

Discussion of Draft Results Frameworks (Strategic Objectives)

Executive Summary

In adopting the IPA, the Conference endorsed the application of a new results-based framework for preparing the Strategic Framework, Medium-Term Plan (MTP) 2010-13 and Programme of Work and Budget (PWB) 2010-11 during 2009 (IPA actions 1.1 to 1.8 and 3.1 to 3.11). The present paper reports on the process, achievements and challenges to date in elaborating the results-based frameworks for the Strategic Objectives. Management welcomes further guidance from the Working Group.

Under the leadership of the responsible Senior Managers, inter-departmental Strategy Teams, including staff in decentralized offices, were established to formulate the results framework for each Strategic and Functional Objective using a Log frame-based analysis as set forth in the IPA. Briefings, hands-on training and guidance were provided during January/February, and the Strategy Teams shared their draft results frameworks at an innovative “Results Marketplace” on 11 March. The frameworks will be finalized by end-March for use in preparing the MTP and PWB.

This work has deepened the Strategy Teams’ understanding of the emerging opportunities:

- Strategy Teams are facilitating a multi-disciplinary approach to formulation and there is opportunity to enhance results-based management by eventually involving them in budgeting, implementing, monitoring and reporting on results.
- Applying the criteria set out in the IPA for the application of core functions will help to focus and prioritize the primary tools – the goods and services to be delivered to primary stakeholders - under the Organizational Results.

Management points out that the full application of results based framework will not be short process and recognizes three immediate challenges:

- Regional contributions are a major challenge in the short timeframe available for preparation of the planning documentation in 2009. Efforts have focussed on promoting understanding of the new results-based framework and RBM principles in regional and sub-regional management teams, and definition of regional priorities linked to the results frameworks.
- There is room to improve the formulation of Organizational Results to ensure integration of sectoral and cross-sectoral objectives. These will be further refined based on the gaps and linkages among the results frameworks identified through the Results Marketplace and through on-going discussions through the Strategy Teams.
- The iterative formulation process has shown the need for improvements in several areas related to indicators. Follow-up practical sessions on improving the formulation of indicators have been organized, aiming for continuous incremental improvement.

To illustrate the above considerations and allow for WG1 to interact with Strategy Team leaders, the current draft frameworks for Strategic Objectives F (natural resources) and L (investment) - as presented at the Results Marketplace on 11 March - are provided.

Discussion of Draft Results Frameworks (Strategic Objectives)

Introduction

1. In adopting the IPA in November 2008, the Conference endorsed the application of the new results-based framework, the vision and global goals of FAO, the in-principle strategic objectives, functional objectives and core functions, and the format for the presentation of strategic objectives and organizational results in the Medium Term Plan¹, whereby:

- three Global Goals represent the fundamental development impacts in the areas of FAO mandate which the member countries aim to achieve;
- Strategic Objectives contribute to the Global Goals and express the impact, in countries, regions and globally, expected to be achieved in a ten year horizon by Members with a contribution from FAO;
- Organizational Results define the outcome expected from the use by member countries and partners of FAO's products and services in the pursuit of each Strategic Objective; and
- Functional Objectives provide the enabling environment; and
- Core Functions are the critical means of action employed by FAO to achieve results, drawing on the Organization's comparative advantages.

2. On this basis, FAO units and staff have been working intensively since December 2008 on refining the new results-based framework for the Strategic Framework, Medium-Term Plan (MTP) 2010-13 and Programme of Work and Budget (PWB) 2010-11 to be considered by the Governing Bodies. Draft results frameworks for the Strategic and Functional Objectives will be finalized by 31 March 2009 for use in preparing the PWB during April-June. These frameworks will also be considered by Working Group 1 (WG1) at its meeting on 16 April, as well as by the Committee on Agriculture on 22 April and the Programme and Finance Committees on 11-15 May.

3. The present paper reports on progress to date with respect to elaboration of the new results-based frameworks for the Strategic Objectives. It describes the ongoing work including achievements and challenges, and seeks guidance from the Working Group to inform the preparation and presentation of the results frameworks in the MTP 2010-13.

Process, main achievements and challenges

4. The process, timeline and guidance for preparing the Strategic Framework, MTP and PWB were discussed and agreed with the Senior Management Team - IPA and issued on 23 December 2008. The overall timeline comprises fourteen main steps up to the final approval by Conference in November 2009 (see Annex 1). Steps 1-4 focus on preparation of the Strategic Framework and MTP, while steps 5-9 cover preparation of the PWB, and steps 10-14 concern review and approval of the final documents. This paper covers progress and outcome of steps 1 (strategy teams) and 2 (formulation), and is issued as part of step 4 (working group review of draft results frameworks).

5. Under step 1, senior managers (Assistant Directors-General and heads of Offices) were assigned responsibility for formulating the results framework for each Strategic and Functional Objective (see Annex 2). They formed inter-departmental Strategy Teams for this purpose, including staff in decentralized offices and with a senior officer designated as team leader.

¹ C 2008/4 Report of the Conference Committee on Follow-up to the IEE of FAO - Immediate Plan of Action: Actions 1.1 to 1.8 and 3.1 to 3.11, and Annex 1 Elements of the Strategic Framework and Medium Term Plan

6. In line with IPA action 3.79 to fully involve ADG/Regional Representatives in programming and budgeting, a consultation process for engaging Regional and Sub-regional Offices was proposed by these offices and agreed by the SMT-IPA. In 2009, this involves: horizontal consultations within regions/sub-regions to define priorities, starting from the draft results frameworks; and vertical consultations with Strategy Teams. The longer-term development of Regional and Sub-regional priority frameworks will also be set in motion for the Regional Conferences in 2010.

7. Under step 2 on formulation of the results frameworks, three briefings were held with the Strategy Teams in January. These were followed by hands-on training clinics for the teams conducted by two experts in results-based management (RBM) to facilitate the application of the recommended analytical process. An outcome of these consultations was a glossary of key terms and an updated results framework template (see Annex 3). An information sharing node was established in the Organization's web-based planning system PIREs to facilitate access by all staff to guidance and training materials, as well as the results framework for each Strategic Objective as they evolved.

8. The Strategy Teams developed their results frameworks during January/February. At the Strategic Objective level, a Log frame-based analysis was used to validate how the proposed Organizational Results addressed key problems and to determine any gaps and overlaps. At the Organizational Result level, the teams were advised to: formulate S.M.A.R.T.² indicators of outcome, including targets and means of verification; identify key assumptions and risks associated with each indicator, together with the appropriate mitigation strategies; and validate the primary tools – the goods and services FAO will need to produce – taking account of FAO's strengths in the core functions, past organizational performance, technical capacity, availability of alternative sources of supply, and partnership opportunities.

9. With further expert feedback, the Strategy Teams shared their draft results frameworks at an innovative event, called the FAO "Results Marketplace" on 11 March. Draft versions of the results frameworks were displayed in the FAO Atrium and, during a three-hour facilitated session, the teams exchanged good practices in results formulation and learned about the content of all of the frameworks. The Marketplace had two main outcomes: evidence of strengthened multi-disciplinary teamwork and the identification of gaps and linkages among the results frameworks. It was also recognized as a tangible sign of culture change and innovation in FAO's way of working.

10. Following further consultations and refinements, in particular to improve indicators, the Strategy Teams will submit their final draft results frameworks on 27 March for use in preparation of the MTP and PWB. Five aspects in terms of achievements and challenges are highlighted for consideration by the Working Group.

Role of strategy teams

11. The Strategy Teams were tasked to facilitate discussion and consultation within and across units at headquarters and decentralized offices and to ensure the application of a results-based approach. Relatively broad guidance was provided on their function (formulate the frameworks) and composition (staff directly responsible for constituent results, staff from other relevant disciplines, contributing decentralized offices). Three main outcomes have emerged from this experience to date:

² Specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, timely

- the truly multi-disciplinary character of the teams (on average about one-third of team members are from outside the lead department) is helping to ensure a holistic approach in formulating the results and primary tools;
- although about 22% of team members are from decentralized offices, it has not yet been possible to fully involve these officers in all deliberations despite use of on-site visits, video- and teleconferencing, and e-mail (see also Regional Contributions below);
- most teams wish to be empowered to go beyond the formulation stage and have a role in budgeting, implementing, monitoring and reporting on their results; this provides an opportunity to institutionalize a truly multi-disciplinary and multi-location results-based approach to achieving the full results cycle of the Objectives.

