

Annex 2: List of Key Questions and Sub-questions

Relevance

1. To what extent were FAO's interventions (and its new Country Programme Framework [CPF]) aligned with the Sri Lankan government's national development strategy (*Mahinda Chintana*), priorities and plans and with community needs and priorities?
 - To what extent did FAO support pro-poor, sustainable policies and programmes with respect to fisheries and aquaculture?
 - Did FAO deal with land tenure issues?
 - Did FAO pay sufficient attention to the marketing of crops, dairy and fish products?
2. To what extent were FAO's interventions aligned with UN priorities for Sri Lanka?
 - Did FAO pay sufficient attention to climate change mitigation?
3. To what extent were FAO's interventions aligned with FAO's core functions and comparative advantages, such as its convening power, expert technical knowledge, and its normative role?
4. To what extent were FAO's interventions targeted at disadvantaged and most vulnerable populations, including women?
 - To what extent did FAO support the extremely vulnerable groups, including women-headed households and Estates workers?
 - To what extent did FAO help to increase the resilience of highly vulnerable groups in its programming?
 - To what extent did FAO respond to the needs of youth?

Effectiveness

1. How effective have FAO-supported activities been in achieving their intended results?
 - To what extent have farmers' knowledge, awareness and practices been influenced by training?
 - To what extent have GoSL and other key stakeholders' knowledge, awareness and practices been influenced by FAO through such interventions as training, technical advice, study visits, seminars and so on?
2. How effective has FAO been in coordinating humanitarian responses with government and relief and aid agencies?
3. How effective has FAO been in influencing the development and implementation of GoSL's policies in relation to sustainable rural development, food and nutrition security and environmental issues?
4. How effective has FAO been with respect to convening key stakeholders—government, aid agencies, NGOs and private sector organizations—both nationally and regionally on issues related to food and nutrition security, agriculture, fisheries, environment and gender equality?

- Was there much engagement with non-governmental organizations (NGOs), including farmers' organizations, and private sector groups in relation to some relief and rehabilitation efforts, including those involving livestock inputs? How did FAO identify its partners?

Efficiency

1. To what extent has FAO conducted its operations and delivered its programmes in Sri Lanka in a timely and cost-effective way?
 - To what extent has the integration of the emergency and development work in Sri Lanka under one programme and management led to increased efficiency and effectiveness?
 - The Office of Support to Decentralization (OSD) has proposed five options for country office staffing structures – is the one that has been chosen optimal given the programme size and components?
 - How does the cost of FAO interventions compare with the value-added the Organization has provided?
 - To what extent has engagement with other UN agencies contributed to increased alignment, efficiency and effectiveness of FAO's work?
2. How successful has FAO been in raising funds for its own interventions, and more generally for agriculture sector priorities in Sri Lanka?
 - Why did donors fund some other organizations (e.g. International Organization for Migration (IOM) to do what FAO can do?
3. Did the FAO Representatives have the incentives, authority, resources (people and money) and time necessary to maximize FAO's performance?
 - Were FAO organizational and management structures and systems conducive to the delivery of programme?
 - How appropriate have FAO structures and systems been, particularly those concerning the Emergency and Rehabilitation Division (TCE) and Food and Agriculture Organization Representative (FAOR) relationship, for the transition from recovery to development?
 - What can be learned from the integration of emergency and development work under a one-programme approach?
 - To what extent have FAO headquarters and RAP added value, for example, in relation to technical backstopping?

Sustainability

1. How sustainable have FAO's interventions been?
 - Are the outcomes achieved in relation to livelihood improvements, risk reduction, capacity strengthening (both at individual and organizational levels), knowledge generation, policy generation, and so on, likely to continue once FAO's interventions end?
 - Did projects and programmes have clear exit strategies?
 - How sustainable was FAO's normative/policy work in Sri Lanka?
 - To what extent did FAO deal with long-term sustainability issues related to climate change in its programme?

