAO's portfolio would seem to be required. Mainstreaming climate change will also help to incorporate basic design and implementation best practices into projects and programmes.

### **14. Factors of Performance**

**Finding 14: A clear and explicit CCAM strategy is needed to focus FAO's work on the interventions, countries and partnerships where a meaningful difference can be made. Agency-wide coordination to develop a strategy and facilitate cross-sector collaboration has emerged yet requires strengthening. Relative to other organizations, FAO's resources spent on CCAM have been rather modest and its procurement of available funding could have been faster; however achieving meaningful outcomes with fewer resources is possible.**

#### *Strategy and Vision*

36. The lack of a CCAM strategy has resulted in disconnected climate-related initiatives without any clear articulation with broad agency aims. Underlying this absence of a strategy has been a lack of clarity on what constitutes a direct CCAM-focused intervention, versus others that contribute to CCAM indirectly or by promoting sustainability. Much of the reason for the absence of an explicit strategy on climate change is that the organization has seen CCAM as fully synonymous with natural resource sustainability, the overarching concept framing the SO2 and FAO's agricultural and natural

resource-oriented work as a whole. However, CCAM can require additional measures. Sustainability is then necessary but not sufficient for adaptation.

37. More profoundly, and in light of the impact that climate change is likely to have on agriculture and poverty reduction, and humankind more generally, FAO's commitment to the issue has not yet been translated into concerted actions at the level of global dialogue. The agency has been less active, organized and strategic than it needs to be in utilizing potential opportunities for funding and developing common agendas with donors, member countries and development organizations. Finally, the capacity in FAO is not in place yet for the agency to adequately address the challenge of climate change to agriculture and food security.

#### *Coordination*

38. Coordination in FAO on CCAM and climate-DRR over the review period created a good foundation for future efforts. Yet at a more fundamental level there is a significant gap in coordination, as seen in the lack of coherence in FAO's work; the absence of broader programme and multi-sectoral initiatives; low engagement of decentralized offices; and weak coordination on funding.

#### *Resources and Efficiency*

39. While member countries cited slow administrative processes in FAO as a challenge to working with the agency, no major inefficiencies were found in the agency's CCAM and climate-related DRR work over the period. Overall, FAO's resources for addressing climate change – USD 440.7 million from 2009 to 2014 – were markedly smaller compared to the CCAM budgets of some other development institutions. The agency has also not been very efficient in accessing funds, including those from the Adaptation Fund and Global Environment Facility (GEF). The agency now has a sizeable pipeline of CCAM projects funded by the GEF, which is an important source for climate funding, but it took long to develop the portfolio compared to other UN agencies, due in large part to the capacity limitations of FAO Representations. At the same time, given the generally slow implementation of all FAO-GEF projects, there is a concern that the agency may not be able to contribute to CCAM as much as expected through its GEF portfolio.

40. Regarding the "value for money" of FAO's work, meaningful outcomes have been achieved with modest resources when the aims were strategic in nature. However, the results from a survey of member countries on the benefits versus the costs of working with FAO on CCAM are inconclusive.

## **IV. Recommendations**

41. Addressing the findings and conclusions above, the report provides six recommendations. These are closely linked, and the development of a climate change strategy or action plan (Recommendation 1) lays the foundations for many of the recommendations that follow.

<b>Recommendation 1. Develop a strategy for FAO's work on climate change and climate-related DRR and enhance the agency's staff capacity on CCAM</b>
--

- A) Developing a Climate Change Strategy: As climate change is now one of the top three priorities for FAO, and is one of the main global threats to agricultural systems, food security and poverty reduction in our age, the organization should develop a cross-cutting and rolling strategic plan on climate change. This should be done with the involvement of all specialized expertise on climate change available in FAO and through a coordination body established that engages all relevant entities in the agency. To develop the strategy a coordination body should be established. The development of an FAO climate change strategy should be regarded as urgent. However, this does not mean that a change in the SO framework is required. The climate change strategy may instead be a concrete action plan cutting across all SOs.
- B) Increasing FAO Capacity: Enhance FAO's staff capacity and knowledge on climate change to enable the development of the climate change strategy and the implementation of many of the recommendations below, particularly at country level.

**Recommendation 2. Strengthen FAO's country-level engagement on climate change, and position the agency as a facilitator of inter-institutional and inter-sectoral harmonization on CCAM, climate-related DRR and emergency response to natural disasters**

- A) Strengthening Country Engagement: In consultation with the FAO Representations, FAO should strengthen the capacity of its Country Offices to engage more proactively and substantively on CCAM and climate-related DRR policy, strategy and investment, with government ministries and major development partners at national level. The countries where these efforts should be focused ought to be the same as any that may be prioritized in the climate change strategy (under Recommendation 1).
- B) Facilitating Inter-Institutional Strategic Harmonization: In the selected priority countries identified FAO should actively explore opportunities with the ministries for agriculture, environment, other natural resource management sectors, disaster risk management and emergency response, and sub-national government entities, to serve as a neutral and expertise-based inter-/intra- institutional facilitator to coordinate and align different sectoral strategies and systems for increased harmonization on all climate-related issues at national and sub-national levels.