Regional contributions

12. A major challenge is that the timeframe available for preparation of the planning documentation in 2009 is shorter than for the next full cycle that will start in 2010. This has a particular impact on the regional contributions, as they could not benefit from guidance on regional priorities by the Regional Conferences (which will take place in 2010). Furthermore, the Organization needs to promote understanding of the new result-based framework and RBM principles over a wide and diversified audience in the decentralized offices. First steps have been taken for this through participation of specialist planning and RBM staff, either in person or by video- or teleconference, in the Regional Management Team meetings and Multi-disciplinary Team meetings held in the first quarter of the year.

13. As of mid-March, all regions had completed horizontal consultations within regions/sub-regions to define priorities, starting from the draft results frameworks. However, consultations with Strategy Teams has been uneven and more work needs to be done to reflect these priorities in the results frameworks, which will be undertaken during the definition of specific unit outputs.

Integration of Strategic Objectives

14. Given that the set of Strategic Objectives agreed by Members consists of a mix of sectoral and cross-cutting objectives, Members have stressed the importance of proper integration of these Objectives and their Organizational Results to ensure that the areas of work are complementary to one another and clearly focused and delineated so as to avoid duplication. During the IEE follow-up process last year, WG1 endorsed principles suggested by management to promote the integration of Strategic Objectives and Organizational Results. In particular, Members endorsed the need to: i) incorporate in sectoral OR's clearly identifiable links to primarily cross-cutting areas; ii) focus on and specify the added interdisciplinary value that cross-sectoral ORs would bring to the implementation of all SO's; and iii.) establish interdisciplinary coordination mechanisms supporting integrated approaches.

15. During the formulation of the Objectives, the Strategy Teams face the challenge of refining the focus of the Organizational Results and their Primary Tools so as to ensure integration along the lines of the principles outlined above. Leading up to the FAO Results Marketplace, management and the Teams themselves recognized there was room for further improvement and harmonization in how the various formulations were treating this important aspect. Based on the gaps and linkages among the results frameworks identified through the Marketplace, and on-going discussions through the interdisciplinary Strategy Team mechanism, this aspect will be further refined.

Indicators

16. The identification of realistic, measurable indicators of outcome is at the heart of the new FAO planning framework, and will be one of the critical success factors for an effective results-based management system. This also presents one of the most significant challenges facing the Organization, as staff capacity to formulate indicators of good quality is currently uneven, and needs to be strengthened.

17. The iterative formulation process has evidenced the need for improvements in several areas related to indicators, including: i) indicators that can measure outcome and not output-level results; ii) the ability to effectively benchmark, measure and monitor the indicators on an on-going basis through baselines and data sources (“means of verification”); iii) a sufficiently restricted number of key indicators for each outcome, so as to permit monitoring within foreseeable resource levels; and iv) consistency in phraseology.

18. A follow-up practical session on improving the formulation of indicators was conducted for the Strategy Teams on 17 March.

Application of core functions

19. Members have stressed the importance of prioritization and focus of action in determining how FAO will respond to the various development problems addressed through the Organizational Results. When designing an intervention, FAO must decide on an appropriate set of Primary Tools – goods and services to be delivered to primary stakeholders by the Organization – that will most effectively leverage its comparative advantages. In doing so, FAO has a powerful “toolkit” at its disposal – the critical means of action articulated in the Organization’s core functions. It is important to recognize, however, that while FAO’s potential strengths are clearly embodied in the core functions, the use of the core functions in-and-of themselves is not necessarily sufficient to guarantee effectiveness.

20. Another challenge facing management in refining and finalizing the formulation of the results frameworks is to deepen the analysis of how FAO will intervene, including which of its core functions will be leveraged, to sharpen focus and position the Organization effectively vis-a-vis other development actors. This analysis will be based on the following key criteria as set forth in the IPA: i) organizational performance; ii) existing technical capacity, including for cross-disciplinarity; iii) integration of strengths in advocacy, normative work and technical cooperation; iv) availability of alternative sources of supply and avoidance of duplication; and v) ability to leverage partnerships to achieve desired results.

Examples of draft results frameworks

21. To illustrate the above considerations and allow for WG1 to interact with Strategy Team leaders, the current draft frameworks for Strategic Objectives F (natural resources) and L (investment) - as presented at the Results Marketplace on 11 March - are provided in annexes 4 and 5 respectively.

22. The sample results frameworks are presented in their full logframe elaboration so that the Working Group can gain some understanding of how the results, indicators and targets have been derived. The IPA-agreed format to be used for presentation in the MTP is shown in Annex 6.

Guidance requested

23. Management welcomes further guidance from the Working Group on the process that is being followed to prepare the results frameworks for the Strategic Objectives and on their presentation format.

Annex 1: Overall timeline for preparation of Strategic Framework, MTP 2010-13 and PWB 2010-11

Step	Process	Timing	Action
1	Establishment of Strategy Teams (including HQ and decentralized staff)	By end December '08	ADGs responsible for Strategic and Functional Objectives
2	Formulation of Strategic and Functional Objectives, Organizational Results and Indicators including application of Core Functions, and Impact Focus Areas	December '08 – March '09	Strategy Teams
3	<i>Technical Committee consideration of draft results frameworks (as requested by Programme Committee)</i>	<i>March-April '09</i>	<i>Technical Committees and ADG's responsible for Strategic Objectives</i>
4	<i>CoC Working Group review of draft results frameworks, application of core functions</i>	<i>March-April '09</i>	<i>CoC Working Group and ADG's responsible for Strategic and Functional Objectives</i>
5	Formulation of unit-specific contributions to Organizational Results (requires draft of new Org structure)	April-May '09	Strategy Teams and concerned units including decentralized offices
6	Planning of resources (integrated assessed and voluntary) against Organizational Results	April-May '09	Strategy Teams, HQ and decentralized offices
7	<i>CoC Working Group review of draft elements of Strategic Framework and MTP</i>	<i>May '09</i>	<i>CoC Working Group and relevant ADG's</i>
8	<i>PC/FC/CL initial review of draft results frameworks, core functions, IFAs and overall resources framework</i>	<i>May-June '09</i>	<i>PC/FC/CL; DDG and ADGs</i>
9	Review, quality assurance, refinement of results frameworks and resources, core functions and IFAs in draft MTP/PWB document	June-July '09	Strategy Teams in conjunction with HQ units and decentralized offices
10	<i>CoC Working Group review of fully developed MTP/PWB results frameworks, with resources, baselines and targets</i>	<i>June-July '09</i>	<i>CoC Working Group and relevant ADGs</i>
11	<i>PC/FC review of draft, fully developed MTP/PWB results frameworks and elements of PWB including budget level</i>	<i>July '09</i>	<i>PC/FC; DG, DDG and ADGs</i>
12	<i>Council and CoC review and recommendation of Strategic Framework, MTP and PWB</i>	<i>September '09</i>	<i>Council and CoC; DG, DDG and ADGs</i>
13	Final refinements for Conference	October '09	PBE in consultation with relevant parties
14	<i>Final approval by Conference</i>	<i>November '09</i>	<i>Conference; DG, DDG and ADGs</i>

Annex 2: List of Strategic/Functional Objectives, Core Functions, and Impact Focus Areas (with lead senior managers/units indicated)