2. To what degree has disaster risk reduction, including the concept of resilient livelihoods, been built into FAO's recovery and development programming and its new CPF?
3. What was the extent of the Sri Lankan government's ownership of FAO's interventions, as evident through cash contributions, participation, follow-up and scaling up?
4. What was the extent of beneficiary participation in, and ownership of, FAO's projects and programmes?

Impact

1. What difference has FAO made through its work between 2006 and 2012?
 - What positive developmental change has FAO contributed to in relation to its projects and normative and policy work?
 - Would these changes have taken place without FAO?
2. What have been the positive and negative unexpected or unintended impacts of FAO's work?

Issues

Programme design

1. To what extent did FAO have a coherent programme with well-defined links between relief, rehabilitation and development?
 - How does FAO Sri Lanka set priorities?
 - Why did some issues, such as the privatization of water tanks, over-fishing, over-use of pesticides and land tenure receive less attention than others?
 - Why was the FAO country office slow to produce a country CPF?
 - Does the draft CPF spell out a programme that is coherent and well aligned with GoSL development priorities, the needs of the poor, UN and FAO policies, FAO's regional programming framework, FAO's comparative advantages and FAO's own capacity to deliver?

Project designs

2. To what extent were FAO's projects well designed?
 - Were there adequate needs assessments, including gender and social inclusion analyses?
 - To what extent were beneficiaries involved in the designs?
 - To what extent did the projects reflect humanitarian codes of conduct, a rights-based approach, peace-building, conflict sensitivity, disaster risk reduction with resilient livelihoods provisions and so on?
 - Were there adequate provisions in the designs (including budgets) for monitoring, evaluation and follow-up, such as beneficiary assessments?
 - Did projects have sound logic models and results-based performance measurement frameworks?
 - Did FAO choose the right partners for delivery?

- What did FAO do to ensure that its implementing partners had sufficient capacity in such areas as results-based management and reporting, gender equality, conflict mitigation and peace-building sensitivity?
- Did the designs reflect what has been learned about effective relief and development practice, such as adequate timeframes, attention to organizational capacities (including systems for incentives and rewards), developing institutional capacities (such as policies, laws and regulations that make for a conducive enabling environment), building resilience, and the effective use of such measures as cash transfers?
- Were the designs iterative with sufficient flexibility to allow for changes when needed?
- Why did so many of the relief projects look the same?
- How much flexibility and control did FAO have in designing projects when the Consolidated Humanitarian Assistance Programme (CHAP) process was driving the project formulation process?

Cross-cutting issues

1. To what extent did FAO integrate gender equality and mainstream gender in its projects, programmes, staffing and management systems?
2. To what extent did FAO respect sound environmental policies in its project, programmes and policy interventions?
 - Why did some projects require heavy inputs of fertilizers? Did FAO take adequate measures to mitigate over-fishing?

Management and operations issues

1. How has FAO's corporate reform agenda affected its performance in Sri Lanka?
 - Decentralization: What can we learn from the present FAOR, who was an "early adopter" of the decentralized operations model, about how much time it takes for FAORs in general to take on these new areas of responsibility and the challenges they will face?
 - To what extent does the CPF formulation process in Sri Lanka follow the guidance provided?
 - How have UN as One and UNDAF processes affected FAO's work in Sri Lanka?
2. To what extent does FAO have effective systems in place for results-based monitoring, evaluation, learning and reporting?
3. What progress has been made in rectifying some of the more serious weaknesses highlighted in the audit of the country office's financial and administrative systems?
 - What are the risks to FAO's resources and reputation for transferring significantly more financial responsibility to country level?
 - How adequate was the operational self-assessment?
4. How effectively has FAO managed its partnerships for the delivery of its projects and programmes?
 - What has it done to strengthen or compensate for the weak capacity of some of its partners?

Learning

1. What lessons can be drawn from the strengths and shortcomings of FAO's work in Sri Lanka from 2006 to 2012?