

September 2013



منظمة الأغذية
والزراعة للأمم
المتحدة

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

E

PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

Hundred and Fourteenth Session

Rome, 11 - 15 November 2013

**Evaluation of FAO's role and work in Disaster Risk Reduction in Asia and
in Latin America and the Caribbean**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

Mr Daniel Gustafson
Deputy Director-General (Operations)
Officer-in-Charge, Office of Evaluation Tel. (06) 570-56320

*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*



mi101e



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the United
Nations

Office of Evaluation

Evaluation of FAO's role and work in Disaster Risk Reduction in Asia and in Latin America and the Caribbean

Executive Summary

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Office of Evaluation (OED)

This report is available in electronic format at: <http://www.fao.org/evaluation>

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO 2013

FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO's endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way.

All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request or addressed to copyright@fao.org.

For further information on this report, please contact:

Director, OED
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 1, 00153
Rome, Italy
Email: evaluation@fao.org

Executive Summary

Evaluation background, scope and methodology

ES1. An Evaluation of FAO's role and work in Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) was requested by FAO's Programme Committee in October 2011. The evaluation was undertaken in 2012, managed by FAO's Office of Evaluation – which commissioned it to DARA, an independent non-profit organization specialized in evaluations. The evaluation assessed FAO's work in DRR in Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC). This Executive Summary provides the key findings, conclusions and recommendations from the two regional reports, which are annexes to the final evaluation report.

ES2. The purpose of the evaluation is to provide FAO Management, member countries and interested stakeholders with:

- i. accountability for the Organization's performance in terms of its mission, goals and DRR-related objectives; and
- ii. recommendations based on solid evidence and lessons learnt with respect to FAO's comparative advantages, its role in the international architecture of DRR, its priorities, and ways to improve its work in DRR to best serve member countries in the future.

ES3. The evaluation focuses on the role and work of FAO in DRR in the period 2006-2011, during which time FAO adopted two Strategic Frameworks. The first, for 2000-2015, contained reference to DRR in Strategic Objective A3 – Preparedness for, and effective and sustainable response to, food and agricultural emergencies. The second Strategic Framework, for 2010-19, included DRR within Organisational Result 1 of Strategic Objective I. The evaluation encompasses the full range of FAO's interventions that support prevention, mitigation and preparedness for disasters in Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean – including both normative and operational services, and irrespective of the source of funding or whether the work is explicitly or implicitly defined as DRR¹.

ES4. The evaluation was guided by Terms of Reference (Annex 1) and an evaluation matrix (Annex 2), which outlined the key evaluation questions to be answered. Primarily qualitative tools and methods were used, and all findings were validated through a systematic triangulation of the evidence. The tools and analysis used were as follows:

- An assessment of selected projects – 32 projects were chosen, from a total of 259 deemed to be relevant in the two regions.
- Review of previous evaluations – 27 evaluations of projects, programmes and thematic areas relevant to DRR were reviewed.
- Review of normative products – 17 normative products were selected, from a total of approximately 200 produced by FAO, including guidelines, manuals, technical reports, databases, and policy briefs.
- Review of other publications – such as technical reports and assessments.
- Stakeholder consultation – described in further detail below.

¹ In the context of FAO, DRR is described as “protecting people's livelihoods from shocks, and strengthening their capacity to absorb the impact of, and recover from, disruptive events” – *Resilient Livelihoods: Disaster Risk Reduction for Food and Nutrition Security*, FAO, 2013 edition.

ES5. The evaluation consulted extensively with a broad range of stakeholders. These included FAO personnel in Headquarters, Regional, Sub-Regional and Country Offices; relevant Ministries and national institutions at country level; other FAO partners (such as UN organizations, resource partners, International Financial Institutions, and international NGOs); as well as national civil society organizations and project beneficiaries. These interviews were undertaken during various evaluation missions, as follows:

- Several missions to FAO Headquarters at various stages of the evaluation.
- A mission to Latin America and the Caribbean – covering the Sub-Regional Office in Panama, and country visits to the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Bolivia, Peru and Ecuador.
- A mission to Asia – covering the Regional Office in Thailand, and country visits to Cambodia, the Philippines, Indonesia, Nepal and Bangladesh.

