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1. **General background and context**

1. Growing populations, income gains and urbanization have made livestock one of the fastest growing sub-sectors of agriculture, and the largest user of agricultural land, directly as pasture and indirectly through the use of feed crops. Livestock contribute 40 percent of the global value of agricultural output and support the livelihoods and food security of almost a billion people. In many emerging nations, livestock sector growth has been largely unbalanced and has often not been accompanied by necessary adjustments in sector policies, governance and investments. Given its projected growth, the livestock sector can contribute significantly to society’s current and future environmental, social, economic and health objectives. Rapidly rising incomes and urbanization, combined with underlying population growth, are driving demand for meat and other animal products in many developing countries. Supply-side factors, such as the globalization of supply chains for feed, advances in genetics and other technologies are further transforming the structure of the sector.

2. Livestock-sourced food requires more feed, energy and water resources per unit product than most other food products. Meat, milk and eggs will therefore only be able to maintain their role as a provider of high-quality food if these higher resource needs will be brought in line with global resource availability. Currently, the livestock sector is a major contributor to climate change, land degradation, water pollution and the erosion of biodiversity. There is, however, large potential to reduce the sector’s ecological footprint, and enhance its role in climate change mitigation, nutrient recycling and biodiversity conservation. This can be done by addressing existing policy failures such as access to land, subsidies on inputs (water, feed and energy), by aligning incentives to environmental outcomes, rewarding providers of environmental services and promoting best practices. Previous experiences have shown that livestock farming can make a major contribution to soil carbon sequestration and the enrichment of biodiversity through the introduction of new technology and payment for environmental services. In other places, important reductions in water use and pollution have been achieved by reconnecting specialized livestock production with crop agriculture.

3. The livestock sector has particularly come into focus as worries about climate change, sustainability of food systems and public health protection, and the urgency of poverty reduction through agricultural development continue to grow. Such concerns are even more important as the world’s livestock production is expected to double by 2050 to feed its then population of more than 9.3 billion. Livestock are a vital component of agriculture and can significantly promote movements out of poverty in agrarian settings in developing countries. Possession of animals has been shown to signify essential place-markers in households’ trajectories out of poverty; livestock can provide a store of wealth and a productive asset that can lead to higher incomes through increases in agricultural productivity and diversification of income sources.

1.1 **FAO experience in the livestock policy sector**

4. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nation’s (FAO’s) Animal Production and Health division (AGA) has implemented several initiatives in the area of livestock policy. Between 2000 and 2007 FAO led the Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance Partnership (LEAD) hosted within AGA. The initiative’s purpose was to devise and promote ecologically sustainable livestock production strategies and practices while at the same time being concerned with reducing poverty. The focus was on the role of livestock in land degradation in arid lands, deforestation in the tropical humid areas, land and water pollution, and the contribution of livestock
to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Over the ten years of its existence it produced several major publications, operated a well-regarded electronic information centre and started field testing innovative concepts to manage the negative impacts of livestock. Some of the latter have been scaled up through support of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the World Bank and various national governments. The LEAD report “Livestock’s Long Shadow”, published in 2006, attracted international attention.

5. The Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Initiative (PPLPI) was also hosted by the Animal Production and Health Division (AGA) and was implemented between 2001 and 2010. PPLPI facilitated and supported the formulation and implementation of livestock-related policies and institutional changes that have a positive impact on the world’s poor. To achieve this, PPLPI combined stakeholder engagement with research and analysis, information dissemination and capacity strengthening.

6. Additionally, FAO’s 2009 edition of “The State of Food and Agriculture 2009: Livestock in the Balance”, the World Bank’s “Minding the Stock” (2008), and the multi-stakeholder “Livestock in a Changing Landscape” publications (2010), clearly indicated that the livestock sector was not contributing optimally to the provision of the goods that are expected of it, largely because the necessary policy changes, adjustments in the regulatory frameworks and supporting investments have not been made.