Strategic Objectives	Core functions
A. Sustainable intensification of crop production. ADG/AG	a. Monitoring and assessment of long-term and medium-term trends and perspectives. ES
B. Increased sustainable livestock production. ADG/AG	b. Assembly and provision of information, knowledge and statistics. ES, KC
C. Sustainable management and use of fisheries and aquaculture resources. ADG/FI	c. Development of international instruments, norms and standards. LEG
D. Improved quality and safety of foods at all stages of the food chain. ADG/AG	d. Policy and legislative options and advice. TC, LEG
E. Sustainable management of forests and trees. ADG/FO	e. Technical support to promote technology transfer and build capacity. KC
F. Sustainable management of land, water and genetic resources and improved responses to global environmental challenges affecting food and agriculture. ADG/NR	f. Advocacy and communication. KC
G. Enabling environment for markets to improve livelihoods. ADG/ES	g. Interdisciplinarity and innovation. PBE
H. Improved food security and better nutrition. ADG/ES	h. Partnerships and alliances. UNC
I. Improved preparedness for, and effective response to, food and agricultural threats and emergencies. ADG/TC	Functional Objectives
K. Gender equity in access to resources, goods, services and decision-making in the rural areas. ADG/ES	X. Effective collaboration with Member States and stakeholders. (ADG/KC, ADG/TC, ADG/UNC, AUD, LEG, OCD, ODGS, PBE)
L. Increased and more effective public and private investment in agriculture and rural development. ADG/TC	Y. Efficient and effective administration. ADG/AF
	Impact Focus Areas
	Action towards global food security in the context of the current food crisis and climate change. ADG/TC
	Prevention and reduction of the negative effects of transboundary animal and plant pest and food safety incidences. ADG/AG
	Strengthening the information base for sustainable forest management. ADG/FO
	Implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. ADG/FI
	Coping with scarcity of land and water resources. ADG/NR
	Information and statistics – strengthening national, regional and global capacities. ADG/ES
	Standard setting and regulation: Strengthened national and global capacities for the development and implementation of regulations and standards (plant protection, food safety, genetic resources). LEG

Annex 3 – Template for formulation of Strategic and Functional Objectives

This template indicates the critical analytical and data elements to be included in the results-based formulation and refinement of the Strategic and Functional Objectives for the finalization of the FAO Strategic Framework and Medium-Term Plan 2010-13³.

Strategic/Functional Objective [Title]: *Benefits or changes expected to be achieved in a ten year time frame in Member country institutions, the international community or development partners. These benefits represent several steps in the causal chain beyond the immediate result of the uptake of FAO's products and services by its primary users, building on the related Organizational Results.*

Issues and Challenges – <i>statement of the problem to be addressed and the beneficiaries (the individuals, groups, or organizations, whether targeted or not, that benefit, directly or indirectly, from the development intervention).</i>					
Assumptions and Risks <i>associated with the achievement of the Strategic/Functional Objective, assuming the Organizational Results are achieved. Assumptions are hypotheses about risks that could affect the progress or success of a development intervention.</i>					
Organizational Results					
Organizational Result 1 [title] <i>The likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. Identified as "Organizational Results" in FAO's terminology. "Organizational Results" represent the outcomes that FAO commits itself to achieve for Member Countries and the international community in a time-frame of four years in order to contribute to the achievement of Strategic Objectives. Organizational Results represent the first-order level of results in the causal chain beyond what FAO produces, i.e. requiring up-take and use by primary user groups, and are stated in terms of what it is expected to be the result of the use of products and/or services by these primary users. In order to be able to measure and report on the achievement of organizational results, indicators, means of verification, baselines and targets are formulated related to a given timeframe. Organizational Results will normally involve contributions of multiple organizational units, both headquarters and decentralized.</i>					
OR Indicator 1 [describe] <i>Quantitative or qualitative factor or variable that provides a simple and reliable means to measure achievement, to reflect the changes connected to an intervention, or to help assess the performance of a development actor.</i>	Means of Verification	Baseline	Actual	Target (4yr)	Milestone (2yr)
Assumptions related to achievement of the OR Indicator.					
Risks related to achievement of the OR Indicator. <i>Risk analysis is an assessment</i>		Risk Rating		Risk Mitigation Strategy	

³ Note that elements shown in gray shading are for informational purposes only, and are to be elaborated in subsequent processes.

<p><i>of factors (including assumptions) that affect or are likely to affect the successful achievement of an intervention’s objectives.</i></p>		
<p>Primary Tools - <i>the key Outputs and Activities required in order to achieve an Organizational Result. They represent the overall approaches, or major activities, to be utilized by FAO in crafting its intervention under a particular Organizational Result. The Primary Tools reflect careful analysis by programme managers of where FAO can best leverage its comparative advantage, as expressed through the core functions, to promote actions necessary for or remove obstacles impeding the achievement of the Organizational Result. The Primary Tools will normally consist of a mix of regular programme activities as well as extra-budgetary project activities. As in the case of the Organizational Result, Primary Tools are delivered by multiple organizational units.</i></p>		
<p>Analysis of the application of the organization’s core functions to achievement of each of the organizational results</p>		
<p>Strategic Objective Budget broken down by Organizational Result (and by: assessed contributions and extra-budgetary resources; and by region)</p>		

Annex 4: Strategic Objective F

Strategic Objective F: Sustainable management of land, water and genetic resources and improved responses to global environmental challenges affecting food and agriculture

Issues and Challenges

Natural resources (land, water, climate and genetic resources) and their services are essential to food production, enhanced rural development and sustainable livelihoods. Conflicts and competition over access to, and the use of these resources are likely to increase in many regions, due to increasing demands for food, water, fibre, energy as well as the loss and degradation of productive land. These will be exacerbated by changing growing conditions, increased water scarcity, loss of biodiversity, extreme weather events and other effects of climate change, and by shocks in global markets. The sustainable management of natural resources for the benefit of present and future generations requires recognition of the distinct technical disciplines addressing key aspects of natural resources and their governance, as well as the multi-disciplinary and multi-sectoral approaches required to address trade-offs and manage natural resources on a sustainable basis. The challenges are to ensure that capacities in managing natural resources are able to address current challenges and respond to rapid transitions and emergency situations; that environmental services and values are sustained; and that key data (including geospatial), knowledge and approaches related to natural resources are available at the national, regional and global levels, including in support of the development and use of international instruments, and are adopted across the crop, livestock, forestry and fisheries sectors.

Many opportunities exist to limit the adverse impacts on/f climate change through improved knowledge and management of natural resources by sustainable agriculture, forestry and fisheries policies and practices. Adaptation and mitigation actions involve for instance direct reduction of anthropogenic emissions or the enhancement of carbon sinks. Financing mechanisms (e.g. CDM, GEF, PES and other innovative mechanisms) support means to mitigate and adapt to climate change that apply across sectors and that require multidisciplinary approaches. However, complex procedures and restrictive eligibility criteria have tended to hamper funding of activities relevant to agriculture, forestry and fisheries. There is increasing international recognition that bioenergy development both offers opportunities and challenges for sustainable agricultural and rural development. International and national data and information and consultative processes leading towards sustainable bioenergy strategies and policies are needed.

Assumptions and Risks	Risk Rating	Risk Mitigation Strategy
Within the broader external environment , the main assumptions (and risks if the reverse are true) are that:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> current international interest in and commitment to sustainable natural resources management, reflecting its critical importance for food security and poverty reduction, will continue and be converted into policy decisions and budget allocations to promote the adoption 	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sustained, high-level promotion through international fora, active communication and supported applied research for sustainable natural resources management, and linkages between sustainable natural resources management, food security and poverty reduction.

