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Annex 3. Evaluation survey analysis

1. Consolidated findings (internal/external surveys)
   November 2016-January 2017

1. Six surveys (using SurveyMonkey software) covering both the staff of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) working across all offices (country, regional and subregional and headquarters) and FAO’s partners in the different Emergency Prevention System (EMPRES) sectors (Animal Health, Aquatic Animal Health, Plant Protection, Forest Health and Food Safety) were sent to 721 persons and organizations. Despite a long opening (30 November 2016–6 January 2017), less than 30 percent of the target responded to the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surveys</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Targeted</th>
<th>Not delivered</th>
<th>Resp. rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Health</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Protection (Plant Pests and Diseases)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Safety</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Animal Health</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Health</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 Familiarity and knowledge of EMPRES

2. Nearly three quarter (71-73 percent) of the overall respondents were knowledgeable about EMPRES, while one third of the external respondents were not familiar with it. This percentage is quite high for a programme created in 1994. There seems to be an assumption that the programme is known, in part due to its longevity. The outcome of the survey may indicate the need to conduct a new “visibility campaign” across sectors and around the world on EMPRES, its role and core functions in order to increase its potential.

1.2 FAO’s communication products

3. Internally the Food Chain Crisis Intelligence and Coordination Unit products were assessed critically and rated differently depending on their use. These products were mainly used for ‘early warning purposes’ for nearly 45 percent of the respondents but rarely or never were these products used when the purpose was either ‘resource mobilization’ or ‘long-term forecasting’. Except in the case of early warning, at least one person out of three rarely or never used these products when it comes to coordination, resource mobilization, long-term forecasting, risk analysis and advocacy.

4. At the same time, partners across sectors were less critical and appreciated some of the FAO products for their technical guidance, the strengthening of programmes and the awareness raising.
1.3 Partnership

5. The partnership was assessed against the results achieved, the knowledge transferred or gained, the complementarity of roles and the quality of the partnership, and the respondents were asked to rate their top three partners against these.

6. From an FAO perspective, partnerships with universities and to a minor extent with non-governmental organizations were assessed negatively. Overall partners rated positively the partnership across the various sectors with slightly more than one person out of ten assessing the partnership as fair.

1.4 Response

7. In both cases (FAO staff and partners), the majority of the respondents had contributed to a response. Overall partners have assessed the response positively (between 65 to 80 percent) in terms of impact, planning, implementation, technical direction, collaboration with governments and partners. They raised some concerns about timeliness and gender equality. The crisis was either controlled or minimized thanks to this response for nearly 73 percent of the respondents. The lessons learned from these interventions were shared in most of the cases (nearly 66 percent) except for food safety (25 percent).

8. Internally a third to half of the respondents were not able to answer the question related to gender mainstreaming. 52 percent of those who did stated that the response contributed “in some limited way to gender equality”.

9. The categories below were taken from the “IASC Gender Marker” which is a tool that codes, on a 0-2 scale, whether or not a humanitarian project is designed to effectively respond to the different needs of men, women, girls and boys within the affected population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender-focus approach response?</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The response contributed significantly to gender equality</td>
<td>14,0</td>
<td>35,1</td>
<td>50,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through all its activities and outcomes advancing gender equality</td>
<td>20,7</td>
<td>36,9</td>
<td>52,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The response contributed significantly to gender equality</td>
<td>10,8</td>
<td>34,4</td>
<td>41,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(gender mainstreaming)</td>
<td>24,6</td>
<td>34,5</td>
<td>50,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The response contributed in some limited way to gender equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender is not reflected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Internally again a tiny majority (51 percent) stated that the lessons learned from these responses were not shared while 49 percent stated they were. When asked on good practices related to lesson learning, very few were able to provide evidence or examples.

1.5 One Health

11. An overwhelming majority (91 percent) of FAO staff sees an added value in FAO taking on board the One Health approach while 69 percent witnessed the adoption of this approach in their region or country.

12. Partners from the animal health (91.5 percent) and the aquatic animal health (80 percent) sectors were the most familiar and convinced with the One Health approach while one third of the ‘plant protection’ and ‘forest health’ sectors were not familiar with it.

13. With the exception of the plant protection and the food safety sectors, a majority of the partners knew of other organizations (not FAO), including private sector partners, involved in food chain crises (e.g. preparedness, contingency planning, response): World Health organization (WHO), World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE), United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), regional organizations, international regional agency for agricultural health (OIRSA).

