



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



OFFICE OF EVALUATION

Thematic evaluation series

Evaluation of FAO Strategic Objective 5:
**Increase the resilience
of livelihoods to
threats and crises**

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

October 2016

THEMATIC EVALUATION SERIES

**Evaluation of FAO Strategic Objective 5:
Increase the resilience of livelihoods
to threats and crises**

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
OFFICE OF EVALUATION**

October 2016

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Office of Evaluation (OED)

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

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

© FAO 2016

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

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

For further information on this report, please contact:

Director, Office of Evaluation (OED)
Food and Agriculture Organization
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 1, 00153 Rome
Italy
Email: evaluation@fao.org

Cover photo credits: ©FAO/Olivier Cossée, Maame Duah, FAO Tajikistan

Management response to the Evaluation of FAO Strategic Objective 5

- 1 Management welcomes the Evaluation of FAO's contribution to Strategic Objective 5 – Increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises. It provides a comprehensive analysis of the way FAO's resilience agenda has successfully strengthened the development positioning of the Organization's work in preparation for and response to crises. This agenda broadens the services FAO offers, moving more towards encompassing resilience programming, bridging between short-term emergency response and longer-term risk reduction and management. As highlighted by the Evaluation, FAO is an Organization which primarily supports longer-term agricultural development but remains present at times of disasters and crises to provide emergency assistance with a resilience perspective. The report captures well the essence of SO5, which encompasses development work, that takes years of policy and capacity development support (e.g. for early warning systems or disaster risk reduction and preparedness), as well as a response component, framed and contained within the longer-term development perspective.
- 2 Management appreciates the report's findings in terms of strategic positioning of the Organization. It highlights well how FAO is ideally positioned to contribute to the resilience agenda and to work as an opinion leader in the field. Indeed, at country level, SP5 is making a difference by ensuring more cohesive multidisciplinary resilience building interventions. Tailored programmatic supports together with the promotion of country resilience strategies have served to connect the broader country programming framework with project level details.
- 3 Management notes the evaluation's acknowledgement of the flexible, dynamic and supportive approach developed and implemented by the SP5 team at all levels, especially working with country offices in delivering results. It further notes that the country support process pioneered by the team, is credited with greatly enhancing the dialogue between headquarters, regional, subregional and country offices in a demand driven, integrated and holistic manner. In fact, this was critical in strengthening the corporate cross-SPs approach developed to support country results delivery.
- 4 Progress achieved under the various pillars is well captured and Management agrees with the main recommended actions. Under pillar one (Govern Crises and Disaster Risks), efforts are already underway to develop a One Health Strategic Action Plan. Under pillar two (Monitor Crises and Disaster Risk with Early Warnings), early warning and information systems are being further institutionalized to strengthen decision making, while under pillar three (Reduce Community Vulnerability to Crises and Disaster Risk) work has been initiated to identify, capture and disseminate good practices to facilitate uptake by country offices in order to build more diversified resilience programmes. Under pillar four (Prepare for and respond to Crises and Disasters), surge capacity mechanisms are being strengthened notably through the development of standard operating procedures for Level 1 and Level 2 emergencies.
- 5 Management's observations and planned actions on the five recommendations and 31 sub-recommendations are described below.
- 6 The **first recommendation** and set of eight sub-recommendations are all accepted.
 - Dialogue is on-going to adjust and update the corporate definition of resilience, to include further relevant dimensions and account for recent key developments (e.g. the outcomes of the World Humanitarian Summit, Sendai Framework for DRR, etc.).
 - Work related to improving the access of the most vulnerable groups to services (Output 3.2) will be strengthened by focusing more on social protection and risk transfer tools in addition to increasing access to land and natural resources as a means of reducing vulnerabilities of communities.
 - The SP5 collaboration with other SP Teams will be further enhanced. Work will be pursued with SP1 at policy level, supporting countries to develop and implement appropriate legal,

policy and institutional systems as well as regulatory frameworks (including Food Chain Crisis Management, Disaster Risk Reduction and Management for the agricultural sectors and the Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises). With SP2, work will continue on complementarities between resilience and climate change/adaptation, and with SP3 on social protection and migration, with specific regard to coordination, common vision and country-level joint-technical support. Collaboration with SP4 will cover areas such as the impacts of food chain crises on the value chain and country support in the formulation of strategies on resilience of post-harvest food systems.