Annex 4: Strategic Objective F

of appropriate management approaches and practices.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> international policies and arrangements can be agreed by countries for sustainable natural resources management, including, for example, in relation to access to genetic resources and the sharing of benefits derived from their use; and in relation to climate change related instruments, such as the Kyoto protocol and any post-2012 arrangements, Clean Development Mechanism and other carbon market mechanisms, facilitating farmers' access to such financial resources. 	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> participation in international discussions and, where appropriate, provision of a neutral forum for consideration of international policies and arrangements related to sustainable natural resources management.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> new challenges will develop in relation to natural resources and their sustainable management. 	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> identification of new challenges, including in the context of new impact focus areas, and mobilisation of capacities, resources, media and communications strategies, extra-budgetary resources and partnerships.
At the national level , the main assumptions (and risks if the reverse is true) are that:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> countries are able to set achievable goals and formulate relevant policies, programmes and practices for the sustainable management of their natural resources, including, for example, for access to genetic resources and the sharing of benefits derived from their use, and for adaptation to and mitigation of climate change 	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> support development of effective sustainable natural resources management strategies and policies and their implementation at country level;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> countries are able to develop the capacities to manage the opportunities and challenges and mobilize necessary resources for capacity building related to sustainable natural resources management. 	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> application of resources to develop new knowledge products and support competency-based capacity building in relation to sustainable natural resources management.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> countries are aware of and able to use effectively FAO capacities in sustainable natural resources management. 	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> support for communication and awareness raising of FAO capacities across the range of national level institutions that address sustainable natural resources management related issues.
At the institutional level (of FAO and its partners), the main assumptions (and risks if the reverse are true) are that:		

Annex 4: Strategic Objective F

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FAO capacity can contribute effectively to the formulation of relevant instruments related to sustainable natural resources management at the international level and their implementation at the national level. 	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> maintenance and continuing development of FAO skills and mobilization of sustainable extra-budgetary resources for FAO support to sustainable natural resources management programs at the international and national levels. 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> continuing existence of FAO “critical mass” related to sustainable natural resources management to provide technical support and capacity building. 	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> adequate skills concentrations maintained and developed in FAO in relation to requirements for sustainable natural resources management. development and maintenance of effective partnerships and of an effective FAO staff and consultant skill register. 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> adequate mechanisms exist to ensure effective inter-unit collaboration. 	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> appropriate mechanisms put in place for cross-cutting issues to ensure effective inter-unit collaboration. 			
Organizational Results					
Organizational Result F1: Countries have strengthened capacities to promote and develop sustainable land management					
Indicators	Means of Verification	Baseline	Actual	Target (4 years)	Milestone (2 years)
F.1.1 Number of countries that have improved their land resources databases and geospatial infrastructure in order to assess, monitor and report on the state of the land resource.	Land resource information system and geospatial infrastructure improved. Reporting of assessments and monitoring internally as well as to international bodies improved.	Capacity assessment in concerned countries indicating strong need for new inventories or weak geospatial capacity to assess monitor or report on land resources		10 countries have enhanced their geospatial and database capacities and assess, monitor and report in a better way.	5 countries have enhanced their geospatial and database capacities and assess, monitor and report in a better way.
F1.2 Number of countries that use FAO guidelines and policy, legal and technical advice for land use planning and sustainable land management including in environments at greatest risk.(particularly drylands/mountains/coastal zones)	(Sub) national plans, legislation and strategies on land resources reflect technical, legal and policy recommendations that are based on FAO guidelines Field projects on land management that use the FAO Sustainable Land Management approach and guidelines including on environments at the greatest risks	Evaluation shows that Guidelines and Tools not adopted in countries		10 countries have reviewed their plans, strategies and legislation in light of FAO guidelines and advice.	5 countries have reviewed their plans, strategies and legislation in light of FAO guidelines and advice.

Annex 4: Strategic Objective F

Assumptions related to achievement of the OR Indicator (relate to all indicators)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The international community continues to show its commitment to support sustainable land management and to prevent land resource degradation, in particular in environments at the greatest risks (e.g. drylands, mountains, coastal zones) • Countries have the understanding, the political will and the institutional and legal framework to perform sound planning and strategies of land resources based on enhanced knowledge and information provided by FAO • FAO maintains and enhances its capacity to develop innovative, integrated and user friendly approaches, methods, and tools related to sustainable land management, land degradation assessment, land cover, land use planning and other related fields; and to develop, manage, maintain and distribute databases and geospatial information on land resources, that meet the needs of countries, in particular , in relation to food security and environmental challenges. 		
Risks related to achievement of the OR Indicator	Risk Rating	Risk Mitigation Strategy
FAO knowledge, achievements and capacities are not adequately recognised by other international agencies and conventions	M	Demonstration of FAO knowledge, achievements and capacities, at normative and field levels. . Active involvement in UN decision making processes, in relation to land issues.
Not enough countries are interested and/or committed on land management issues, in particular at political level, and on implementing Environmental Agreements (eg UNCCD, UNCBD), in particular in environments at the greatest risks (e.g. drylands, mountains, coastal zones)	L	Awareness , communication, training activities on land management , targeted mainly to the national policy makers
FAO loses its capacity and critical mass expertise to perform in integrated land management related fields (policy and legal advice, technical, geospatial data and information systems)	H	Full Implementation of IEE recommendations, in particular those related to integrated/ cross sectoral land management, to land use and to geospatial data.
Primary Tools for achievement of the Organizational Result		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide policy and legal advice, capacity building and technical guidance and/or develop guidelines on how to use land in sustainable ways, including the comparative analysis of food chains and their relative impact on the land resources • Strengthening the capacity of countries to generate and use soil, land cover and land use data at the national level, including through the establishment of appropriate Spatial Data Infrastructures and Standards • Contribute to the preparation of a periodic, high-profile FAO publication on the State of Land and Water Resources (SOLAW) • Assess and monitor land resources, land use, land suitability, land degradation, and soil/land management practice and coordinate, compile and disseminate global level assessments notably through Geonetwork • Contribute to the long-term perspectives, harmonized monitoring, assessment and reporting of trends at various levels: global, regional and national 		

Annex 4: Strategic Objective F

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support international conventions where land use, land use change and land degradation are relevant and support countries in their reporting obligations under these international instruments and in implementing these convention through appropriate national legislation • Assess interactions between land and climate change, including GHG emissions and sequestration, and payments for environmental services 					
Organizational Result F2: Countries address water scarcity in agriculture and strengthen the capacities to improve water productivity of agricultural systems at national and river-basin levels including trans-boundary water systems					
Indicators	Means of Verification	Baseline	Actual	Target (4 years)	Milestone (2 years)
F2.1 Number of countries, river-basin organizations or sub-national or trans-national governments/organizations adopting recommendations on “water productivity enhancement/water-scarcity coping strategies” as a result of policy, legal and strategy support	(i) Projects/programmes together with water audits and investment frameworks developed/implemented at request of member countries or regional organizations. (ii) Key “outcomes” generated by FAO’s “technical and policy knowledge development programmes” adopted by member countries, regional or river-basin organizations, with or without FAO direct intervention	(i) Countries receiving assistance lacking adequate national strategies to address water scarcity. (ii) Investment plans lacking consistency with national policies & strategies.		At least 8 countries or river basins or sub/supra-national organizations	At least 4 countries or river basins organizations or sub/supra-national organizations
F2.2 Number of countries, river basins , agricultural systems or large irrigation schemes where water productivity enhancement tools (including MASSCOTE, AQUACROP, monitoring and benchmarking) have been adopted	Surveys assessing member countries or regional/river-basin organizations using water FAO’s productivity enhancement tools.	(i) Existing FAO portfolio of water control projects. (ii) Countries or schemes lacking productivity enhancement tools.		At least 20 countries, river basins, agricultural systems or large irrigation schemes	At least 8 countries, river basins, agricultural systems or large irrigation schemes
F2.3 Uptake of FAO Water information products and global datasets	Surveys assessing internal and external demand	(i) Number of initial links to be assessed through baseline survey		50% increase	20% increase