Key findings

Resources for FAO’s work in DRR

ES6. FAO is undergoing a change process wherein DRR has gained more space and higher prioritisation across the Organization. Recent strategies and projects, particularly in Asia, also give attention to climate change adaptation (CCA) – which, like DRR, aims to reduce vulnerability. This is a positive development that, if supported by adequate institutional capacity, can place FAO in a central position in terms of bridging the gap and conceptual understanding between disasters, vulnerabilities, food security, resilience and climate change adaptation. All of these areas fit well within FAO’s mandate and are concerns that rank high on the international agenda.

ES7. FAO’s work in DRR is funded through both the Regular Programme and extra-budgetary resources (voluntary contributions). Extra-budgetary resources allocated to DRR interventions over the evaluation period amounted to USD 328 million in Asia (of which \$14 million, or 4.3 per cent, was Regular Programme-funded); and USD 90 million in Latin America and the Caribbean (of which \$16 million, or 17.8 per cent was Regular-Programme funded). Funding has increased over time in Latin America and the Caribbean, but decreased in Asia – although the latter has received more funding overall (Table ES1).

Table ES1. Funding for DRR projects over the evaluation period

<i>Year project started</i>	Latin America and the Caribbean		Asia	
	<i>DRR projects (#)</i>	<i>Amount (USD)</i>	<i>DRR projects (#)</i>	<i>Amount (USD)</i>
Prior to 2006	5	3,487,780	13	12,399,300
2006-2007	24	14,457,033	51	187,107,443
2008-2009	43	32,001,105	40	74,085,003
2010-2011	35	40,398,715	49	54,292,152
TOTAL	106	90,344,633	153	327,883,898

Source: FPMIS

ES8. In terms of human resources, the majority of personnel working on DRR are funded through extra-budgetary resources, and data on numbers of such personnel over time is not readily available. However, information is available for Regular Programme-funded posts, which have increased substantially over the evaluation period (Table ES2). This increase is most likely due to the allocation of an Organizational Result specifically for DRR in the Strategic Framework introduced in 2010.

Table ES2. DRR-related posts over the evaluation period (Regular Programme-funded)²

Biennium	Director	Professional	General Service	Total
2006-07 (Posts associated with Programme 2.1.1 and 2.1.2)	1	5	0	6
2008-09 (Posts associated with Programme Entity 4DS02)	1	6	0	7
2010-11 (Posts associated with Organizational Result 1, SO I)	2	37	29	68

FAO's DRR-related interventions and normative work

ES9. FAO's support to DRR represents two types of engagement: emergency-related interventions that have explicit DRR activities and objectives, and other interventions in FAO's technical core areas (such as land use management, watershed management, etc) that address DRR in an implicit manner. An analysis of DRR interventions over the evaluation period shows a shift from an almost exclusive focus on emergencies to more inclusive and holistic approaches, as well as a progressive use of DRR terminology.

ES10. However, most interventions lacked a clear approach or realistic programme logic as to how they would reduce risks for target populations. Project objectives were usually relevant to national priorities and FAO's strategic frameworks, but they were generally implemented without prior analyses and considerations of local contexts and vulnerability assessments. This was particularly true where projects were 'spin-offs' of emergency interventions, such as in Central America. In most cases, and across both regions, the effectiveness of interventions was limited to restoration of livelihoods, without addressing the root causes of risks and structural food insecurity. Funding windows and project duration have clearly been limiting factors, which did not allow sufficient time for proper project preparation, testing, implementation, and capacity development. Efficient and effective implementation has also been hindered by insufficient staff capacity in DRR at country and regional levels.

ES11. One particularly noticeable weakness that limited the effectiveness of projects (as well as the ability of the evaluation team to assess impacts) was the general absence of proper monitoring systems. Most projects did not include monitoring beyond the level of activities or outputs – there is no documentation of outcomes. This results in limited organizational learning, and reduces accountability to resource partners as well as government counterparts and project beneficiaries.

² It should be noted that these posts are not all fully dedicated to DRR, and there is no information available on relative time allocations. For the 2006-07 and 2008-09 biennia, only part of the programmes and entities shown are devoted to DRR. These figures should therefore be treated as a proxy to indicate change over time.

