

Thematic Evaluation Series

**Evaluation of FAO's support to
climate action (SDG 13) and the
implementation of the FAO Strategy on
Climate Change (2017)**

**Annex 2. Synthesis of FAO climate change-related evaluations from the SDG
perspective**

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Scope of the synthesis and overview of the methodology | 1 |
| 1.1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.2 | Mapping the relevant FAO evaluation documents | 2 |
| 1.3 | Overview of the analysis | 2 |
| 2 | FAO contributions to SDG 13/Climate Action and potential for supporting transformational change based on the quantitative content analysis | 5 |
| 2.1 | Contributions to SDG 13 and the Paris Agreement | 5 |
| 2.2 | Contributions to transformational change | 7 |
| 3 | Qualitative synthesis of concrete project contributions to climate action objectives and targets, and transformational change..... | 11 |
| 3.1 | Findings from FAO Strategic Objective evaluations..... | 12 |
| 3.2 | Major evaluated programmes/projects contributing explicitly to the climate action | 15 |
| 3.3 | Examples of FAO’s integrated agriculture and land management approaches making positive contributions to the climate agenda/SDG 13 | 20 |
| 3.4 | Examples of possible missed opportunities to address REDD+ and climate change in general | 25 |
| 4 | Main findings on gender and other cross-cutting objectives | 27 |
| 5 | Main findings on FAO partnerships..... | 29 |
| 6 | Identified information gaps..... | 31 |

1 Scope of the synthesis and overview of the methodology

1.1 Introduction

1. This synthesis study was carried out during the scoping phase of the evaluation of FAO's support to climate action (SDG 13) and the implementation of the FAO Strategy on Climate Change (2017).
2. This synthesis of relevant evaluations of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations' (FAO's) work on climate change in 2015-2020 aims at:
 - i. summarizing available evidence and lessons learned on FAO contributions to Climate Action (SDG 13, Paris Agreement) targets and related co-benefits, and on the potential for supporting transformational change;
 - ii. summarizing evidence on cross-cutting issues/objectives and partnerships;
 - iii. identifying FAO's comparative advantages in climate change work.
3. At the end of this synthesis report, information gaps are presented (based on this analysis alone), some of which can possibly be addressed as part of the FAO Climate Action (SDG 13) evaluation.
4. The analysis comprised four steps:
 - i. Mapping the climate change-relevant FAO evaluation portfolio for the period 2015-2020.
 - ii. Quantitative content analysis (using MAXQDA) of the evaluation reports identified during step 1. Content analysis was framed by the developed transformational change framework SDG 13/Paris Agreement conceptual framework which are all reflected in the FAO Climate Action theory of change model. This step was used to identify relevant projects for more detailed analysis under step 3, and also during the actual evaluation in terms of making significant contributions, or failing to contribute to the SDG 13/Paris Agreement objectives and targets, and climate action in general.
 - iii. "Traditional" qualitative review of all identified evaluation reports paying attention to the following key issues linked to the Climate Action evaluation questions:
 - a. contributions to SDG 13 and Paris Agreement; co-benefits (often linked to other SDGs);
 - b. contributions to transformational change;
 - c. partnerships;
 - d. lessons learned;
 - e. comparative advantage;
 - f. gender, indigenous people, youth, vulnerable groups.
 - iv. Writing the synthesis of the findings under step 3. . The project evaluation findings will be used during the actual Climate Action evaluation implementation to complement new country level analysis of case studies on thematic areas of FAO's work in climate change .
5. The concrete process of mapping the evaluation project portfolio for the synthesis is described below.

1.2 Mapping the relevant FAO evaluation documents

6. Relevant FAO evaluations concerning all climate change-related work were identified for the period 2015-2020. Evaluations included project, programme, thematic and strategic evaluations, and selected country programme evaluations (CPEs) (countries with significant climate change-related interventions), as well as related synthesis reports. The scope covered both centralized and decentralized evaluations.
7. The FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) provided two databases (Excel sheets) of evaluations which were screened to identify evaluations dealing with climate change at broad. The screening was done based on the name of the project and in many cases downloading the evaluation reports and quickly reviewing them. This was done for example for the CPE evaluations. In addition, some additional relevant final evaluations and mid-term evaluations, for instance from the FAO Field Programme Management Information System (FPMIS) or partner (UN-REDD Programme, Global Environment Facility, GEF) web sites were identified.
8. In total, 63 evaluations were downloaded into the MAXQDA evaluation database. REDD+-related evaluations - including FAO strategic evaluations and selected CPEs which also deal with REDD/forestry and climate change - amounted to 41 reports but only few of these evaluations cover "pure" REDD+ projects. The REDD+-related GEF evaluations were also analysed as a separate group to feed into i) the REDD+/forestry and climate change scoping study; and ii) to provide complementary information to the ongoing overall Office of Evaluation (OED) GEF climate change portfolio assessment study.¹
9. The evaluation reports cover agriculture (crops), forestry, livestock, fisheries, and integrated projects. Geographic scope covers all regions: Africa and the Near East, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Europe and Central Asia.
10. Some relevant OED evaluations were close to finalization and will be available later during the FAO Climate Action evaluation. It needs to be noted that the current FAO-GEF and Green Climate Fund (GCF) portfolio is relatively young which means that many projects of great relevance to this evaluation, for example under the GEF-7 portfolio, have not even had a mid-term evaluation.
11. Other evidence. There's also other evidence available including the project's own terminal reports. They need to be naturally reviewed as part of the Climate Action evaluation, for example based on sampling. Since they are not proper evaluations with independently validated findings, and not produced by the FAO Office of Evaluation (OED), they were excluded from this analysis