Annex 4: Strategic Objective F

Assumptions related to achievement of the OR Indicator (relate to all indicators)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water scarcity increasingly recognised and understood by decision makers as critical problem requiring adaptation at the level of the agricultural sector • Food security and agriculture increasingly recognized and understood by decision makers as critical issues requiring attention at the level of the water sector • Decision makers in countries aware of FAO technical capacity in the field of water scarcity adaptation. • Internal capacity devoted to the work plan not reduced from the current level (no reduction of resources, no diversions due to unforeseen corporate emerging needs) 		
Risks related to achievement of the OR Indicator	Risk Rating	Risk Mitigation Strategy
Agricultural institutions do not perceive water scarcity as a priority issue	L	Awareness, communication, training activities on water scarcity, targeted mainly to the national policy makers. Demonstration of FAO knowledge, achievements and capacities, at normative and field levels. Support to development of knowledge networks and hubs
Institutional rigidity in agricultural water management institutions persists and compounded by poorly aligned policies, legislation, practices, and investment	H	Support the development of monitoring of investment and results and benchmarking at all levels and the adoption of water/irrigation investment frameworks. Support national/river basin initiatives operating at all relevant scales of decision making and management. Map FAO water tools that support investment, mainstream them in TCI, Support countries and IFI/regional banks in the preparation of investment programmes and long-term investment planning
Water productivity enhancement tools lose relevance in changing contexts and overall improved capacity	M	Continued demand-driven updating and adapting of FAO-produced tools
Loss of linkages between FAO's programmed tasks and field programme through NMPTF, UNDAF, One UN approaches	M	Strengthened decentralized capacity according to regional priorities and support to knowledge networks. Amended guidelines for upstream awareness at country level.
Primary Tools for achievement of the Organizational Result		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>FAO Water platform</u> to promote joint technical work and disseminate results on the multi-functional use and cross-sectoral management of water within FAO (in collaboration with relevant units of agriculture, livestock, economics, forestry , legal and technical cooperation departments) • <u>Water policy service</u> to address inter-sectoral water allocation under conditions of scarcity and the implementation of agricultural water management strategies. Deployment of water audit and irrigation and water investment framework methodologies to account for agriculture's water use and related investment in institutional and infrastructure assets. • <u>Technical support facility to promote responsive agricultural water management</u>: Strengthen national capacity to address irrigation performance and modernization and water use efficiency and productivity enhancement using FAO main products (e.g., MASSCOTE, AQUACROP, etc.). Support to 		

Annex 4: Strategic Objective F

<p>knowledge hubs and communities of practice for knowledge synthesis, dissemination, and building capacity at requisite scales.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Water information service</u> to underpin field and normative water activities across FAO. Coordinate, compile and disseminate assessments of water resources and water use at global level (AQUASTAT, FAOSTAT, GeoNetwork), and develop global analysis on status and trends of water resources (specifically, for FAO;s AT2030/50 projections, the World Water Development Report and inter-agency coordination on water issues – UN-Water). 					
Organizational Result F3: Policies and programmes are strengthened at national, regional and international levels to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity for food and agriculture and the equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources					
Indicators	Means of Verification	Baseline	Actual	Target (4 years)	Milestone (2 years)
F3.1 Outputs and milestones achieved, as agreed by the intergovernmental Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA) in its Multi-Year Programme of Work on biodiversity for food and agriculture	Meeting reports of CGRFA-13 & CGRFA-14	NA		Achievement of at least six major outputs/ milestones	Achievement of at least three major outputs/ milestones
F3.2 Countries developing/ strengthening their overall programmes and policies on biodiversity for food and agriculture, including on access and benefit-sharing, in response to or on the basis of policy instruments or recommendations of the CGRFA	Regular country and regional progress reports and synthesis progress reports submitted to CGRFA	Status of implementation of the GPA AnGR, 2009 <i>The 2nd State of the World's Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, 2009</i>		Programmes and policies of at least 10 developing countries have been developed in response to or on the basis of recommendations or policies developed by the CGRFA	Programmes and policies of at least 5 additional developing countries have been developed in response to or on the basis of recommendations or policies developed by the CGRFA
F3.3 – Joint work plans or other cooperation arrangements strengthening	Meeting reports of CGRFA and other forums	Strategic Plan for the implementation of the Multi-Year Programme of Work		At least 5 joint work plans or cooperation arrangements with international	Review of existing joint work plans/ cooperation arrangements and

Annex 4: Strategic Objective F

and planning cooperation on biodiversity for food and agriculture with relevant international forums (IT/PGRFA, CBD, WIPO/ UPOV, WTO, CGIAR, etc.)	Contributions of CGRFA and its secretariat to relevant forums	(2010-2017) of the Commission		organizations are operative	development of a strategy for new partnerships of the CGRFA
Assumptions related to achievement of the OR Indicator (relate to specific indicators)					
F3.1					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate skills and extra-budgetary resources are available within FAO for the implementation of the Commission's Multi-Year Programme of Work. • Commission Members contribute nationally or regionally aggregated information for the preparation of <i>the State of World's Forest Genetic Resources</i> and the <i>State of the World's Aquatic Genetic Resources</i>, as required. • The review of the Multi-Year Programme of Work (13th Session) does not lead to substantial changes of the programme. • FAO's collaboration with relevant international organizations and institutions can be maintained. 					
F3.2					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governments have sufficient capacity or incentives to develop or strengthen relevant programmes and policies. • FAO and its partner organizations provide sufficient support to developing countries for the development/ strengthening of relevant programmes and policies. 					
F3.3					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human and financial resources are available within FAO to establish and implement cooperation agreements and joint work plans. • Other international organizations are willing and able to support the development of cooperation agreements/ joint work plans with FAO. 					
Risks related to achievement of the OR Indicator	Risk Rating	Risk Mitigation Strategy			
F3.1					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human and financial resources required for the implementation of the Multi-Year Programme of Work are not available or insufficient. • Milestones/ outputs are postponed to later sessions of the Commission. • Governments lack the capacity to provide accurate information on FoGR and AqGR. • Partner organizations are not able to contribute to the implementation of the major outputs and milestones. 	<p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <p style="text-align: center;">L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobilization of extra-budgetary resources, in particular for State of the World reports on AqGR and FoGR by targeting donor countries with special interest in these areas. • Improvement of planning and streamlining of work through the Strategic Plan for the implementation of the Multi-Year Programme of Work. • Mobilization of sustainable extra-budgetary resources for FAO support to capacity-building required for accurate country assessments. • Liaison with partner organizations and communication of needs for contributions at early stage of implementation. 			

Annex 4: Strategic Objective F

F3.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governments lack capacity to develop or strengthen programmes and policies for genetic resources for food and agriculture. • FAO's capacity to support countries in the implementation is insufficient. 	<p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <p style="text-align: center;">M</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of regular programme and sustainable extra-budgetary resources to competency-based capacity-building • Mobilization of sustainable extra-budgetary resources for FAO support to implementation activities. 			
F3.3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human and financial resources for the coordination of activities and cooperation with other international organizations are insufficient • Lack of political support for cooperation from potential partner organizations. 	<p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <p style="text-align: center;">L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generation of efficiency savings through better coordination and cooperation compensating thereby for increased coordination costs. • Communication to governments on purpose and advantages of increased coordination of activities and cooperation. 			
Primary Tools for achievement of the Organizational Result					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide an intergovernmental forum for policy making, including the negotiation of effective international instruments, on all components of biodiversity of relevance to food and agriculture, including through facilitating sessions of the CGRFA. [NRD, AGA, AGP, FIM, FOM] • Guide and oversee: 1) assessments of the state of the world's different components of genetic resources for food and agriculture and 2) the implementation of policy instruments on biodiversity for food and agriculture. [NRD, FIM, FOM] • Facilitate the achievement of outputs and milestones established by the Commission's Multi-year Programme of Work. [NRD, AGA, AGP, FIM, FOM] • Establish partnerships and strengthen cooperation with relevant international organizations, <i>inter alia</i> through the coordination of FAO expertise/ cooperation with allies, to facilitate through policy and technical advice the implementation of instruments of relevance to biodiversity for food and agriculture. [NRD, AGA, AGE, AGP, FIM, FOM] • Monitor trends regarding the use and exchange of genetic resources for food and agriculture to assist in articulating policy and strategy options for access and benefit-sharing policies, at national, regional and international levels, aiming at improving food security. [NRD, AGA, AGE, AGP, FIM, FOM] 					
Organizational Result F4: An international framework is developed and countries' capacities are reinforced for responsible governance of access to and secure tenure of land and its interface with other natural resources					
Indicators	Means of Verification	Baseline	Actual	Target (4 years)	Milestone (2 years)
F4.1 Increased international consensus on measures to	Workshop reports Surveys	No consensus on specific measures exists, although		Adoption of voluntary guidelines	Draft voluntary guidelines