- Regarding the Regional Initiatives, their concepts and purposes will be reframed based on the deliberations of the Regional Conferences in order to anchor them as flagship programmes backed by solid political commitment at regional level.

7 The **second recommendation** and its three sub-recommendations are partially accepted.

- This recommendation relates to issues such as the lack of predictable resources in SP5 and the need for greater predictability in contractual arrangements for its technical and operational staff which cannot be implemented in isolation within SP5. It will be considered along with other corporate priorities in preparing the Programme of Work and Budget 2018-19.

8 The **third recommendation** and eight sub-recommendations are all accepted.

- As recommended, SP5 will:
 - increase its strategic engagement with resource partners at global and country level and strengthen its current resource mobilization mechanisms (e.g. through the Disaster Risk Reduction Facility and further promotion of the Special Fund for Emergency and Rehabilitation Activities (SFERA)).
 - take a greater leadership role in countries affected by severe crises, while other Strategic Programmes should be more prominent in institutionally stable contexts with manageable levels of hazards and risks. In such contexts, SP5 will lead the implementing measures for resilience of ecosystems, people and communities, including prevention and enhancement of capacities, in collaboration with other SPs.
 - pursue the work already initiated under the Early Warning for Early Action which proved to be catalytic in the response to the El Nino phenomenon, as per the recommendation related to the development of an overarching IEWS strategy.
- The recommendation regarding the development of country resilience strategies as a means of acquiring a body of knowledge about livelihoods, strengths and vulnerabilities, and programmatic entry points is well noted and is in line with the country resilience strategies already developed in Somalia, Uganda, Kenya, South Sudan and Ethiopia.
- Likewise, the recommendation to develop a semi-standard menu of “signature services” to champion systematically, is in line with work SP5 has recently embarked on. Good field experiences and practices are being documented and disseminated, to increase knowledge exchange and country offices support in their upscaling and expansion.
- As valued by the evaluation, SP5 will pursue its work on gender in resilience, Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA) and Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP), as a result of which programme design has progressively given greater consideration to these important dimensions. SP5 will also develop further guidance and will strengthen capacities to integrate gender equality in needs assessments and data collection.

9 The **fourth recommendation** contains seven sub-recommendations, six of which are accepted, and one partially accepted.

- As per the skill mix assessment carried out in 2015/16 and confirmed by the findings of the evaluation, SP5 will work on strengthening its pool of technical expertise in areas such as Disaster Risk Reduction/Management (DRR/M) and cash-based emergency response interventions. This will be considered in the preparation of the PWB 2018-19.
- As recommended, FAO will further strengthen its collaboration on resilience with other UN agencies including the robust technical support and work on food security assessments and/or agricultural livelihoods programming contributions to various initiatives and

agencies such as the Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI), the UN Secretary-General’s Climate Resilience Initiative, Anticipate, Absorb, Reshape (A2R), and the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR). In addition, FAO will play a leading role in the implementation of the Rome Based Agency (RBA) Framework.

10 Inter-Country Offices’ knowledge exchange will be further promoted through the development of a corporate mechanism. Alliances with NGOs and other partners as a source of expertise and capacity are being explored, also through stand-by partnership agreements with new organizations. FAO’s fruitful partnerships with inter-governmental regional platforms such as the Comité permanent inter-États de lutte contre la sécheresse dans le Sahel (CILSS) and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) will be expanded to similar regional groups in other regions.