1.3 Overview of the analysis

12. MAXQDA Plus, including MAXDictio, was used in the qualitative and quantitative content analysis of the evaluation reports applying the two developed frameworks to assess the relevance and potential contributions of FAO climate change interventions to SDG 13 and the Paris Agreement, as well as to transformational change. These conceptual frameworks are described in the developed REDD+, forestry and climate change methodological paper.

¹ These REDD+ specific findings are not presented in this report but in the separate REDD+ Scoping Study. The high share of REDD+ related projects is mainly due to having many integrated (cross-sectoral) projects and agriculture and livestock-related projects – many of them funded by GEF - which address deforestation and/or forest degradation indirectly, for example. through improved land management. Most of them are not forestry projects.

13. This assessment made use of two MAXQDA's functions/tools: quantitative content analysis and word/concept frequency analysis. Further, the keyword-in-context feature was tested to display all key words/concept locations and their (freely definable) context in an interactive result table. Key words used in the frequency analysis linked to SDG 13/Paris Agreement were: SDG 13, Paris Agreement, transformational change, REDD, mitigation, adaptation, co-benefits.
14. Transformational change is defined as "...relevant engagements that help achieve deep, systemic, and sustainable change with large-scale impact in an area of global and national environmental concern" (World Bank and GEF).
15. The Climate Investment Funds (CIFs) have adopted a concrete definition that includes four dimensions: relevance, systemic change, scale and sustainability, for which specific characteristics have been identified (see the related table under Section 3). These concepts and related characteristics were then "operationalized" so that they could be used in the assessment of SDG 13 contributions based on the review of FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) climate change-related evaluations.
16. When viewing both of these frameworks against the developed FAO Climate Action evaluation theory of change (TOC) (see Appendix 1 for the complete Theory of Change), it can be seen how well they capture the progress towards impacts (catalytic and/or transformational change) and outcome levels, and to some extent also outputs. The applied quantitative content analysis method therefore builds directly on the evaluation theory of change.
17. Autocoding of documents required creation of dictionary categories, which were derived from the developed two frameworks. In MAXDictio, hierarchical types of dictionaries were created; hierarchy followed the same structure and feature of the transformational change framework. In the actual analysis, key words were developed (second subcategory) under these more conceptual characteristics. Hierarchical dictionaries are similar to the MAXQDA "code system".
18. Having two clear analytical frameworks with related key words/concepts is crucial for the analysis because it allows immediate coding, and coding is directly linked to the SDG 13 (and relevant parts of SDG 15) and transformational change framework, and therefore enhances the quality and relevance of the analysis. Below, summarized pros and cons of the applied method:
 - i. Pros:**
 - a. Allows automated quantitative content analysis of many documents. It has potential for application for the entire evaluation.
 - b. Provides an analytically strong, but always complementary method to answer the evaluation questions.
 - c. The developed results reports can be exported to Excel and further analysed.
 - d. The analysis can be modified later by adding more documents and modifying the dictionary if new relevant characteristics (e.g. FAO project activity categories) related to SDG 13/Paris Agreement or transformational change are identified.
 - e. Can be used as the first phase of a two-phase analysis, for example to categorize those projects with highest and least potential for transformational change, and in the second phase study those projects in more detail using other methods.

ii. Cons:

- a. In this way, the analysis of project portfolio is theoretical and is related to contribution analysis, building on an assumption that if certain steps/measures are undertaken effectively, specified outputs and intermediate outcomes are delivered which is *likely* to result in planned impacts. This needs to be complemented by other methods such as case studies, interviews and field visits.
- b. Requires solid *ex ante* analytical framework.
- c. Analysis is also influenced by words/concepts which are not in the right context; this issue can be tackled in a more detailed analysis. At this stage, coding was based on English, which means that Spanish and French language project documents were excluded (they were however addressed in a qualitative review of evaluation reports). This is assumed to cause no bias in the analysis since the share on non-English language evaluation reports was only about 5 percent.