14. The majority of FAO staff were not aware of any private sector involvement in preparedness and response activity.

15. The big absent in both responses seems to be definitely the private sector. This lack of knowledge, links or synergies with the private sector is also witnessed by the very few respondents (less than 8 percent) originating from this sector.
1.6 Additional partner’s perspective

16. More than three quarters of the partners agreed with the fact that FAO works effectively for building resilience to food chain crises, has a standard setting and guidance role to play in addressing food chain crises and ensures sustainability. Moreover, for the majority of respondents FAO’s efforts in building resilience (supporting risks sensitive policies, monitoring and early warning, prevention and vulnerability reduction, emergency preparedness and mid- to long-term response, rapid response, coordination of stakeholders and enabling research) either stayed the same (23 percent) or improved (44 percent) over past four years. 10 percent of the respondent stated that FAO’s efforts were weakening in the rapid response over the past four years.

17. More than 60 percent of the partners knew of the existence of a national or regional animal disease tracking system supported by FAO but were not aware (55 percent) of any monitoring system capable of tracking hazards and threats from multiple sectors.

18. A high percentage (43 percent) of persons were unaware of FAO’s support in the design of preparedness or contingency plans for future food chain crises indicating the need to better communicate about these plans.

1.7 Additional FAO perspective

19. A majority of respondents (56 percent) stated that, over the past four years, the relevance of the Food Chain Crisis Intelligence and Coordination Unit remained the same (29 percent) or even grew (27.7 percent) while a small proportion (6 percent) thought its relevance was decreasing.

20. A majority of the internal respondents advised to strengthen “significantly” the Intelligence and Coordination Unit in the following areas: coordination between EMPRES teams (55 percent), risk analysis (51 percent), advocacy beyond FAO (57.5 percent) and resource mobilization (62.5 percent). The latter representing the highest score under this mention.

21. For a majority of the respondents (from 50 to 67.5 percent), the organizational set-up of the Intelligence and Coordination Unit responded (somewhat yes to definitely) to the current needs of FAO constituencies in terms of early detection, improved early warning, preparedness, contingency planning, coordination, forecasting, risk analysis and advocacy.

22. The set-up was not deemed so appropriate in terms of enabling research (35 percent of somewhat no to not at all) and resource mobilization (32 percent of somewhat no to not at all).
2. Way forward

23. Both FAO staff and partners were asked to list some priorities for FAO to improve its efforts to build resilience to food chain crises. Both respondents drafted a long list of areas to focus on with recommendations which can be summarized as per the table below.

**Table 1: Areas to focus - partner's perspective**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Knowledge transfer</th>
<th>Building capacities</th>
<th>Coordination role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Health</td>
<td>Keep the focus on supporting Member Countries using the existing national expertise and linkages</td>
<td>Continued capacity building</td>
<td>Allocate sufficient human resources and budget to EMPRES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Protection</td>
<td>Develop (new) national expertise</td>
<td>Continued capacity building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Safety</td>
<td>Raise awareness of Food Chain Crisis linked to food safety</td>
<td>Continued capacity building</td>
<td>Strengthened coordination and collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Animal Health</td>
<td>Technical support in setting biosecurity guidelines, disease monitoring, preparedness and response</td>
<td>Continued capacity building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Health</td>
<td>Technical support in establishing surveillance systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stimulate the exchange of information between countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Areas to focus - FAO staff’s perspective**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge transfer (guidance)</th>
<th>Building capacities</th>
<th>Coordination and advocacy role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stronger focus and engagement at country and regional level</td>
<td>Continued capacity building</td>
<td>Resource mobilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support in preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinated information platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support in early systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthened coordination and collaboration among EMPRES teams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. A few additional interesting recommendations were drafted by few FAO staff and summarized here:
- stronger involvement of the communities;
- promoting One Health approach;
- strategic vision related to the components of the Food Chain Crisis and to the risk forecasting;
- promoting the public-private partnership;
- enabling the environment of the Food Chain Crisis by incorporating it in the FAO country programme framework and developing resilience strategic documents.
Annex 4. List of key products identified by survey respondents

**FCC-ICU**
- EMPRES Quarterly EW Bulletins
- FCC Monthly Information sheets

**Animal Health**
- EMPRES Animal Health bulletin
- EMPRES Animal Health Risk Analysis
- GEMP Manual
- Rinderpest Manual
- Guidelines for contingency planning, national control plans preparation and surveillance
- Lumpy skin disease Manual
- Situation Updates (on H7N9 and MERS CoV)
- Global animal disease intelligence reports

**Plant protection**
- FAO Locust watch
- Desert Locust monthly bulletins
- Desert Locust situation updates
- elocust3
- Desert Locust Guidelines (Volume 1-7)
- FAO Desert Locust Standard Operating Procedures (Guidelines)
- FAO Guidelines for Pesticide Trials against Desert Locust Hoppers (Guidelines)
- WMO / FAO Weather and Desert Locust (Guide), 2016

**Food safety**
- FAO/WHO Framework for developing national food safety emergency response plans

**Forest health**
- Guide to implementation of phytosanitary standards in forestry
Aquatic animal health

- FAO National Aquatic Emergency Preparedness and Response System Self-Assessment Questionnaire