ES12. In some countries, FAO's advocacy work has led governments to place greater emphasis on small scale farmers than in the past, through interventions that focus on food security and livelihoods. In other countries, FAO has been instrumental in advancing local-level priorities to governments, in particular revitalising extension efforts at the local level. This was particularly the case in LAC, but less so in Asia. Overall, such results were not the norm, and the evaluation found limited evidence that projects yielded the expected results at policy level for the reasons stated above.

ES13. Many of FAO's agricultural interventions, despite not being labelled explicitly as 'DRR', nonetheless have the potential to reduce risks and/or contribute to CCA. These interventions are typically developed to address sector-specific challenges or support mechanisms. They may therefore provide FAO with a more effective and relevant entry point to DRR than interventions originating in emergency responses. The evaluations in both Asia and LAC found that FAO has significant potential to contribute more effectively to DRR and CCA through its core activities.

ES14. In terms of the sustainability of interventions, there are clear indications that most interventions are unsustainable – and will not continue without FAO's technical and financial support. The short time frame for most activities leaves FAO little opportunity to develop the necessary capacities for ownership and sustainability among counterparts. Projects with longer time frames, which built on earlier interventions, also typically did not give sufficient consideration to sustainability.

ES15. With respect to normative work, FAO has made clear progress in the inclusion of DRR elements in publications and normative products. The *Resilient Livelihoods: Disaster Risk Reduction for Food and Nutrition Security Framework Programme* (DRR FP), first produced at the end of 2011, is FAO's first corporate, strategic DRR publication. It is an opportune reference for future country programming, and appropriately links DRR, resilience building, and food security. It also represents a first institutional attempt to bridge the areas of DRR and CCA. However, many strategic DRR publications (including the DRR FP) have not been sufficiently disseminated – leading to low awareness of these products amongst FAO staff, particularly at the country level.

ES16. FAO has developed multiple information, monitoring and early warning system tools, such as the Global Information and Early Warning System on Food and Agriculture (GIEWS). However, in general, early warning tools have so far had limited use in the Asian and LAC regions – despite FAO's use of such tools in Africa. The anticipated focus, according to the DRR FP, to use these tools more proactively for anticipatory analyses related to natural hazards and climate change, is a relevant and appropriate step in the direction of designing more coherent and prospective interventions. Vulnerability mapping, through the most recent Integrated Food Security and Humanitarian Phase Classification (IPC2), is being introduced in Asia and will, if adequately used, provide FAO (and member countries) with essential information in terms of targeting future interventions – particularly those addressing more structural causes of vulnerabilities. The most effective contribution of FAO to early warning and preparedness in Asia has been in animal disease control, namely related to the Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI).

ES17. DRR performance can be significantly improved. This, however, is not strictly related to DRR *per se* but also related to FAO's overall operational performance. Limited funding for too many activities at country level is a constraint for achieving more effective

and relevant interventions. This also calls for a prioritisation of countries where the relevance of implementing a multi-disciplinary approach along the lines of a resilience framework must be documented through in-depth (causal) analyses that allow FAO to address most vulnerable groups and the root causes of their food insecurity.

Mainstreaming DRR

ES18. Mainstreaming DRR into sectoral and other medium and long-term development plans is widely considered to be one of the most effective means for reducing risks. However, recent UNISDR Global Assessment Reports have shown that there are few examples of successful mainstreaming of DRR – the tendency remains to focus on emergency-led disaster risk management (DRM).

ES19. FAO has struggled to mainstream DRR into national policies for a variety of reasons. Insufficient institutional capacity in FAO Country Offices means that they are often more involved in project management than upstream work – the latter requires specific technical DRR knowledge that most FAO Country Offices do not have. In addition, FAO usually pays limited attention to the absorptive capacity of government counterparts. There are nonetheless examples of successful DRR mainstreaming by FAO, such as in Peru's Plan GRACC and Bangladesh's National Food Policy. These show that, when FAO has sufficient capacity and the conditions in the partner country are appropriate, FAO can indeed draw on its field experience to engage effectively at policy level.

FAO's Institutional Capacity

ES20. Several institutional factors set limits for the achievement of FAO's potential in the area of DRR. Due to insufficient staff and expertise dedicated to DRR, only little guidance and support can be provided by headquarters and the Regional Offices to FAO Representations. The support that has been provided was, however, widely appreciated, especially in the Asia region where DRR-inspired programming is slowly gaining ground.