7. In June 2010, on the initiative of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation of the Netherlands (MEAAI), a number of countries and international organizations convened during the session of the FAO Committee on Agriculture (COAG) in Rome. Called the “Dialogue Group” they agreed to broadly consult on how to accommodate livestock production and sector growth in a socio-economic and environmentally sustainable fashion within growing resource constraints. They recommended the development of an Agenda of Action which would seek to shape the sector’s role in future global food systems. A second meeting of this Dialogue Group was held from 30 October to 2 November 2010 in The Hague, the Netherlands, in parallel with the Global Conference on Agriculture, Food Security and Climate Change, organized by MEAAI. This meeting suggested that a Global Agenda of Action for Sustainable Livestock Sector Development should be built on broad based, voluntary and informal stakeholder commitment to act towards improved sector performance, targeting natural resource protection while including poverty reduction and public health protection, as they relate to the livestock sector.

1.2 FAO’s experience in Multi Stakeholder Partnerships

8. Multi Stakeholder Partnerships (MSPs) can be broadly defined as processes in which diverse actors (e.g. government agencies, producer organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), private actors, donors and others) collaborate to achieve a common goal. They are designed for actions, initiatives or programmes that require cooperation among different stakeholders.

9. MSPs have become increasingly common starting from the 1990s when several United Nations organizations started to engage more with actors such as private sector, NGOs, social movements, governments (beyond donors and recipients) and producer organizations. This trend reflected the fact that partnerships are necessary as no single sector in society can deliver the complexities of sustainable development alone. This was reflected both in Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 8

---
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(global partnership for development) and in Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 17 (strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development). While these partnerships cannot be a substitute for government responsibilities and commitments, they continue to be instrumental in the implementation of the outcomes of several United Nations conferences and summits.

10. FAO has a long and broad experience in participating and hosting MSPs in the areas covered by its mandate. In the agriculture and rural development domain, a single organization often cannot achieve complex development goals on its own while also being efficient and cost-effective. It necessarily needs to engage in a process with multiple stakeholders to take effective actions and make efficient use of resources. Some examples of global level MSPs in which FAO is involved include the Global Soil Partnership, the Committee on World Food Security (CFS), the Collaborative Partnership on Forests, the Global Alliance for Climate-Smart Agriculture and the Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance Partnership.

2. Description of the Project

11. The Project started its implementation in December 2011 and had an initial timeline of two years with an initial budget of USD 1 830 000. A number of budget revisions and extensions, as well as the entry of new donors resulted in an overall budget of USD 4 750 308 and an end date of 30 September 2017. The main donor is the Federal Office for Agriculture of Switzerland which contributed around 85 percent of the project funds, while other donors are the Governments of France, Ireland, the Netherlands and New Zealand, and the Livestock Research Centre of Wageningen University and Research (The Netherlands). At the time of the evaluation the project expenditure is 100 percent.

12. The goal of the Project was to improve the sustainability of the livestock sector by establishing a multi stakeholder platform to build consensus on policies and actions for the sustainable development of the sector. The rationale for the Project was the need for increased awareness and evidence of the negative environmental impact of the livestock sector as well as its potential for contributing to sustainable development and poverty reduction. As mentioned, the FAO Committee on Agriculture in its 22nd session in 2010 recommended that such a platform be established and that it should be hosted in FAO. The Project therefore established the Global Agenda of Action (AoA) as a Multi Stakeholder Partnership committed to sustainable development of the livestock sector from a social, economic and environmental perspective. According to the 2017-2018 Project Document, the intended goal of the AoA is to provide a global platform, regionally and locally rooted, to comprehensively address the sector’s multiple challenges towards sustainable development. It also aims at facilitating global dialogue to foster local practice and policy change, focusing on innovation, capacity building, and incentive systems and enabling environments. Appendix 4 of the main report provides the project’s logical framework.