Annex 4: Strategic Objective F

improve governance of access to and secure tenure of land and its interface with other natural resources		there is increasing recognition of the need for improvement of governance of tenure			
F4.2 - Number of countries that have increased capacity to implement secure and equitable tenure of land and its interface with other natural resources.	Surveys Internal review of projects	N/A		Additional 15 countries	Draft tools prepared
Assumptions related to achievement of the OR Indicator (related to all indicators)					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity and commitment exist within FAO and partner organizations to carry out inter-disciplinary work on natural resources governance. Extra-budgetary resources are available for consultations and other activities required to develop consensus on voluntary guidelines and policies for governance of tenure of natural resources Decision makers continue to consider tenure as a critical problem that can be positively addressed and are aware of FAO's capacity in this area 					
Risks related to achievement of the OR Indicator		Risk Rating	Risk Mitigation Strategy		
Lack of capacity and commitment to carry out inter-disciplinary work on natural resource governance		M	Strengthened networks and mechanisms for inter-disciplinary cooperation		
Lack of extra-budgetary funds for consultations and other activities		L	Development of proposals for extra-budgetary funding		
Tenure is seen as too complex and political a problem to address		M	Target to government decision-makers to ensure their awareness and understanding of the challenges and possibilities.		
Primary Tools for achievement of the Organizational Result					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for the development of consensus on voluntary guidelines and policies on responsible governance of tenure, including through the development of partnerships and alliances, and undertaking advocacy and communication. Tools and methodologies for building capacity in the administration of natural resource tenure, including through the development of partnerships and alliances to stimulate the dissemination and application of information. 					

Annex 4: Strategic Objective F

Organizational Result F5: Countries have strengthened capacities to address emerging environmental challenges, such as climate change and bioenergy					
Indicators	Means of Verification	Baseline	Actual	Target (4 years)	Milestone (2 years)
F5.1 – Number of countries with enhanced capacity to address challenges related to climate change mitigation and adaptation and sustainable bioenergy development.	Countries' review of national development strategies and legislation Updated analytical techniques for assessing agriculture's GHG emissions and impacts of climate variability and climate change Country reports to UNFCCC UNFCCC database on local coping strategies and good practices FAO outputs (tools, papers) Project progress reports from field projects related to climate change and bioenergy	There is no systematic monitoring of national climate change adaptation and mitigation measures and only weak involvement with national plans of adaptation (NAPAs) Available country data as of Jan. 2010		As a result of FAO support, at least 15 countries have adequate capacities in agricultural sector to address the different aspects related to the challenges of climate change and sustainable bioenergy development This encompasses national policies, research, legal matters, financial and implementation mechanisms, such as payments for environmental services, extension and communication for development	Normative material ready for use Training materials developed and Training delivered in at least 10 countries on different aspects related to climate change and sustainable bioenergy development At least 5 countries have started to use FAO's material and technical support
F 5.2 Links between food security, sustainable natural resources management, poverty reduction and adaptation to climate change and sustainable bioenergy recognized and addressed in international dialogue and Multilateral Environmental Agreements.	Occurrence of explicit references to food security in international climate change and sustainable bioenergy debates and agreements FAO inputs to UNFCCC reports, to GBEP, and to the RSB Access to FAO websites on Climate Change and Bioenergy Project reports – Sustainable Biofuels Development Project	The final declaration of the High Level Conference on World Food Security: the Challenges of Climate Change and Bioenergy, June 2008 The Post-Kyoto UNFCCC Agreement decided at Copenhagen, Dec 2009		- At least 10 countries have used the results of FAO's normative work, training sessions and/or meetings or training sessions to contribute to a better consideration of the links between food security and the global changes posed by climate change bioenergy development in international dialogues and multilateral environment - Output of sustainable	Development of FAO Websites on CC and BE FAO provided feedback on RSB zero draft standard and inputs into development of 1 st draft standard GBEP presents first framework of criteria and indicators 2 FAO meetings on bioenergy and food

Annex 4: Strategic Objective F

				bioenergy development project proposed for intergovernmental consensus - Soil carbon is a recognised mitigation and adaptation option under post-Kyoto regime	security/poverty standards Pilot projects demonstrate the feasibility of soil carbon sequestration in semi-arid soils and rangelands
Assumptions related to achievement of the OR Indicator (related to all indicators)					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about climate change and energy prices continue to drive national and international interest in bioenergy development Post Kyoto agreement will be achieved to further support and investment and action on climate change Agriculture will have achieved a higher profile in post Kyoto agreements 					
Risks related to achievement of the OR Indicator		Risk Rating	Risk Mitigation Strategy		
Entrenched positions prevent achieving international or intergovernmental agreement on standards related to sustainable bioenergy development		M	Provision of scientific information to inform the debate and use of FAO's neutral facilitator's role		
Entrenched positions prevent achieving international or intergovernmental agreement on the potential of soil carbon sequestration and its inclusion in CC mitigation financing mechanisms		M	Provision of scientific information to inform the debate and use of FAO's neutral facilitators role		
Agriculture continues to be a marginal player in international climate change negotiations and in national perceptions		H	Development of advocacy at the government and international level		
FAO's high visibility policy in international CC fora reduces resource availability at technical levels for establishing leadership based on FAO's unique international outlook, understanding of current trends and the technical skills of its staff		H	Significant more resources invested in tangible outputs		
Primary Tools for achievement of the Organizational Result					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generation and management of knowledge, data, tools, technologies, approaches, policy guidance, and good technical, policy, communication for development, and extension practices, related to climate change impact assessment, mitigation and adaptation, and sustainable bioenergy development Policy and legal advice and technical assistance related to climate change impact assessment, mitigation and adaptation, and sustainable bioenergy development 					

Annex 4: Strategic Objective F

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training,, appropriate information, communication and other types of capacity building support related to the challenges of climate change and sustainable bioenergy development • Technical support, facilitation and participation in international dialogues on sustainable bioenergy development and in Multilateral Environmental Agreements • Technical support to countries to facilitation and make more efficient their participation in international dialogues on sustainable bioenergy development and in Multilateral Environmental Agreements • Advocacy and provision of inputs to intergovernmental processes to ensure that the dimensions of food, crop, livestock, forestry and fisheries are reflected in the negotiation and implementation of international instruments addressing global challenges 					
Organizational Result F6: Improved access to and sharing of knowledge for natural resource management has been facilitated.					
Indicators	Means of Verification	Baseline	Actual	Target (4 years)	Milestone (2 years)
F6.1 Number of countries with enhanced capacities to generate, disseminate and scale up adapted technologies and integrated technology packages on sustainable natural resource management	Final statements of national/regional planning documents, reports, plans and projects	National research capacities assessments indicate strong need for technical assistance. Demand for normative, policy, and technical assistance in extension is quite high and increasing		At least 10 countries have enhanced capacities	At least 5 countries have enhanced capacities
F6.2 Number of programmes and strategies of communication for development for sustainable natural resource management	Final statements from national/regional planning documents, reports, plans, and projects	Demand for normative, policy, and technical assistance in communication for development is quite high and increasing		10 programmes and strategies	5 programmes and strategies
Assumptions related to achievement of the OR Indicator (related to all indicators)					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity and commitment exist within FAO and partner organizations to carry out inter-disciplinary work on knowledge for sustainable agricultural development • Work on coalition development with GFAR, CGIAR and other research entities are demanded by Member countries, within FAO, and international partners • Regular programme and extra-budgetary resources are available for consultations and other substantial activities required to enable effective cross-cutting collaboration on development of capacities for sustainable agricultural development and natural resources management 					

Annex 4: Strategic Objective F

Risks related to achievement of the OR Indicator	Risk Rating	Risk Mitigation Strategy
Lack of capacity and commitment to carry out inter-disciplinary work on capacity development	M	Strengthened networks and mechanisms for inter-disciplinary cooperation
Lack of regular programme and extra-budgetary funds for consultations and other substantial inter-disciplinary activities	L	Allocation of regular programme funds and development of proposals for extra-budgetary funding
Primary Tools for achievement of the Organizational Result		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical assistance and policy advice to Member countries on strengthening national research and extension systems • Technical assistance and policy advice in coalition efforts with GFAR, CGIAR and other international agricultural research entities for sustainable agricultural development and knowledge availability and transfer • Assessment tools on countries' research, extension, and communication for development plans and structures in sustainable agricultural development and natural resources management • Global and regional studies on strategies for research systems, delivery of services, and communication for development in natural resources management and Climate Change • Strengthening of partnership between FAO and international agricultural research for development and extension institutions and other entities • Facilitation of dialogue to establish functional linkages among stakeholders of agriculture innovation systems 		
Analysis of the application of the organization's core functions to achievement of each of the organizational results		
Strategic Objective Budget broken down by Organizational Result (and by: assessed contributions and extra-budgetary resources; and by region)		

Last two rows are shown for information purposes only, and are to be elaborated in subsequent processes.