**Recommendation 3. Communicate FAO's position on CSA more clearly to all stakeholders**

- A) Owing to remaining member-country and stakeholders questions regarding FAO's promotion of CSA, FAO should ensure that it communicates clearly its CSA approach, particularly its position on mitigation and its role of providing the evidence base on it, to stakeholders in the UNFCCC and GACSA, but also more widely to all member countries.

**Recommendation 4. Position FAO in the most relevant global climate change forums, and enhance knowledge provision for the UNFCCC process**

- A) Positioning FAO Globally: The agency should ensure that it is well-positioned in UN System discussions on climate change and other international forums to increase the attention to food security and agricultural systems on the global climate agenda, be a lead voice on these issues and garner additional resources.

- B) **Enhancing Knowledge Provision for the UNFCCC Process:** As a neutral knowledge provider to the UNFCCC, and given the substantive information needs of negotiators on agricultural issues, FAO should develop and implement activities for providing them, particularly those from the developing countries, with the knowledge they require to be more informed and prepared on climate change and agricultural issues (including fisheries, forestry water and land) as they relate to the negotiations. However, the agency should be clear that it is not promoting any particular positions in the negotiations in helping countries prepare for them, but is merely providing the information base.

**Recommendation 5. Integrate capacity development and a gender focus into FAO's CCAM projects, improve conceptual guidance on climate change adaptation, and mainstream CCAM into the agency's development and NRM work**

- A) **Strengthening Member-Country Capacity on Climate Change:** Given the importance that member countries give to capacity development, in reviewing projects and programmes for inclusion in the CSA Major Area of Work, FAO should ensure that any that include a component for conducting analysis, or developing and/or applying an analytical tool or data, also includes an adequate component for capacity development of member-country staff for the analysis or tool. Similarly, capacity development should be a component in all new CCAM-related analytical and knowledge products.
- B) **Strategically Addressing the Gender Dimension:** In accordance with FAO's recognition of the greater adverse impacts on women globally from climate change, FAO in consultation with member countries should conduct national-level assessments in a select number of priority countries of the effects of climate change and variability, and climate-related disasters on women and gender relations in their key agricultural sectors in order to provide FAO and member countries with the foundation to develop a set of projects specifically to address this important issue.
- C) **Providing Conceptual Guidance on climate change adaptation:** FAO should see to it that there is greater conceptual clarity throughout the SOs and contributing departments on the different possible interventions in the areas of DRR and CCAM, including climate-oriented emergency response measures and the extent to which their different approaches can contribute to climate change adaptation, using FAO knowledge and the global evidence base.
- D) **Mainstreaming CCAM in FAO:** Involving all the SOs, technical departments and decentralized offices, FAO should develop a practical set of criteria and guidance for a basic level of climate change and variability mainstreaming in the agency's non-CCAM explicit food security, poverty reduction and agricultural development projects to better ensure that all of FAO's work is CCAM-oriented, and the criteria should be introduced into project design and implementation.

**Recommendation 6. Increase partnerships with NGOs, other knowledge organizations, multilateral investment institutions and the private sector**

- A) **Partnering with NGOs and Knowledge Organizations:** Based on the significant role and experience of NGOs in field-based CCAM work and advocacy, FAO should partner more with them and with national organizations of small-producers to share with them its knowledge on

best practices for CCAM and DRR, and to develop agreements for project implementation. Given the knowledge that research and academic institutions at global, regional and country level have to offer on CCAM, FAO should seek to draw on their information for project development and implementation.

- B) Partnering with Investment Institutions: To achieve a much wider impact for CCAM in the agricultural sectors, FAO should discuss with the selected priority countries (or others) and investment partners the potential applicability of its advanced climate-related tools and data in country investment operations and explore the demand for other tools that FAO can provide.
- C) Engaging with the Private Sector: While respecting its own due diligence procedures, FAO should establish more collaborative arrangements with private sector stakeholders in the development of CCAM knowledge products, projects, and harmonized metrics for assessing CCAM opportunities in agricultural and food systems.

The full report and annexes of this evaluation are available on the Office of Evaluation's Website:

<http://www.fao.org/evaluation>

### **List of Annexes**

1. Terms of Reference
2. List of Climate Change Projects by Lead Technical Unit Division
3. List of Interviewees
4. Focus Projects in Evaluation
5. Knowledge Partner Survey
6. Member Country Survey
7. Country Mission Reports
8. Project Reviews
9. Detailed Contributions to Country-level Climate Change Readiness, Bibliography, Alignment of Strategic Objectives 2 and 5 to Contribution Map Elements
10. FAO Normative and Analytical Products on Climate Change
11. Projects Reviewed for Climate Change Mainstreaming, Documents, and Bibliography
12. Team Member Profiles
13. Expert Panel Member profiles