13. The aim of the partnership is to be open, voluntary, consensual and inclusive, based on mutual respect and built on voluntary stakeholder engagement from seven different clusters including civil society, public and private sectors, non-governmental organizations, academia and research, donors and multilateral organizations. It strives to be evidence-based and to foster knowledge as key to making livestock more sustainable. It also aims at supporting knowledge generation and sharing, along with technological, institutional and policy innovation. It intends to be a good example of SDG 17 (partnership for the goals) which recognizes that sustainable development can only be achieved by joint action.
14. In FAO’s Strategic Framework 2010-2019, the Global Agenda for Action is linked to Strategic Objective B (Increased sustainable livestock production) and specifically to the organizational result B04 (Policy and practice for guiding the livestock sector are based on timely and reliable information). As of 2013, FAO revised its Strategic Framework and the Project was aligned to Strategic Objective (SO) 2 (Increase and improve provision of goods and services from agriculture, forestry and fisheries in a sustainable manner). More specifically, it relates to SO2 Outcome 203 (Stakeholders endorse/adopt international (including regional) instruments and support related governance mechanisms for sustainable agricultural production systems) and to output 20301 (Stakeholders are supported to participate in, update existing and develop new international (including regional) instruments and mechanisms under the auspices of FAO). At the time of project formulation, FAO followed a different strategic framework.

15. A second phase of the Project has been agreed and will extend the current activities until December 2018, with the addition of a few new activities. The overall goal of the new Project progresses away from the establishment of the Agenda of Action and towards the policy and practice changes by members. The Project Document is available to the evaluation team.

16. The original project design did not include special measures and components related to gender; however this has been revisited in the new phase, where gender-related objectives have been included. These include the adequate representation of women in the Global Agenda’s stakeholder consultations, advocacy for sex-disaggregated data and gender-responsive livestock practices.
Figure 1: Timeline of key milestones

- **Context**
  - Increasing evidence and awareness of livestock sector’s environmental impact
  - 2000: FAO launches LEAD: Livestock, Environment and Development Initiative
  - 2010: Recommendation by FAO Committee on Agriculture (COAG 22) to establish AoA
  - 2016: Livestock is selected as main topic of the Committee on World Food Security Expert report (HLPE)

- **Project**
  - Dec 2011: Project start
  - 2011: First session of Multi Stakeholder Partnership held in Brazil
  - Sept 2017: Project End
  - Jan 2017: Phase 2 start
2.1 Institutional framework and coordination

17. Within FAO, the Project is housed in, and managed by the Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL) of the Animal Production and Health division (AGA).

18. The composition of the project team and the overall structure and governance of the Global Agenda have evolved since the Project’s beginning in 2011. This was foreseen by the project design, as it was expected that a learning and adaptive process would take place and that the governance of the Global Agenda would adapt based on the needs expressed by its participants.

19. At the time of the evaluation, the governance structure of the Global Agenda, illustrated in Figure 2, consists of two main bodies which represent the Global Agenda’s members: the Multi Stakeholder Partnership and the Guiding Group. In addition, the support roles of the Chair and the Agenda Support Team (AST) have been established to provide the support services in order for these bodies to function. These support roles comprise one of FAO's major roles in the Global Agenda as they provide the reporting, convening and facilitation functions. Further description of the roles and structure is provided below:

20. The **Multi Stakeholder Partnership** (MSP) is the plenary body of the Global Agenda and it provides a platform for dialogue and consensus building on priority issues and actions. It is the main decision-making body and it is composed of all Global Agenda members (full list in Appendix 2 of the main report). The MSP convenes once a year in different locations. All the other coordination, collaboration and support bodies of the Global Agenda report to the MSP. So far, seven MSP meetings have been held: Brasilia and Phuket 2011; Nairobi 2012; Ottawa 2013; Cali 2014; Panama 2016; and Addis Ababa 2017. The 8th MSP meeting is planned for June 2018 in Mongolia.

21. The **Guiding Group** (GG) is a more restricted group than the MSP and it provides the strategic direction of the Global Agenda and provides guidance and monitoring of its activities. It is composed of representatives of each of the seven stakeholder clusters (public sector, private sector, academia/research, donors, NGOs, social movements and intergovernmental organizations). Each cluster has up to five representatives to any GG session. The GG convenes twice a year at FAO headquarters in Rome and once during the annual MSP meeting. The FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) participated as an observer at the GG session in September 2017 and in February 2018.

22. The **Chair** acts as the facilitator of the Guiding Group and Multi Stakeholder Partnership meetings. He reports to the Guiding Group according to the tasks agreed in the work plan.