ES21. Joint planning between divisions has still not been rolled out despite more integrated organisational results and strategic objectives. The evaluation found that FAO still needs to break the silo-structure and develop more multi-disciplinary programmes that address the multiple causalities and root causes of food insecurity more holistically and thus more effectively.

ES22. With FAO moving into fairly unknown territory for many of its staff members with respect to DRR and CCA, information sharing and clarity on what FAO can achieve and how is all the more important. Linking DRR to resilience is highly relevant, but more so if it is done based on what FAO is good at. This can only be tested and proven if the Organization dedicates resources and time to understanding causalities between agricultural interventions, food security and resilience. Within FAO and among partners, the role of DRR and CCA in this logic remains unknown, which makes efforts on information sharing, monitoring and knowledge management vital.

Capacity Development

ES23. Capacity development is at the heart of FAO's mandate and is one of the primary pillars in the recent DRR FP publication. FAO-supported DRR interventions include capacity development at both local and central levels, either through direct training activities aimed at strengthening specific skills within certain institutions, or by introducing technical skills through projects. With respect to institutional capacity development, FAO interventions were usually focused on individual skill development rather than on building institutional capacities. This threatens the effectiveness and sustainability of such interventions, as frequent staff turnover leads to the loss of these newly-developed skills. It should be noted that the weakness of institutions also impacts FAO's ability to be effective with capacity building, particularly in countries where DRR responsibilities have been decentralized to the sub-national level.

ES24. In the case of introducing technical skills through projects, FAO has been relatively successful in introducing new technologies under very specific circumstances – such as the introduction of materials and technologies that require certain skills. For agricultural demonstration projects with a DRR focus that included training of farmers, capacity development was often limited to the provision of inputs (notably seeds of stress tolerant varieties) accompanied either by demonstrations or Farmer Field School sessions. The effectiveness of these methods was mixed and did not seem to be related to the issues or technologies concerned, but rather to input delivery. Results varied widely, with the most successful interventions occurring in Cambodia and Bangladesh. However, the tendency to use similar project designs in all countries without accounting for local needs and conditions limited effectiveness in other places (for example Nepal and Ecuador). For the most part, there was little sign that effective capacity development had taken place through the projects. The evaluation believes that the core objective of capacity development was not achieved in most of the assessed projects – given the lack of outcome monitoring, this assessment is based primarily on stakeholders' perceptions. An area where FAO has implemented successful capacity development initiatives is in relation to HPAI (discussed further below).

ES25. Overall, many DRR-related capacity-building efforts were linked to short-term projects or specific demands from national counterparts: the short time frames limited the effectiveness of the interventions, which often lacked follow-up plans or support mechanisms for after the completion of training. Monitoring of capacity development efforts was generally absent from most if not all projects and interventions assessed in the two regions; improvements in this area are vital. Without information on the actual outcomes of the capacity development activities, FAO staff cannot learn from these interventions or gauge their relevance and effectiveness. Finally, insufficient guidance from headquarters and limited capacity in Regional and Country Offices about how to conduct capacity development also contributed to the limited results.

Partnerships and collaboration

ES26. FAO's traditional counterparts in government are those institutions whose mandates are linked to food and nutrition security or different agricultural sectors. However, these institutions have often been sidelined on DRR and climate change issues – and FAO relations with better positioned ministries (e.g. environment, civil protection, etc) are often limited. In addition, in some countries DRR and climate change in agriculture is not a government priority. For these two reasons, FAO often is not in the right position to engage with those

government entities with the knowledge and leverage on resource allocations for DRR. Notable exceptions have been in Bangladesh, where FAO's ability to coordinate with various ministries (agriculture, environment, health) is valued; and in Guatemala.

ES27. FAO has increased its collaboration with other UN agencies over the evaluation period, and has become more active in joint coordination mechanisms and UNDAF processes. This engagement has translated into some joint DRR-related programmes, particularly in Asia. Where joint initiatives did exist in LAC (e.g. in Peru and Guatemala), they benefited from a more holistic and multi-disciplinary approach – this allowed the partners to address food insecurity issues, including the underlying risk factors, more comprehensively. FAO has a formal engagement with the United Nations Office for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR). With other agencies (e.g. UNDP and WFP), while formal institutional partnerships may exist, collaboration at country level depends largely on the country teams and their personal relationships. In Asia, some evidence was found of overlap of roles between FAO and both UNDP and WFP – this can lead to FAO missing out on opportunities.