11 The **fifth recommendation** contains five sub-recommendations, all of which are accepted.

- On the area of knowledge management, SP5 has been working since 2015 to identify, document and disseminate resilience good/promising practices using established methodologies. This work will be taken further in order to accelerate the pace of dissemination and adoption of good practices.
- In addition, training on resilience, resilience programming and resilience measurement, will continue to be organized through webinars and knowledge sharing activities under the European Union-funded INFORMED knowledge sharing platform on resilience which promote learning and exchange around resilience programming.
- Management is committed to use this Evaluation as an important management tool. Many of the recommendations are encouraging as they squarely fall in line with initiatives on which SP5 has already started embarking, in line with FAO’s World Humanitarian Summit commitments and direction for the MTP 2018-21. Every effort will be made to further enhance the delivery of SP5 mandate and meet member countries’ growing demand for support in increasing the resilience of agricultural livelihoods to shocks and crises.

Evaluation recommendation (a)	Management response (b) Accepted, partially accepted or rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection (c)	Responsible unit (d)	Timeframe (e)	Further funding required (Y or N) (f)
Recommendation 1: While no major change is required to the strategic framework, FAO should make a few adjustments to the Strategic Programme 5 result framework, clarify the concept of the Regional Initiatives, and promote greater integration of products and services across FAO units involved in Strategic Programme 5.					
1a. The corporate definition of resilience should be edited to include: (1) a reference to ‘households, communities and nations’ to be more explicit on whose resilience; (2) the ability of a society to ‘transform’ as a result to a disaster or crisis; and (3) the principle that resilience starts from people’s strengths, assets and strategies.	Accepted	SP5 will ensure that the resilience definition will evolve considering the latest developments such as A2R, WHS, Sendai Framework for DRR, etc. This will be reflected in the new SP5 publication.	SP5	Mid-2017	No

Evaluation recommendation (a)	Management response (b) Accepted, partially accepted or rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection (c)	Responsible unit (d)	Timeframe (e)	Further funding required (Y or N) (f)
1b. The SO5 output and outcome structure could be simplified by combining Output 1.1 with Output 4.1, as the two seem highly connected but seen from different standpoints.	Accepted	The output structure will be simplified in the context of the MTP201821, recombining 511, 512 and 542 around two revised outputs: 511 focusing on formulation and 512 on coordination.	SP5	MTP 2018-21	No
1c. More generally, there is potential for further integration of FAO services related to resilience, by promoting greater collaborations and coherence between concerned FAO units involved in policy advice (outcome 1) and early warning (outcome 2).	Accepted	SP5 will continue and step up its ongoing efforts (also supported by flagship programme such as FIRST and INFORMED) to increase the policy impact of its resilience and food security analyses. A particular attention will be paid to the collaboration with regional organizations such as CILSS and IGAD in providing support to member countries in the implementation of regional resilience initiatives such as AGIR and IDDRISI			
1d. Output 3.2 deserves greater attention from the Strategic Programme 5 team, with promising resilience building pathways through basic services in agriculture (extension and veterinary services) and agricultural insurance schemes.	Accepted	SP5 will strengthen output 3.2 through two main priorities: focus on social protection and risk transfer tools, and supporting the access and tenure to land and natural resources to reduce vulnerabilities of communities. Diffusion of knowledge through Farmer Field School and support to Veterinary services will also benefit from dedicated attention under the MTP2018-21.		2017-2021	No