23. The **Agenda Support Team** (AST) is the Secretariat of the Global Agenda and provides the technical and operational support to ensure its functioning. It is hosted in FAO and it is composed of the FAO project coordinator (senior officer AGAL) and a FAO project manager (livestock policy officer AGAL). The AST is tasked with promoting inclusive interaction and cross-fertilization among the stakeholder clusters, while ensuring a coherent approach.

24. Nine **Action Networks** have been established throughout the Project’s implementation. These are the means through which the Agenda of Action engages in practical application of its principles and decisions. The action networks perform sector analysis, produce and disseminate tools, knowledge and pilot practical initiatives in countries. Recognized research centres and organizations are usually the leaders of the implementation of the activities of these Action Networks. The nine action networks are:
i. The Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance Partnership (LEAP)
ii. Closing the efficiency gap
iii. Restoring value to grasslands
iv. Waste to worth (targeting feed use of waste and productive use of livestock waste)
v. Dairy Asia
vi. Global Network on Silvopastural Systems
vii. Livestock Antimicrobial Partnership (LAMP)
viii. Livestock for Social Development
ix. Animal Welfare

25. In addition to its role as secretariat, FAO is also engaged as a stakeholder stressing the dual objectives of food security and the elimination of poverty, and has programmatic and technical collaboration with many partners of the Agenda of Action, increasing the quality and applicability of its products.

**Figure 2:** Organigram of the Global Agenda

26. In terms of human resources, at the time of the evaluation, the project team consists of the three core figures: i) the Project Coordinator, who is the senior officer of AGAL, and is the Project’s budget holder and lead technical officer; ii) a Project Manager who is a livestock policy officer of AGAL and manages day-to-day matters of the Project; and iii) a senior consultant who is the chair and moderator in the Global Agenda’s meetings. Together these three positions form the Global Agenda’s Support Team. In addition, the Project contracts additional support services such as communication and translation as needed.

### 2.2 Project stakeholders

27. The Global Agenda currently has 104 members divided into seven clusters that represent different groups in society concerned with sustainable livestock development. A full list of stakeholders is available in Appendix 2 of the main report. The members are grouped in the following clusters:

a. Public sector: representatives from governments
b. Private sector: representatives from private sector organizations
c. Academia/research: representatives from research organizations and universities
d. Donors: representatives from monetary contributors to the Global Agenda’s Trust Fund
e. Non-governmental Organizations: representatives from interest groups such as animal welfare and environmental or livelihood non-governmental organizations
f. Social movements and community-based organizations: representatives of pastoralists; indigenous people; agricultural workers; small farmers and peasants
g. Inter-governmental and Multilateral organizations: institutions that have a mandate in livestock sector development

2.3 Target Beneficiaries

28. The programme is largely focused on supporting normative work, with an indirect support to food security. It is expected that the impacts of the analytical work, knowledge sharing and networking, and the potential resultant changes in practices by relevant stakeholders will enhance potential livestock sector’s contribution to the achievement of environmental, social, economic objectives at the national level.

29. The Project does not include any gender-related special measures and components; however, its outcomes aim at potential contributions to the livelihoods of ‘extreme poor’, many of which are female.

3. Evaluation purpose

30. The Final Evaluation was envisaged at the project design stage. The purpose of the Final Evaluation is to provide accountability to the donors and partners by assessing FAO’s contribution to establishing and managing the Global Agenda of Action. Also, the evaluation aims at drawing lessons from the implementation processes and provides recommendations to FAO staff and AoA stakeholders for the programmatic improvement in its ongoing phase (October 2017–December 2018). Where possible, the evaluation will draw lessons for similar ongoing initiatives and potential future initiatives. Finally, the evaluation will contribute to FAO and other development practitioners’ understanding of multi stakeholder processes as a tool for achieving the 2030 Development Agenda. The main users of the evaluation are the FAO project team, FAO management and the stakeholders of the Global Agenda.

4. Evaluation scope

31. The evaluation will assess the entire implementation period of the Project, from December 2011 to September 2017. The evaluation will cover all key activities undertaken within the framework of the Project as described in the Project Document. The focus will be on design and delivery of results (outputs and outcomes) against the intended objectives.