ES28. With respect to NGOs, collaboration in the LAC region is diverse, and NGOs with different skill sets are used to implement local-level DRR projects. In Asia, NGOs engaged closely with FAO as partners or sub-contractors – FAO's capacity to link local-level experiences to national policy dialogue was valued. However, FAO's actual ability to use its experience with NGO collaboration in its upstream work was limited, apart from some exceptions related to the HPAI initiative.

Gender issues

ES29. Poverty reduction and food security goals can only be achieved if gender issues are adequately considered. However, the evaluation team found that DRR interventions in both Asia and LAC were not based on any gender analysis, meaning that gender issues were not sufficiently factored into project design and implementation. The evaluation also found that gender sensitive programming was commonly misunderstood or misconceived by project staff. There were cases of agricultural related training activities with DRR components that were actually reinforcing the reproductive roles of women, and failing to pay sufficient attention to the gender distribution of tasks/time at the household level.

ES30. The integration of gender concerns into field projects depends largely on staff competencies and skills. In those Country Offices that have established a staff Gender Focal Point (e.g. Nicaragua, Bolivia, and Ecuador), the effect on awareness amongst employees regarding gender sensitive programming has been immediate. The presence of a person knowledgeable on gender issues facilitates the integration of such issues into all of FAO's work, including DRR-related activities.

Animal Health – HPAI

ES31. The evaluation assessed FAO's role in the response to HPAI in Asia as an example of the Organization's intervention in the field of animal health. While animal health is not an area that is traditionally linked to DRR, FAO's guide on preparing for animal health emergencies makes a strong case for such emergencies to be considered in the same category as natural disasters, requiring the same level of preparedness and planning.

ES32. FAO's support to HPAI has been, by far, the intervention that was most praised among government officials, project beneficiaries and resource partners. FAO has managed to respond to an emergency, transform interventions into surveillance, and finally develop national capacities that, with varying degree, are capable of taking over key functions in terms of prevention and preparedness to respond to emerging animal diseases.

ES33. However, the HPAI interventions lacked an overall strategic guidance, meaning that the programme in each country was carried out on an ad-hoc basis. Furthermore, the HPAI interventions were not supported by a monitoring framework that would have allowed FAO to systematise processes and document outcomes.

ES34. Nonetheless, the relative success of the HPAI is related to the fact that it was a multi-year engagement with significant funding levels that allowed FAO both to adapt over time to changing needs and recruit skilled technical staff to sustain operations, at headquarters, regional and particularly also at country level. These success criteria stand in contrast to other FAO interventions and are thus worth considering in terms of how the Organization can improve future performance.

Main Conclusions

ES35. The evaluation fully recognizes that FAO is undergoing a change process wherein DRR has gained more space and higher prioritization across the Organization. However, this process is moving at slow pace, and needs to be accelerated if FAO wants to make use of its technical know-how and expertise in linking food insecurity with DRR and climate change adaptation. Greater emphasis should be given to addressing the root causes of vulnerabilities. If FAO fails to act faster, other actors, both international and national, will move into this field because it offers significant opportunities for change and has the attention of many resource partners and governments.

ES36. DRR (including CCA) still constitutes a conceptual and practical challenge – for FAO, its member countries, and other UN and non-governmental actors in this arena. Despite normative progress, FAO has yet to define its role and place within DRR, and to demonstrate the potential it possesses in terms of moving DRR out of the emergency mode and into development-oriented and mainstreamed approaches. FAO has fragmented elements internally that, if used more coherently, could allow it to contribute significantly to reducing exposure to risk and food insecurity of vulnerable populations.

ES37. Innovative research-based agricultural interventions, high-level technical inputs, land use and territorial planning formats, environmental service management, and up-to-date forecasting tools and methods are some of the means FAO possesses for potentially achieving this, rather than explicit DRR and CCA practices *per se*. The increasing focus on CCA and resilience, in academic literature, global declarations, UNDAFs and to some extent among government priorities, also provides a clear opportunity for FAO to engage technically and position itself as a key player at the national and international levels.