Evaluation recommendation (a)	Management response (b) Accepted, partially accepted or rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection (c)	Responsible unit (d)	Timeframe (e)	Further funding required (Y or N) (f)
<p>1e. There is potential for enhanced collaboration between Strategic Programmes, and for clarifying interfaces. Strategic Programme 5 shares significant common concerns with Strategic Programme 2 on climate change adaptation and with Strategic Programme 3 on social protection and migration. There is also potential for more work with Strategic Programme 4 on value chains, given that food chain crises strongly affect value chains. Overlaps are not necessarily a problem as long as they are utilized proactively to foster effective collaboration.</p>	Accepted	<p>SP5 will enhance its collaboration with other SPs, in particular on: Complementarity between resilience to climate change and adaptation to climate change (SP2). Joint work on social protection and migration, especially in terms of coordination, common vision and country-level joint-technical support (SP3). FCC impacts on value chain, strengthening of regulatory frameworks and public sector organization capacities, and country support in the formulation of strategies/policies on the resilience of postharvest food systems (SP4).</p>			
<p>1f. The concept of the Regional Initiatives under SO5 should be clarified and their purpose reframed to that of regional flagship programmes co-funded from external resources, and implemented in collaboration with regional and national partners. Regional Initiatives can also serve as useful vehicles for knowledge sharing and awareness raising (within and beyond FAO).</p>	Accepted	<p>Inspired by the example from RLC, and based on the deliberations of the Regional Conferences, the Regional Initiatives in RAF and RNE will be adjusted in the context of the MTP2018-21.</p>	SP5, Regional Offices	MTP2018-21	No

Evaluation recommendation (a)	Management response (b) Accepted, partially accepted or rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection (c)	Responsible unit (d)	Timeframe (e)	Further funding required (Y or N) (f)
<p>1g. This framing of the Regional Initiatives as regional flagship programmes requires a strong political commitment behind them at regional level. From this standpoint, Regional Initiative 3 on African Drylands should probably be more formally anchored in the Malabo Declaration. The establishment of expanded Regional Initiatives on One Health and Resilience to Climate Change is the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific should be supported.</p>	Accepted	<p>The RAF Regional Initiative is already linked to the Malabo Declaration as a basis of for strengthening resilience in Africa, including the specific areas of policy support and social security issues.</p> <p>SP5 fully supports RAP in the development of the two regional priorities.</p>	SP5, Regional Offices	MTP2018-21	No
<p>1h. When introducing new systems for planning and reporting, FAO should try and keep the related transaction cost as low as possible, since such cost reduces FAO's capacity to attain its members' goals. This consideration applies to the new project cycle and to the two distinct channels for country reporting (annual FAO Representative reports and reporting against the outcomes and outputs of the Strategic Framework in corporate databases, which should be merged into one reporting channel so that Country Offices are not required to report twice.</p>	Accepted	<p>This is one of the key points expected to emerge in the Digital Strategy that is under development.</p> <p>Country reporting processes will be harmonized. All possible efforts will be made to keep transaction costs as low as possible while at the same time, meeting fiduciary requirements of resource partners.</p>	<p>CIO</p> <p>OSD, OSP</p> <p>TCS</p>	<p>2017</p> <p>2017</p> <p>2017-21</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>

Evaluation recommendation (a)	Management response (b) Accepted, partially accepted or rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection (c)	Responsible unit (d)	Timeframe (e)	Further funding required (Y or N) (f)
Recommendation 2: Resilience presents FAO with a momentous opportunity to redesign its programmes in crisis monitoring, response and prevention with strong political and financial support from member countries. To seize this opportunity, FAO needs to further promote an integrated financial model combining assessed and voluntary contributions, and invest predictable resources in a few areas that are key to establishing FAO's presence in resilience, including staff. The return on investment in this area of work is likely to be significant.					
2a. The lack of predictable resources in Strategic Programme 5 affects FAO's capacity to position itself strategically in resilience. The Organization has committed politically to this area of work by adopting SO5 as one of its Strategic Objectives, and by advocating in global, regional and national forums for resilient development. It now needs to invest more predictable resources in a few Strategic Programme 5 areas that are key to establishing FAO's presence in resilience: programming capacity, high quality "signature services", knowledge systems, resource mobilization, and regional and national teams. A scan of current and future funding trends in the area of resilience indicates that if FAO invests in resilience funding (in addition and beyond the humanitarian funding stream), this is likely to generate a significant return that will enable the Organization to further strengthen its work.	Partially accepted	To be considered along with all other corporate priorities in preparing PWB 2018-19	OSP	2017	Yes
2b. In particular, FAO and Strategic Programme 5 need to find ways to offer better recognition and greater predictability in contractual arrangements to its technical and operational staff in the resilience area, in order to establish sustained FAO presence and capacity in this area. Short-term personnel may be adequate for short-term emergency responses, but not for long-term resilience building.	Partially accepted	This matter will be further explored with other HR priorities.	SP5 Management Team, OHR	2017	No