32. The evaluation will also draw on the design of the second phase of the Project (October 2017–December 2018) in order to understand the Project’s own learning and adaptation process. This will allow for the evaluation to make forward looking recommendations. The evaluation will also make an assessment of intermediate results stated in the second phase, and assess the potential for the final results to be achieved.

33. Figure 3 below presents the evaluation scope in relation to the Project’s result chain.
Figure 3: Indicative intervention logic and evaluation scope

**Activities**

- Advocacy for stakeholder participation in Global Agenda
- Facilitate inclusive multi-stakeholder dialogue
- Produce technical analysis and methodologies of livestock sector status and trends

**Phase 1:**
- GCP /GLO/360 /MUL

**Phase 2:**
- MTF /GLO/787 /MUL

**Outputs**

- AoA is established as a functioning multi-stakeholder platform
- Technical reports and methodologies are provided to AoA members

**Short-term outcomes**

- Research, discussion and consensus building on livestock sustainability principles, including validation and field-testing
- General livestock sustainability principles are produced

**Medium-term outcomes**

- Stakeholders implement changes in their practices and policies

**Long-term outcomes (impact)**

- Livestock sector sustainability (economic, social, environmental) is increased (SDGs 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 17)
- Livestock sector growth reduces poverty and malnutrition (SDGs 1, 2)
5. **Evaluation objectives and key questions**

34. The **objectives** of the evaluation will be to:

   a. assess the appropriateness of the Project’s design and approach;
   b. assess the project’s achievements and contributions vis-à-vis its objectives;
   c. assess the potential impact of the Project and its contribution to building consensus on sustainable livestock sector development;
   d. identify key success areas and lessons, and make the appropriate recommendations to the project team, FAO, the donor and other stakeholders to guide decision-making and planning for the subsequent phase and similar projects.

35. The **Evaluation Questions** reflect the objectives and scope of the evaluation. They must be agreed upon among the Evaluation Manager and principal stakeholders, and accepted or refined in consultation with the evaluation team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Result chain level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent were the Project design, approach and implementation arrangements relevant and efficient?</td>
<td>Input/design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent did FAO, through the Project, successfully perform its facilitator, convener, technical and programmatic services in establishing and maintaining the GASL?</td>
<td>Output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent does GASL function effectively in an inclusive manner, also by mainstreaming gender considerations?</td>
<td>Short-term outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent have stakeholders adopted or are likely to adopt new practices or policies as a result of their participation in GASL?</td>
<td>Medium-term outcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. In addition, for each of the main evaluation questions above, a set of more detailed sub-questions are formulated in order to better focus the evaluation.

**Evaluation Question 1. To what extent were the Project design, approach and implementation arrangements relevant and efficient?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation sub-question</th>
<th>Area of focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 What needs were the project objectives addressing and was the project design appropriate, also considering other related initiatives?</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Did the Project align and contribute to the FAO Strategic Objectives and United Nations Development Agenda?</td>
<td>Alignment/contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 To what extent is the approach to sustainable livestock development promoted by the Agenda of Action aligned with FAO’s sustainability framework expressed through Strategic Objective 2?</td>
<td>Alignment/contribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 [http://www.fao.org/3/a-i3940e.pdf](http://www.fao.org/3/a-i3940e.pdf)
1.4 To what extent did the Project define clear and shared objectives for the Agenda of Action with measurable deliverables and a defined timeline?  

Design

1.5 Have gender considerations been incorporated in the project design?  

Gender

1.6 Were the potential stakeholders mapped and approached with an effective and targeted message in order to solicit their participation?  