ES38. The so-called implicit DRR interventions, i.e. those whose main focus is on agricultural aspects or other core sectors within the mandate of FAO, have the potential to contribute significantly to DRR as well as to CCA. Such interventions require different and more long-term approaches as they address challenges related to the improvement of agricultural systems as a whole, and create conditions in which populations are less

vulnerable and become more resilient over time through improved practices that are adapted to variations in climate. Therefore, if FAO focuses on doing what it does well and making sure that sufficient attention is devoted to how DRR and CCA become part of these implicit interventions – and not vice versa – medium and longer-term DRR and CCA outcomes may be achieved more effectively.

ES39. FAO has spent more time and resources on reactive DRR interventions aimed at post-disaster livelihood recovery and preparedness of affected populations towards future disasters, without necessarily addressing the root causes of their vulnerabilities. Short-term interventions do not allow FAO to address the root causes of vulnerability and when the next disaster hits, recovery investments might be lost. Thus, FAO's approach should become more adaptable to change, by anticipating scenarios of what may happen – especially considering vulnerabilities that are related to future hydro-meteorological variations affecting the livelihoods of the most vulnerable populations. Such an approach requires solid analysis and examination of the root causes of food insecurity and anticipation of livelihood threats: this has not been common in FAO to date. FAO would benefit from a thorough analysis of needs and priorities in countries – both to decide where to engage in DRR and CCA work, and to select specific interventions under a programmatic approach.

ES40. Sector capacities for DRR in most countries in the two regions considered are still very low, and few Ministries of Agriculture are in a position to promote a more prospective approach. Again, if FAO manages to create the necessary technical skills within the Organization, there should be multiple options for engaging constructively in promoting and mainstreaming DRR and CCA within national sector programmes and strategies.

ES41. The Resilient Livelihoods: Disaster Risk Reduction for Food and Nutrition Security Framework Programme, first developed in 2011, is a first attempt to link DRR and CCA with food security (and resilience) – and a clear indication that FAO is starting to consider DRR in a more comprehensive matter. Greater technical capacities and stronger institutional leadership will be needed if FAO is expected to manage such a transition effectively.

Recommendations

ES42. Early post-disaster recovery operations, where DRR interventions often define the nature of FAO's support (i.e. restoring livelihoods) should, to the extent possible, be transformed into development programmes or have clear short lived exit-strategies. Refocusing the DRR approach thus implies not having DRR as the programmatic entry point (or primary objective), but instead building DRR into core activities where FAO has demonstrated capacities. Hence, such an implicit notion of risk management infers a stronger focus on FAO's core areas of expertise. Such a change also implies that FAO's core activities become a means to achieve more prospective, effective and long-term DRR effects and hence more resilient communities.

ES43. This requires a clear analytical framework – or causality analysis – of how agricultural and related interventions, including (but not limited to) land-use and watershed management, environmental services, forestry and control of deforestation, fisheries, animal diseases, coastal management, agricultural extension work, and seed varieties, will contribute to reducing risks through decreased generation of socio-natural hazards, decreased exposure, and increased livelihood and population resilience. This will reduce the risk of both slow and rapid onset disasters. Such mainstreaming, carried out on the basis of a clear analytical

framework where most vulnerable populations and their immediate and future exposure are addressed, will enable FAO to contribute much more significantly to risk reduction and climate change adaptation. Recommendation 1 addresses this aspect.

Recommendation 1: To Technical Departments, on DRR mainstreaming within FAO

It is recommended that FAO refocuses its approach to DRR by mainstreaming it through the Organization's core development activities, as this will ensure a more coherent and technically sound contribution to risk reduction and potentially also climate change adaptation, in line with the Organization's Reviewed Strategic Objective 5's focus on resilience.

ES44. This approach will furthermore imply that DRR and risk management must be considered as elements to be mainstreamed in all relevant FAO interventions where prior analysis contemplates possible causalities between the selected activity, food security, DRR and resilience. The new Strategic Framework, with its focus on multi-disciplinarity, should support such linkages.

ES45. A logical framework on DRR should identify the causal connections between root causes for structural food insecurity, the possible implications related to natural hazards and climatic variations, and how these are expressed among determined (vulnerable) population groups in different contexts and territories. It should outline methodological guiding principles that will facilitate the elaboration of comprehensive multi-disciplinary field interventions under the CPFs. The framework should, as far as possible, promote the use of existing tools developed (or under development) by FAO, such as the IPC 2 and GIEWS, amongst others.