Evaluation recommendation (a)	Management response (b) Accepted, partially accepted or rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection (c)	Responsible unit (d)	Timeframe (e)	Further funding required (Y or N) (f)
<p>2c. The creation of new regular budgeted posts appears unlikely in the face of overall resource constraints. However, FAO could expand on its use of trust funds to partially “cushion” the unpredictability of project funding, allow longer-term contracts for its core resilience personnel, and invest in strategic tools and processes. In keeping with the ‘integrated budget’ policy of the Organization, new cost recovery policy represents an opportunity to further promote an integrated financial model combining assessed and voluntary contributions into a coherent whole.</p>	Partially accepted	To be considered along with all other corporate priorities in preparing PWB 2018-19	OSP	2017	No
<p>Recommendation 3: To strengthen resilience programme development and resource mobilization, FAO should strengthen and diversify its offer of high-quality resilience-enhancing services and better tailor its programmes to the type and duration of crises it tries to respond to.</p>					
<p>3a. A re-tooling of FAO’s resilience programming and resource mobilization capacity appears necessary. FAO should define a workable strategy to approach “resilience donors”. This strategy should include SFERA, which FAO has used strategically to establish its presence and assess needs at the start of a response.</p>	Accepted	Although donors have increased their resilience portfolio, there are still no “resilience donors” per se. SP5 will strengthen its dialogue with donors using tools such as the DRR Facility, SFERA and CARM.	SP5, TCS	2017-21	No
<p>3b. “Resilience strategies” provide a simple and tested way to acquire a body of knowledge about livelihoods, strengths and vulnerabilities, and programmatic entry points for resilience in country. Country Offices with significant opportunities in resilience programming may consider developing a resilience strategy as part of their Country Programming Framework or separately, to guide their involvement in this area.</p>	Accepted	Agreed. Building on the resilience strategies formulated in Somalia, Uganda, Kenya, South Sudan and Ethiopia (under development), special attention will be given to protracted crises and conflict areas.	SP5 HQ team, Regional and Subregional Offices, Resilience Hubs and Country Offices.	2017-2021	No

Evaluation recommendation (a)	Management response (b) Accepted, partially accepted or rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection (c)	Responsible unit (d)	Timeframe (e)	Further funding required (Y or N) (f)
<p>3c. The prioritization of FAO Strategic Objectives in country should be determined not by the specific (or lack of) interest of individual managers, but by the relevance of resilience programming to the country context and government priorities. Strategic Programme 5 should have a leading role in countries affected by severe crises, while other Strategic Programmes should be more prominent in institutionally stable contexts with manageable levels of hazards and risks. Evidently, Strategic Programme 5 may still provide valued inputs in the latter type of countries, e.g. on DRR/M policies.</p>	Accepted	For countries where there are constant threats and crises, SP5 should lead the implementing measures for resilience of ecosystems, people and communities, including prevention and enhancement of capacities, in collaboration with other SPs.	SPLs	2017-2021	No
<p>3d. Any crisis-oriented intervention of FAO that extends over more than two years should be designed and implemented with due considerations paid to the sustainability of achieved results. In essence, when a long-term intervention is required, community-based and market-oriented approaches are more suitable than free handouts.</p>	Accepted	As per the recommendations above on resilience strategies and programming, SP5 will continue to work towards ensuring sustainable interventions and long-term impact.	SPLs	2017-2021	No