Partnerships

1.7 To what extent did the Project establish partnerships with other FAO and non-FAO initiatives and projects?  

Partnerships

**Evaluation Question 2. To what extent did FAO, through the Project, successfully perform its facilitator, convener, technical and programmatic services in establishing and maintaining GASL?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation sub-question</th>
<th>Area of focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 To what extent has FAO supported open and voluntary stakeholder participation in an objective and unbiased manner?</td>
<td>FAO as facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 To what extent has FAO provided a neutral forum for discussion and negotiation and constructive consensus building?</td>
<td>FAO as convener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 To what extent has FAO provided high quality technical inputs (reports, assessments, methodologies) to the stakeholders for evidence based and informed discussion?</td>
<td>FAO as technical agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 To what extent has FAO promoted the creation of pilot initiatives and projects to test the principles discussed?</td>
<td>FAO as programming agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 To what extent has FAO been able to manage its multiple roles while avoiding overlaps and conflicts of interest?</td>
<td>FAO overall role</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Question 3. To what extent does GASL function effectively in an inclusive manner, also by mainstreaming gender considerations?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation sub-question</th>
<th>Area of focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the Agenda Support Team have the necessary human, financial and technical capacity to effectively support the functioning of the Agenda of Action?</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Do the members have appropriate capacity to participate and contribute to the Agenda of Action’s sessions?</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 To what extent do the members of the Agenda of Action constitute a balanced geographic and sectoral representation of livestock sector actors?</td>
<td>Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 To what extent do the members of the Agenda for Action participate and contribute to the sessions?</td>
<td>Participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Are the internal governance mechanisms appropriate to deliver the expected outcomes? Have sustainability considerations been taken into account in designing these mechanisms?

3.6 Are the FAO systems and procedures appropriate to ensure the effective functioning of the Agenda of Action?

3.7 To what extent has gender equality been mainstreamed in the work of the Agenda of Action?

---

**Evaluation Question 4. To what extent have stakeholders adopted or are likely to adopt new practices or policies as a result of their participation in GASL?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation sub-question</th>
<th>Area of focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What, if any, were the new tools, policies or practices adopted by members as a result of their participation in the Agenda of Action? What were the enabling or liming factors?</td>
<td>Adoption of tools, practices, policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 What are the most significant costs and benefits in participating in the Agenda of Action? (E.g. networking, knowledge, visibility, funding etc.)?

---

6. **Methodology**

37. The evaluation should adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards\(^3\) and be in line with the Office of Evaluation (OED) Manual and methodological guidelines and practices.

38. The evaluation will use a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods, drawing on multiple levels and lines of evidence. The evaluation questions have been informed by a review of evaluations and assessments of multi stakeholder processes within the United Nations system and draw on the criteria for effective partnerships expressed by the FAO’s Office for Capacity Development\(^4\) and the Bali Principles for Partnerships.\(^5\) These principles were respectively established by FAO and the United Nations Economic and Social Development Department in 2013 and 2002 to guide the increasing number of multi stakeholder initiatives and ensure their effectiveness in contributing to the United Nations Development Agenda.

39. The evaluation will use the following tools to collect primary data and evidence that answer the evaluation questions and sub-questions:

---


\(^5\) UN Department for Economic and Social Affairs, World Summit for Sustainable Development (2002) [https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/dsd/dsd_aofw_par/par_mand_baliquidprin.shtml](https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/dsd/dsd_aofw_par/par_mand_baliquidprin.shtml)
1. desk-review of existing Project Documents, reports and studies conducted by FAO and other partners;
2. semi-structured interviews with key informants including FAO staff, AoA members, stakeholders in partner organizations and donors, guided by checklists and/or interview protocols that will be developed at the beginning of the evaluation mission;
3. a survey of all AoA members based on the evaluation sub-questions, administered through an online questionnaire and designed and tested during the initial evaluation phase;
4. direct observation during sessions of the AoA Guiding Group held in Rome in September 2017 and February 2018.

40. Evaluation Question 1 will draw mostly on desk-reviews and semi-structured interviews with multiple key informants. Evaluation Questions 2, 3 and 4 will also draw on these tools, and will also be informed by the survey of AoA members. The direct observation of the AoA sessions will inform the evaluation team’s understanding of the dynamics and functioning of the AoA and will provide an opportunity for interaction with some of its members, thereby informing all evaluation questions.

