Evaluation of the FAO Technical Cooperation Programme

Annex 3. Key results – Government stakeholder survey
1. Respondent profile

![Respondent profile chart]

- **Region**
  - REU: 5%
  - RAF: 39%
  - RNE: 5%
  - RAP: 20%
  - RLC: 31%

- **Country Income**
  - High-income: 3%
  - Low-income: 31%
  - Lower-middle income: 42%
  - Upper-middle income: 24%

- **Gender**
  - Female: 37%
  - Male: 63%

2. Extent to which TCP and TCPF projects are strategic

![TCP and TCPF strategicness chart]

- **TCP**
  - Highly Strategic: 45%
  - Quite Strategic: 30%
  - Somewhat Strategic: 18%
  - Not Strategic: 8%

- **TCPF**
  - Highly Strategic: 44%
  - Quite Strategic: 30%
  - Somewhat Strategic: 18%
  - Not Strategic: 4%

By region:
- **RAP**
  - Highly Strategic: 45%
  - Quite Strategic: 30%
  - Somewhat Strategic: 18%
  - Not Strategic: 8%
  - Not Applicable: 3%

- **RLC**
  - Highly Strategic: 45%
  - Quite Strategic: 30%
  - Somewhat Strategic: 18%
  - Not Strategic: 4%
  - Not Applicable: 3%

- **RNE**
  - Highly Strategic: 44%
  - Quite Strategic: 30%
  - Somewhat Strategic: 18%
  - Not Strategic: 8%
  - Not Applicable: 3%

- **RAF**
  - Highly Strategic: 45%
  - Quite Strategic: 30%
  - Somewhat Strategic: 18%
  - Not Strategic: 4%
  - Not Applicable: 3%

- **REU**
  - Highly Strategic: 45%
  - Quite Strategic: 30%
  - Somewhat Strategic: 18%
  - Not Strategic: 8%
  - Not Applicable: 3%

---

1 This annex presents key results of findings from government stakeholder survey cited in Section 3.1 and 3.5 of the main report. Paragraph 11 of the main report explains the coverage of the survey.
3. **TCP funding as viewed by government stakeholders**

### By Income Level

- **High-income (HIC)**
- **Upper-middle income (UMIC)**
- **Lower-middle income (LMIC)**
- **Low-income (LIC)**

### By Region

- **RAP**
- **RLC**
- **RNE**
- **RAF**
- **REU**

4. **Relevant in meeting country priorities/needs**

### By Income Level

- **Highly Relevant**
- **Quite Relevant**
- **Somewhat Relevant**
- **Not Relevant**
- **Not Applicable**
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5. Alignment of TCP to country’s national development/sectoral plans

By Region

- **RAP**
  - Very well aligned: 57%
  - Quite aligned: 32%
  - Somewhat aligned: 9%
  - Not aligned: 2%

- **RLC**
  - Very well aligned: 60%
  - Quite aligned: 30%
  - Somewhat aligned: 5%
  - Not aligned: 5%

- **RNE**
  - Very well aligned: 65%
  - Quite aligned: 25%
  - Somewhat aligned: 10%
  - Not aligned: 0%

- **RAF**
  - Very well aligned: 58%
  - Quite aligned: 34%
  - Somewhat aligned: 7%
  - Not aligned: 1%

- **REU**
  - Very well aligned: 70%
  - Quite aligned: 26%
  - Somewhat aligned: 3%
  - Not aligned: 1%

By Income Level

- **High-income (HIC)**
  - Very well aligned: 62%
  - Quite aligned: 31%
  - Somewhat aligned: 7%
  - Not aligned: 0%

- **Upper-middle income (UMIC)**
  - Very well aligned: 60%
  - Quite aligned: 29%
  - Somewhat aligned: 11%
  - Not aligned: 0%

- **Lower-middle income (LMIC)**
  - Very well aligned: 55%
  - Quite aligned: 30%
  - Somewhat aligned: 12%
  - Not aligned: 3%

- **Low-income (LIC)**
  - Very well aligned: 50%
  - Quite aligned: 33%
  - Somewhat aligned: 16%
  - Not aligned: 11%
6. Rating on the contribution of TCP to SDG advancement in the country

By Region

- Very well aligned
- Quite aligned
- Somewhat aligned
- Not aligned

7. Factors that enable TCP projects to achieve catalytic effect

By Income Level

- Low-income (LIC)
- Lower-middle income (LMIC)
- Upper-middle income (UMIC)
- High-income (HIC)
### 8. Factors that hinder TCP projects to achieve catalytic effect

#### By Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synergies with bilateral agencies/development partners’ interest/priorities for investment</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government budget allocation to scale up</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector interest to invest</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government policy changes/strategies and plans (developed by TCP) implemented backed with funding</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals to attract global funds</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas/concepts/models from TCP attract investments from multi-lateral development banks (World Bank, IFAD, ADB, AfDB, IDB, CDB)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential investors (including donors/development partners) considered and consulted</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and investment by non-traditional donors</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informs/attracts donors/development partners during emergencies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Region:
- REU - Europe and Central Asia
- RAF - Africa - Sub-Saharan
- RNE - North Africa and Middle-East
- RLC - Latin America and the Caribbean
- RAP - Asia and the Pacific

#### By Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of government budget to scale-up/replicate</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover/change of government officials (champions)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in government priorities</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest/support from the private sector for uptake/investment</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in government/reorganization of departments</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand alone development project focused on a small area in the country</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The political situation in the country</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few donors/development partners active in the country</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor implementation</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate donor/development partner interest in the topic</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor project design including inadequate defining of catalytic effects</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project was more an FAO interest</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor funding mainly for emergencies</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project designed to ensure political relationship (fulfil political interests)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Income Level:
- Low-income (LIC)
- Lower-middle income (LMIC)
- Upper-middle income (UMIC)
- High-income (HIC)
By Region

- Lack of government budget to scale-up/replicate
- Turnover/change of government officials (champions)
- Change in government priorities
- Lack of interest/support from the private sector for uptake/investment
- Change in government/reorganization of departments
- Stand alone development project focused on a small area in the country
- The political situation in the country
- Few donors/development partners active in the country
- Poor implementation
- Inadequate donor/development partner interest in the topic
- Poor project design including inadequate defining of catalytic effects
- The project was more an FAO interest
- Donor funding mainly for emergencies
- The project designed to ensure political relationship (fulfil political interests)

REU - Europe and Central Asia
RAF - Africa - Sub-Saharan
RNE - North Africa and Middle-East
RLC - Latin America and the Caribbean
RAP - Asia and the Pacific