Evaluation recommendation (a)	Management response (b) Accepted, partially accepted or rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection (c)	Responsible unit (d)	Timeframe (e)	Further funding required (Y or N) (f)
<p>3e In order to bring good local experiences up to scale, FAO should focus on a few good practices, keep improving and enhancing them, “champion” them systematically and couple them with solid capacity building in country. This could take the shape of a semi-standard menu of “signature services” – e.g. DRR/DRM/CCA policies; Early Warning and IPC, EMPRES-type surveillance and protection programmes, CAHWs, FFS and their various versions including the <i>caisses de résilience</i>, different forms of input support (input distributions but also input fairs, input shops, <i>warrantage</i>), cash-for-assets, small-scale irrigation, etc. This list includes approaches anchored in significant FAO experience and visibility, with proven impact, adapted to both development and resilience, giving a premium to local capacities, economic sustainability and market linkages, and requiring an investment over the long term while being easily scalable and de-scalable temporarily. Developing such a menu of “signature resilience services” could help FAO develop a stronger, more diversified resilience programme at scale, by standardizing approaches and reducing programme design and roll-out time, while still adapting the services to local context as required.</p>	Accepted	FAO will bring practical and theoretical knowledge to countries, based on good experiences and practices from different contexts at field level, and in the implementation of public policies at national level. Knowledge sharing among countries will remain a key priority for resilience.	SP5 HQ team, Regional and Subregional Offices, Resilience Hubs and Country Offices.	2017-2021	NoYes

Evaluation recommendation (a)	Management response (b) Accepted, partially accepted or rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection (c)	Responsible unit (d)	Timeframe (e)	Further funding required (Y or N) (f)
<p>3f. Strategic Programme 5 should keep integrating gender in its context analyses and monitor the implementation of gender-responsive programmes so as to ensure that such programming translates into real benefits.</p>	Accepted	<p>Guidance materials for Gender-responsive DRR, Gender-based violence and protracted crises will be finalized and widely disseminated and used in training activities.</p> <p>Projects are coded according to gender markers and will be closely monitored for gender-related impacts.</p> <p>Gender equality will be integrated in needs assessment and monitoring tools to collect sex-disaggregated data and report gender impacts.</p> <p>Stocktaking of good practices for learning and upscaling will continue.</p>	ESP, TCE	<p>Guidance materials will be ready and disseminated by mid 2017</p> <p>Mid and end-year spot checks of gender markers will be carried out.</p> <p>By end 2017</p> <p>By end 2017</p>	No/Yes
<p>3g. FAO delivers resilience-enhancing services to communities through a number of partnerships at different levels, e.g. with national and local governments and/or with NGOs. To maximise its impact, FAO should keep programming with and strengthening the capacity of a wide array of partners, including local, national and regional authorities, other UN agencies such as WFP and UNICEF, IFIs, national and international NGOs, farmer organizations, the private sector (for example insurance providers), and academia.</p>	Accepted	<p>Based on recently developed partnerships with various actors, special attention will continue to be given to reinforcing partnerships at the regional/local level through SP5 related regional initiatives.</p>	OPC	2016-19	Yes

Evaluation recommendation (a)	Management response (b) Accepted, partially accepted or rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection (c)	Responsible unit (d)	Timeframe (e)	Further funding required (Y or N) (f)
<p>3h. FAO should initiate the development of an overarching IEWS Strategy, requiring the different systems to converge into a more homogeneous and strategic framework while maintaining the technical and institutional specificities of their area of action. The Strategy should also address the partnership dimension and spell-out a more corporate approach on how to support member countries across the relevant IEWS areas.</p>	Accepted	Development of the IEWS Strategy was initiated with a focus on linking existing FAO EW systems to early action.	ESA (with EST, AGD, TCE)	Dec 2017	Yes
<p>Recommendation 4: Further strengthen FAO’s technical, operational and resilience capacity based on Country Offices demand and needs, so that the post profiles in FAO technical and administrative units progressively evolve to better serve the Strategic Programmes.</p>					
<p>4a. As evidenced by the skill mix assessment, and in a context of high vacancies rates, Strategic Programme 5 needs access to additional technical capacity in DRR/M, insurances and cash-based approaches, as well as in conflict and political analysis in order to address the present demand for resilience programmes. More capacities also appears necessary in resilience programming itself and in resource mobilization. This implies that FAO should continue its present drive to fill vacant positions and create new ones in key technical units, to fill capacity gaps identified through the skill mix assessment and similar exercises, so that the post profiles in technical divisions and administrative units will progressively evolve to better serve the Strategic Programmes.</p>	Partially accepted	<p>S05 is strengthening its pool of technical expertise in areas such as DRR/M and cash-based approaches.</p> <p>With regard to the establishment and filling of vacancies of new positions related to SP5, this will need to be considered along with all other corporate priorities in preparing PWB 201819</p>	OSP	2017	No