41. The evaluation team will start by researching the context in which the Project was designed, and whether there was a preliminary needs assessment among key stakeholders. It will then research what these needs were, and whether the programme responded to them. To identify key stakeholders who are best able to answer the evaluation questions, the evaluation team will draw upon the stakeholder mapping carried out within the Project and will identify additional stakeholders as needed. While answering the Evaluation Questions, due consideration will be given to the fact that some of the members have been participating for several years while other have joined very recently which will ensure diverse views and perspectives.

42. Interviews will be conducted through face-to-face meetings, telephone/video calls and email exchanges. Field visits are not envisaged although this will be re-assessed during the initial evaluation phase and will be organized as needed.

43. The evaluation team will triangulate its findings with the project results framework’s outcome and output level indicators. The evaluation will adopt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation process including FAO and national partners. Triangulation of evidence and information gathered will underpin its validation and analysis and will support conclusions and recommendations.

44. A final stakeholder workshop will be arranged to discuss evaluation findings and recommendations with the project team. The timing and modality of the workshop will be decided during the evaluation, based on findings and conclusions, and in consultation with the project team and the AoA stakeholders.

7. Roles and responsibilities

45. The Office of Evaluation (OED) in consultations with the Budget Holder and the Project Manager will finalize the Terms of Reference (TOR), identify and recruit the consultant and organize the team’s work; it is responsible for the finalization of the TOR and of the team
composition; it shall brief the evaluation team on the evaluation methodology and process and will review the final draft report for quality assurance purposes in terms of presentation, compliance with the TOR and timely delivery, quality, clarity and soundness of evidence provided and of the analysis supporting conclusions and recommendations. The Office of Evaluation (OED) also has a responsibility in following up with the Budget Holder for the timely preparation of the management response and its follow-up.

46. The project team, which includes the FAO Budget Holder (who coincides with the Lead Technical Officer), the project manager and the chair are responsible for initiating the evaluation process, providing inputs to the first version of the Terms of Reference and supporting the evaluation team during its work. They are required to participate in meetings with the evaluation team, make available information and documentation as necessary and comment on the draft final terms of reference and report. The Budget Holder is also responsible for leading and coordinating the preparation of the FAO management response and the follow-up report to the evaluation, fully supported in this task by the project team. Office of Evaluation (OED) guidelines for the management response and the follow-up report provide necessary details on this process.

47. The evaluation team is responsible for conducting the evaluation, applying the methodology as appropriate and for producing the evaluation report. All team members, including the team leader, will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs for the final draft and final report. The evaluation team will agree on the outline of the report early in the evaluation process, based on the template provided by the Office of Evaluation (OED). The evaluation team will also be free to expand the scope, questions and issues listed above, as well as to develop its own evaluation tools and framework, within time and resources available. An evaluation report is not subject to technical clearance by FAO although the Office of Evaluation (OED) is responsible for quality assurance of all evaluation reports. The team members will also be responsible of completing an anonymous and confidential questionnaire requested by OED at the end of the evaluation to get their feedback on the evaluation process.

8. Evaluation team composition and profile

48. The evaluation team will comprise of the Evaluation Manager from the FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) and one or two international experts with a multidisciplinary range of expertise:

- Evaluation
- Livestock sector policy;
- Multi Stakeholder partnerships
- Institutional capacity development

---

6 The responsibility for the administrative procedures for recruitment of the team will be handled by the Office of Evaluation (OED).
9. **Evaluation products (deliverables)**

- **Draft evaluation report**: the project team and key stakeholders should review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria.
- **Final evaluation report**: should include an executive summary and illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation issues and/or questions listed in the TOR. The report will be prepared following the Office of Evaluation (OED) template for report writing.

10. **Evaluation time frame**

49. The evaluation will take place from the period December 2017 to August 2018. The main evaluation mission will last around five weeks, from end-November 2017 to end-January 2018 in Rome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ToR finalization</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>OED in consultation with FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team identification and recruitment Mission organization</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
<td>OED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading background documentation</td>
<td>February 2017</td>
<td>ET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission to Rome</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>OED, ET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft for circulation</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>OED, ET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final draft</td>
<td>August 2018</td>
<td>OED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder workshop</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td>OED, ET, FAO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>