Annex 5: Strategic Objective L**Strategic Objective L - Increased and more effective public and private investment in agriculture and rural development****Issues and Challenges:**

Volatile food and energy prices, the financial crisis, climate change and biodiversity loss threaten global food and nutrition security, pose a broad range of humanitarian, human rights, socioeconomic, environmental, developmental, political and security-related challenges and seriously threaten the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The world's population is projected to reach 9 billion people by 2050. Food production must double between now and then if the world is to be able to feed itself. Cereal yields in developing countries will need to increase by 40 percent to avoid major pressures on food prices. Over the past two decades, public funding of agriculture has declined sharply, in both relative and absolute terms. The share of agriculture in Official Development Assistance (ODA) declined from 18% in 1979 to 3.5% in 2004, rising to 4.4% in 2007. National public funding has also declined dramatically. Improved agricultural productivity will require a continued, strengthening reversal of this sharp reduction in development assistance to agriculture, along with the commitment of increasing amounts of domestic resources to the sector. In 2008, the High-level Task Force on Food Security estimated that the share of ODA for food and agricultural development needs to increase to ten percent within five years to increase agricultural production and productivity, especially of the world's 450 million smallholder farms.

In order to achieve the highest possible impact of public and private investments in food and sustainable agricultural and rural development (FSARD), a number of conditions must be met: among others, appropriate policies, strategies and institutions creating an enabling environment supportive of private investment; state-of-the art formulation of public/private investment programmes and projects; and timely and comprehensive monitoring and evaluation of results and impact. Analysis is needed to increase the viability of investments and to identify barriers to investment options.

With rising untied donor assistance, public financial management needs to be strengthened, in the context of medium-term expenditure frameworks, public expenditure reviews and others. With increased amounts invested in sector-wide approaches, direct budgetary support and basket funding, aid effectiveness needs to be improved in accordance with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and Accra Agenda for Action (2008). Improvements in the design of concrete investment operations are needed, and a shift from international to national expertise in this design process accomplished. Given limited public funding for FSARD, it must be applied in core areas to maximize leverage and impact on poverty reduction and food security and attract private sector funding. Finally, impact monitoring must be enhanced in many countries, as well as the capacity of staff in ministries and agencies outside project staff.

Annex 5: Strategic Objective L

Assumptions and Risks: Within the broader external environment, the main assumptions (and risks if the reverse are true) are that:	Risk Assessment		Risk Mitigation Strategy
	Likelihood	Severity	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the recent strong momentum for FSARD at national and international levels is not sustained over time so that pledges (both from national budgets and ODA) are not converted into actual investment in support of food security and poverty reduction; 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sustained, high-level promotion of investment in FSARD through international fora; support development of effective investment strategies and policies at country level; research into linkages between FSARD investment and poverty reduction.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> volatility in producer price levels for food staples in developing countries inhibit small producers and agribusiness investors from increasing local food production and processing capacity. 	M	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> promotion of improved agricultural productivity and more efficient food supply chains in developing countries; support to the development of financial and fiscal measures (virtual reserves, index-based insurance; social safety nets) to buffer price volatility impacts. Promote more flexible farming and marketing systems to take advantage of commodity price fluctuations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> market distortions resulting from agricultural subsidies and non-tariff trade barriers in OECD countries are not reduced over time; 	M	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> support to the rationalization of OECD country agriculture subsidies through policy analysis and engagement in world trade reform debate.

Annex 5: Strategic Objective L

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> climate change risk to agriculture productivity does not remain manageable in the near to medium term investment horizon (up to 2050); 	M	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> promotion of irrigated agriculture and associated water efficient technologies to buffer production risk on the basis of ‘no regrets’ adaptive measures; support to the development of climate resilient agricultural crop varieties and management technologies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> developing countries do not adopt more effective policies and institutions to help farmers and agri-businesses take advantage of export opportunities; 	M	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> support development of effective strategies and policies and supportive institutions at country and regional/sub-regional levels;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and Accra Agenda for Action (2008) are not put into effective practice, resulting in incoherence between various sources of funding/support to the benefit of the recipient countries. 	L	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> continued support to the principles of aid effectiveness. Ownership, alignment, harmonization, predictability, use of country systems and managing for development results and mutual accountability
At the national level, the main assumptions (and risks if the reverse is true) are that:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> governments do not have the competency to drive a predictable economic reform agenda that applies public funding to leverage private investment in FSARD while reducing private investment risk and transaction costs; and 	M	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> application of regular program and sustainable extra-budgetary resources to competency-based capacity building in FSARD strategy and policy development and investment preparation and management; development and application of new knowledge products on FSARD policy and investment preparation and management.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> governments do not have the sufficient capacity and incentives to effectively manage FSARD investment projects. 	M	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> application of regular program and sustainable extra-budgetary resources to competency-based capacity building in FSARD strategy and policy development and investment management; development and application of new knowledge products on

Annex 5: Strategic Objective L

			FSARD policy and investment preparation and management.
At the institutional level (FAO and its partners) the main assumptions (and risks if the reverse are true) are:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> there is insufficient flexibility in use of resources to meet the specialized investment needs and requests of countries for support to sectoral and policy analysis, investment strategy development and capacity building efforts; and 	H	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> mobilization of untied, sustainable extra-budgetary resources for FAO support to investment programs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> skills are not available, or cannot be brought into the Organization to support investment related priorities of countries. 	L	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> development and maintenance of an effective FAO staff and consultant skill register.

Annex 5: Strategic Objective L

Organizational Results				
Organizational Result L1: Greater inclusion of food and sustainable agriculture and rural development investment strategies and policies into national and regional development plans and frameworks.				
Indicators	Means of Verification	Baseline	Targets	
			<small>(Countries where FAO is involved in policy advice and support) (Baseline and Targets to be further refined)</small>	
			Milestone 2 Year	Target 4 Year
L1.1 – share of public investment to agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government budgets and public expenditure reviews; • Government prepared strategies and plans; • Government gazettes; • National statistics. 	4% (3yr.ave.)	5%	6%
L1.2 – Percentage of ODA allocated to FSARD.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OECD/DAC and donor/IFI annual reports, National statistics; • AU/NEPAD tracking system of the Maputo Declaration 	4.0% (3yr.ave.)	5.0%	6%
L.1.3 – Improvement in agribusiness climate/environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys (methodology to be designed and tested); • Volume of bank loans to agriculture 	TBD	TBD	TBD
L.1.4 - Percentage of national budgets allocated to Agriculture research and extension	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Database NRR and IFPRI 	TBD	TBD	TBD

Annex 5: Strategic Objective L

Assumptions and Risks (related to result achievement)	Risk Rating		Risk Mitigation Strategy
	Likelihood	Severity	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FSARD interventions are not effectively driven by comprehensive FSARD strategies; 	M	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> encourage Member Countries to apply TCP and other extra budgetary resources to country assistance FSARD strategic planning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate skill base in FAO for public expenditure reviews and macro-economic analysis; 	L	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> target FAO staff capacity building and recruitment programs to address skill gaps; create additional “project” posts for flexibility in meeting shifting staff skill needs; establish/expand FAO staff and consultant skills database.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governments lack the competency or governance culture to drive economic reform 	M	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> expand FAO delivery of competency based capacity building in FSARD investment analysis, planning and evaluation; target government financial as well as agricultural decision makers for FSARD capacity building.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IFIs unwilling to contract FAO to support country assistance strategic planning; 	M	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progressively raise IFI awareness of FAO strategy for Support to Investment; encourage Member Countries to apply TCP and other extra budgetary resources to country assistance strategic planning.
<p>Primary Tools for achievement of the Result:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the provision of targeted FAO expertise and knowledge products in government investment framework formulation; FAO FSARD appraisals, policy advice and technical support on, <i>inter alia</i>, poverty mitigation and food security, crop production intensification, sustainable land management, market access, social safety nets, agribusiness, investment climate indicators, public-private partnerships, rural finance systems, agriculture knowledge and information systems, etc. Develop tools tracking private investment in agriculture and business environment to attract additional private investment. 			