Evaluation recommendation (a)	Management response (b) Accepted, partially accepted or rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection (c)	Responsible unit (d)	Timeframe (e)	Further funding required (Y or N) (f)
4b. Continuous improvements of operational capacity are necessary. In particular, FAO should develop of standard operating procedures for Level 1 and Level 2 emergencies, and simplify the project cycle to reduce redundant steps.	Accepted	Formulation of corporate L1 and L2 declaration and response protocols, along with the related operational guidelines/SOPs is already underway.	TCE	2017	No
4c. The tagging of projects to specific strategic objectives should be standardized and quality-assured, as the data is currently unreliable. This issue is of particularly importance to Strategic Programme 5 and its funding model based almost entirely on voluntary contributions.	Accepted	The alignment of projects to the SF is quality assured as part of the Concept Note endorsement and for development projects during appraisal by the PPRC. This recommendation will be implemented as part of overall improvement in project preparation.	OSP, TCS	2017-2021	No
4d. More could be made of inter-Country Offices knowledge exchange. Some FAO COs are staffed with a stable cadre of national technical staff who can do both technical work and contribute policy advice in coordination and policy spaces, and can usefully provide assistance to Country Offices other than their own.	Accepted	Development of a corporate mechanism/online space/community of practice (COP)/ Discussion group to keep an updated roster of CO staff expertise (where COs could look to match their needs).	TCE, SP5	2017-2021	No/Yes. Staff resource needed to coordinate/ manage corporate workspace and potential SP5 COP.
4e. FAO may usefully expand upon its current alliances with NGOs and other partners as a source of expertise and capacity: stand-by partnership agreements with organizations such as the Norwegian Refugee Council, RedR Australia and the Danish Refugee Council provide capacity in critical, under-staffed areas of work (resilience advisors, gender or cluster coordination) and should continue.	Accepted	MoU with new SBP, Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB) Sweden, in last stages of discussion. Additional partners to be sought and current partnerships to be reinforced, including with private sector.	OPC, TCE	Next biennium	No

Evaluation recommendation (a)	Management response (b) Accepted, partially accepted or rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection (c)	Responsible unit (d)	Timeframe (e)	Further funding required (Y or N) (f)
<p>4f. The UN system also harbours significant capacity in areas where FAO would need to become more robust. Among others, FAO already leverages WFP's logistics, collaborates with the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA)'s joint needs assessments, and liaises with the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) on disaster reduction. It could also approach the United Nations Department of Political Affairs (UNDP), which offers excellent political and conflict analysis in countries where the United Nations facilitate elections or other political processes, and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) on qualitative resilience assessment. FAO, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and WFP should operationalise their joint Conceptual Framework for Collaboration and Partnership on Strengthening Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition, through more frequent collaborations in the field based on a strong complementary engagement and building on each other's comparative advantages.</p>	Accepted	<p>FAO provides robust technical support and work on good practice in food security assessments, agricultural livelihoods programming to various initiatives and agencies such as CADRI, A2R, UNISDR, the Global Food Security Cluster. In addition, FAO is fully committed and engaged in the implementation of the RBA Framework.</p>	SP5 and Liaison Offices	2017-2021	No
<p>4g. In Africa, FAO has usefully allied with inter-governmental regional platforms such as the CILSS, IGAD of SADC, which suggests that FAO could usefully approach similar regional groups in other regions.</p>	Accepted	<p>This is important for the positioning of FAO on the resilience agenda at sub-regional and/or regional levels.</p>	SP5 Core Team	2017-2021	No