ES46. A logical framework should be developed to complement the DRR FP and thus serve as a programmatic guidance tool for FAO staff, which is particularly relevant in terms of contributing to achieving SO-5 and SO-2 in FAO's Reviewed Strategic Framework. The logical framework should be based on gender analysis and include specific attention to gender issues, a cross cutting thematic area of the Reviewed Strategic Framework 2010-2019. Recommendation 2 stresses this specific issue.

Recommendation 2: To Technical Departments, on a multi-disciplinary logical framework complementing the FP DRR

It is recommended that FAO develops a multi-disciplinary logical framework that clearly identifies causalities between FAO core interventions, food security, DRR, climate change and resilience.

ES47. For FAO to take full advantage of its unique position with regards to food security, it is essential that the Organization's technical profile in DRR is strengthened. This also goes for the mandate that FAO has in linking interventions related to food security and agriculture to resilience, DRR and climate change adaptation.

ES48. Furthermore, the comprehensive approach to DRR and CCA advocated for by this evaluation requires an enabling institutional setup able to generate learning, innovation and cross-divisional cooperation that promotes mainstreaming of risk management. This comprehensive approach needs to specifically address cross cutting issues such as gender sensitive planning processes.

ES49. It is strongly suggested that technical capacities are strengthened at headquarters and Regional Offices, as this will enable FAO to adapt a progressive approach that identifies targeted countries where conditions (and demands) are in place for the suggested comprehensive approach. The Regional Offices should serve as knowledge centres (as RAP did in the case of HPAI), and provide up-to-date technical support to selected Country Offices on how to prepare and implement the more comprehensive DRR (and CCA) approaches under the CPFs. The ongoing decentralization process is a welcome opportunity to strengthen DRR capacities in Regional and relevant Country Offices. Recommendation 3 addresses these aspects.

Recommendation 3: To Senior Management, on institutional capacity

It is recommended that FAO significantly strengthens its institutional capacity in order to conceptually and technically reinforce DRR at headquarters level and in key Regional and selected Country Offices, including a stronger focus on gender sensitive programming.

ES50. The evaluation found that FAO engages in too many countries. Due to limited resources and capacities, and considering great variations in demands, needs and capacities amongst member countries, FAO should closely analyse where to engage with DRR and CCA. In various countries, particularly in Asia, significant capacities are progressively increasing within national institutions, and FAO therefore needs to be realistic in terms of analysing where it can effectively add value. Recommendation 4 focuses on this issue.

Recommendation 4: To Senior Management and Technical Departments, on DRR engagement in countries

It is recommended that FAO reduces its DRR interventions to pre-selected countries using clear-cut criteria such as national capacities in DRR, vulnerability to climate variability, exposure to natural hazards, food security data and national commitments (i.e. demands for services).

ES51. The evaluation identified a wide range of activities in most countries, and these were often spread thinly across different geographical areas without prior analysis in terms of vulnerability. Focusing interventions on key areas in countries that are particularly food insecure and vulnerable in terms of climatic variations will lead to more effective interventions.

ES52. Focused interventions will also lead to more efficient use of limited human and financial resources and enable FAO to undertake a longer term programme outlook, rather than a collection of projects approach, that will have much better prospects for impact and sustainability. Recommendation 5 was formulated in this respect.

Recommendation 5: To Technical Departments and FAO Representations, on intervention areas in selected countries

The evaluation recommends that FAO focuses interventions on geographically defined areas in selected countries that would enable the Organization to fully implement the suggested comprehensive approach to risk reduction.

ES53. The opportunities lying ahead for FAO in terms of converging DRR and CCA require different and more varied partnerships in the countries where FAO decides to focus on DRR and CCA as part of its efforts to reduce food insecurity. Ministries of Agriculture are often in a less strategic position when it comes to resource allocation and influence in terms of multi-disciplinary planning processes, and the mainstreaming of DRR and CCA in particular. These new partnerships should be emphasised and addressed through more integrated and multi-disciplinary approaches under the CPFs. Recommendation 6 tackles this issue.

Recommendation 6: To FAO Representations, on policy dialogue

The evaluation recommends that FAO broadens its dialogue in the selected countries beyond the Ministries of Agriculture to include other strategic counterparts in DRR such as Ministries of environment, finance and planning.