Annex 5: Strategic Objective L

Organizational Result L.2: Improved public and private sector organisations' capacity to plan, implement and enhance the sustainability of food and agriculture and rural development investment operations.				
Indicators	Means of Verification	Baseline	Incremental Targets	
			<small>(Countries where FAO is involved in policy advice and support) (Baseline and Targets to be further refined)</small>	
			Milestone 2 Year	Target 4 Year
L2.1 – Proportion of FAO/TCI investment formulation projects where national consultants exceed 50% of total staff weeks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TCI MIS – Number of staff weeks (national consultants staff weeks as percent of total SW); 	TBD (TCI MIS database)	TBD	TBD
L2.2 – Number of practitioners trained in FSARD investment and food security planning and implementation assessed as competent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity building assessment reports • Ex-ante and ex-post competency assessment of trainees; 	NA	80	200
L2.3 Number of new FAO knowledge products developed and the number of new and existing products applied in capacity building programs in support for investment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAO reports, including knowledge products; • Capacity building assessment reports • Ex-ante and ex-post competency assessment of trainees; 	NA FAO probably already has several products ready	2 (targets likely to be higher)	4
L2.4 – Country satisfaction with FAO-provided capacity building in support for investment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • User satisfaction surveys. 	NA	70%	80%

Annex 5: Strategic Objective L

Assumptions and Risks (related to result achievement)	Risk Rating		Risk Mitigation Strategy
	Likelihood	Severity	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient FAO or extra budgetary financial support to finance competency based capacity building; 	M	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> mobilization of untied, sustainable extra-budgetary resources for FAO support to investment programs; increased regular program funding for capacity building in support to investment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inability to capture/cohesively apply FAO expertise 	M	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> good forward planning of capacity building events; establishment of cross-Department thematic networks.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate FAO institutional framework to support capacity building; 	L	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> identify/recruit FAO staff with capacity building interest/competency and form capacity building unit or network in FAO.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate FAO country/regional office linkages to IFIs 	M	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integration of IFI investment planning and upstream work into the country NMTPFs.
Primary Tools for achievement of the Result:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the provision of FAO-led capacity building and mentoring of national counterparts in investment cycle management; advocacy and communication, to mobilize political will and promote global recognition of required actions in areas of FAO's mandate; development and dissemination of related information and knowledge products including lessons learned from IFI and regional/ thematic evaluation studies. 			

Annex 5: Strategic Objective L

Organizational Result L.3: Quality assured public/private sector investment programmes, in line with national priorities and requirements, developed and financed.				
Indicators	Means of Verification	Baseline	Incremental Targets (Countries where FAO is involved in policy advice and support)	
			Milestone 2 Year	Target 4 Year
L3.1 – Number and value of investment funding of FSARD operations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IFI Investment reports • NPFS; • RPFS 	No./US\$?? billion 16 NPFS/US\$ 3.59 billion 4 RPFS/US\$ 0.58 billion	No./US\$?? 27 NPFS/ US\$ 7.34 billion 6 RPFS/US\$ 0.73 billion	No./US\$?? 33 NPFS/US\$ 8.76 billion 8 RPFS/US\$ 0.76 billion
L3.2 – Value of private sector financial flows to agriculture as a result of Public- Private Partnerships developed with FAO support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National statistics; • FAO, UNIDO and UNCTAD reports and statistical records • AGS database 	USD ?? billion	TBD	TBD
L3.3 – IFI quality rating of FSARD investment operations prepared with FAO support (in the future consider FAO quality support and assessment mechanisms through FO X3 – FAO as a provider of excellent technical services)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IFI project quality as measured by partner IFIs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ at entry; ○ at supervision 	75% of projects receive satisfactory or higher score at entry 70% of projects	77% 72%	80% 75%

Annex 5: Strategic Objective L

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ at completion 		<p>score moderately satisfactory or higher supervision score</p> <p>70% of projects receive satisfactory or higher score at completion</p>	72%	75%
Assumptions and Risks (related to result achievement)	Risk Rating Likelihood Severity		Risk Mitigation Strategy	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate funding for NPFS/RPFS projects; 	M	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • integrate food security strategies into government and IFI planning documents; • establish a MDTF to finance national and regional food security projects. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient capacity or incentive within government to effectively manage investment projects 	L	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • target government financial as well as agricultural decision makers for FSARD capacity building. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M&E systems inadequate to provide feedback to project preparation and implementation 	M	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen FAO staff capacity to plan and monitor results based investment projects; • build national capacity to plan and implement monitoring and evaluation systems; • Adequately resource project monitoring and evaluation during project design 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient frequency and lack of continuity or relevant expertise in project supervision. 	L	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Match supervision inputs to project risk and technical requirements and incorporate supervision into project design; • negotiate with IFIs for increased FAO role in project 	

Annex 5: Strategic Objective L

supervision and ensure continuity of staff inputs.

Primary Tools for achievement of the Result:

- the integrated provision of FAO interdisciplinary technical and investment cycle management expertise to member countries;
- the application of innovative approaches to the Organization's technical work and support services;
- effective partnerships with IFIs to jointly achieve Member Country development goals.

Check list and description of application of the Organization's Core functions to achievement of the Strategic Objective

Core Function**Application of Core Function for SO-L**

- **Providing long-term perspectives** and leadership in **monitoring and assessing trends** in food security and agriculture, fisheries and forestry;
- **Stimulating the generation, dissemination and application of information and knowledge**, including statistics;
- **Negotiating international instruments, setting norms, standards and voluntary guidelines**, supporting the development of national legal instruments and promoting their implementation;
- Articulating **policy and strategy options and advice**;
- Providing **technical support** to promote technology transfer, catalyse change and build capacity;
- Undertaking **advocacy and communication**, to mobilize political will and promote global recognition of required actions in areas of FAO's mandate;
- Bringing integrated **interdisciplinary and innovative approaches** to bear on the Organization's technical work and support services;

- FAO will apply analysis of long term trends in developing FSARD investment strategies, policies and programs, while country information collected during policy analysis will feed back into FAO monitoring systems;
- FAO support to investment will include investment in agricultural knowledge and information systems;
- FAO support to investment will ensure funding for the implementation of international instruments, norms, standards and guidelines incorporated in investment programs;
- Support to FSARD investment policy and strategy is central to the achievement of SO-L
- FAO will provide capacity building and mentoring of national counterparts in investment cycle management;
- FAO will support member countries to incorporate improved FSARD policies and strategies into national development plans and investment frameworks;
- FAO will build in-house thematic groups/networks and mount multi-disciplinary staff teams to meet investment support requirements

Annex 5: Strategic Objective L

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Working through strong partnerships and alliances where joint action is needed; | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Partnership agreements exist with all major IFIs and will be updated to reflect FAO Member Country strategic goals. |
|--|---|

Strategic/Functional Objective Budget broken down by Organizational Result (and by: assessed contributions and extra-budgetary resources; and by region) (TBC)

Annex 6: Format for Presentation of Strategic/Functional Objectives and their Organizational Results in the Medium Term Plan (from IPA)

Box 2: Format for Presentation of Strategic/Functional Objectives and their Organizational Results	
Strategic Objective Title:	
Issues and Challenges:	
Assumptions and Risks:	
Organizational Results	
Result 1 Title	
Primary Tools for achievement of the Result	Targets and Indicators
Result 2 Title	
Primary Tools for achievement of the Result	Targets and Indicators
Result 3 Title	
Primary Tools for achievement of the Result	Targets and Indicators
etc for each Organizational Result	
Check list and description of application of the Organization’s Core functions to achievement of the Strategic Objective	
Strategic/Functional Objective Budget broken down by Organizational Result (and by: assessed contributions and extra-budgetary resources; and by region)	