Evaluation recommendation (a)	Management response (b) Accepted, partially accepted or rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection (c)	Responsible unit (d)	Timeframe (e)	Further funding required (Y or N) (f)
Recommendation 5: In order to accelerate the pace of innovation, FAO should create a strong learning environment and accelerate the development of tools and channels for knowledge management.					
5a. In a reform such as the one FAO is now enacting, knowledge management is critical. The transition to 'resilience' programming requires a change in mind-set. There is a need to accelerate the pace of innovation, dissemination and adoption of good practices. Better knowledge management would also help communication, advocacy, strategizing and fund raising.	Accepted	The work to identify, document and disseminate Resilience good/ promising practices started in 2015 using established methodologies. This effort will continue and expand in collaboration with regional and country offices.	ESA/SP5 OPC CIO OCC OHRL	2016-2021	No/Yes. More staff resources/ time is required to consolidate this work.
5b. FAO should develop training modules on resilience, resilience programming and resilience measurement, deploy them throughout the Organization, accelerate the development of knowledge sharing networks, and create knowledge management spaces in the Regional Initiatives, which are playing a valid knowledge management role which should be further developed.	Accepted	Webinars and knowledge sharing activities will continue under the INFORMED knowledge sharing platform on resilience to promote learning and exchange around resilience programming. Creation of a Community of Practice (COP) with external resilience partners, within this platform is also planned. Support will continue to be given to regional initiatives for the implementation of regional communication plans for multistakeholder dialogue and knowledge sharing in Africa, Asia and Latin America.	ESA OPC OHR SP5 Management RIDM	By Dec. 2016. 2016-19	No Yes

Evaluation recommendation (a)	Management response (b) Accepted, partially accepted or rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection (c)	Responsible unit (d)	Timeframe (e)	Further funding required (Y or N) (f)
<p>5c. There is a need to keep strengthening monitoring systems, post-distribution surveys and qualitative and quantitative impact assessments, and learn from the information collected. FAO needs to learn more about how to promote resilience to threats and crises, and to do that it needs to experiment and monitor the results.</p>	Accepted	SP5 will support the strengthening of monitoring systems through advisory services and capacity building activities together with OED and regional and country offices.	SPLs, RRs, FAORs, OED	2017-2021	NoYes
<p>5d. There are at all levels in FAO reserves of technical talent that are currently applied to other tasks, such as planning and reporting, and that could be more systematically mapped and tapped into through the creation of virtual knowledge exchange networks.</p>	Accepted	Creation of an online corporate space/ knowledge network to map expertise with needs, and to promote network exchange.	SO5, ESA	2017-2021	NoYes. Staff time needed to create, manage, facilitate, and promote the knowledge Exchange network.
<p>5e. Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) are often used as mere 'implementing partners' but the best of them form knowledge-rich environments with which FAO could interact more. Beyond NGOs, FAO should partner more with Producer Organizations, who are valid knowledge (and implementing) partners, endowed with complementary capacities to those of FAO, in particular in terms of outreach and community mobilization capacity, and very much interested in extension, advocacy, and resilience.</p>	Accepted	Whenever FAO engages with NGOs and/or other groups at community level during project implementation, final narrative project reports should capture systematically promising/good practices. This will require setting up a consultation process with NGOs/CBOs to capture this information.	SP5, OPC	2017-2021	For this to be implemented in a more systematic manner, resources will be required at country office level and at the level of the resilience hubs to support such a documentation process.



**Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations**

OFFICE OF EVALUATION
www.fao.org/evaluation