2 FAO contributions to SDG 13/Climate Action and potential for supporting transformational change based on the quantitative content analysis

2.1 Contributions to SDG 13 and the Paris Agreement

19. The assessed evaluations have not tried to evaluate FAO climate change-related project performance against the SDG framework. The various evaluations have in most cases not considered the contribution or relation of the evaluated project to SDG 13 or other SDGs, and the projects themselves have not tried to do so either. The focus has been on assessing relevance and contribution from the perspective of the FAO strategic framework, which is expected. The exception is the Evaluation of FAO's Strategic Results Framework in 2019 which, for example, refers to SDG 2 being linked to Strategic Objective (SO) 2 and SO results indicators, and that the progress towards SDG 2 will also depend on progress made on climate action (SDG 13) and the sustainable use of marine and terrestrial ecosystems (SDGs 14 and 15).
20. There is in general a weak explicit alignment of the evaluated projects with any SDGs, not only SDG 13. Only 6 of the 63 reports make a direct reference to SDG 13, and 14 reports refer to the Paris Agreement. This is expected for projects designed before the SDGs were introduced in 2015 and the Paris Agreement was reached, but it applies also to most post-SDG projects which have been evaluated up until today by the Office of Evaluation (OED). Surprisingly, most of the projects covered by these evaluations do not appear to explicitly deal with the "ultimate" goal of climate action, i.e. reducing CO₂ and other greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions such as CO₂ and methane and moving towards low carbon development. Of course, there are several important exceptions such as the project Mitigating Agriculture GHG Emissions Towards Wider Opportunities.
21. At the same time, the conducted analysis indicates that most of the climate change-related FAO projects and programmes deal with SDG 13, when looking at work and processes related to SDG 13 and its targets. SDG 13-related work includes REDD+ preparedness work and climate friendly agriculture and livestock. Sustainable land management (SLM) theme stands out in 30 percent of the evaluated projects and climate-smart agriculture (CSA) in about 25 percent of the projects; REDD is referred to in 50 percent of the evaluated projects. Regarding REDD+ and SDG 13, FAO's work on measuring, reporting and verification (MRV), Forest Reference Emission Level (FREL), national, forest inventory (NFI)/ National Forest Monitoring System (NFMS) stand out together with related capacity building, and sustainable forest management, NFI/ NFM, forest resource assessment, afforestation, and forest restoration through contributing to SDG 15.
22. Work on adaptation and mitigation strategies and plans (national adaptation plans, NAPs; nationally determined contribution, NDCs; REDD strategies) on capacity building thematically dominate FAO's climate change work linked to SDG 13. Capacity building is mentioned (intensively) in 90 percent of all these evaluated projects; institutional capacity development also receives attention in almost half of these evaluations. *Work on resilience also features very strongly (linked to adaptation).*
23. The analysis suggests that about 70 percent of the interventions that have been evaluated deal both with mitigation and adaptation. Based on the analysis, adaptation has been much more the focus than mitigation in these evaluated interventions. How well this reflects the

- overall balance of FAO climate change-related work cannot be assessed based on these evaluations alone.
24. Enhanced transparency, linked to the Paris Agreement, does not receive much attention in the evaluated projects; most of the related projects are so new that evaluation reports are not yet available.
 25. Safeguards have been addressed in some 50 percent of the evaluated projects. However, safeguards information systems (SIS) are referred to only in few evaluations, related to REDD+. This is likely explained by the fact that most of these evaluated projects do not deal explicitly with REDD+ and that the focus of FAO was initially on supporting MRV/FREL and NFMS.
 26. Gender issues are discussed in almost 100 percent of the evaluated projects. More than 50 percent of the evaluated projects refer to gender mainstreaming; however, only 39 percent refer to gender analysis/assessment, and less than 1 percent to gender budgeting.
 27. The themes which are explicitly addressed in SDG 13 and Paris Agreement and which receive only little attention in the 63 evaluated projects include:
 - i. carbon outcomes and moving towards low-carbon pathway as well as sources/drivers of CO₂, NO₂ and methane emissions;
 - ii. climate change financing issues, including access to large-scale financing;
 - iii. policy support/reform/change was addressed only in about one-third of the documents; agriculture and land use policies in less than 15 percent of the documents, and legal support in less than 5 percent of the evaluated projects;
 - iv. concepts like pro-poor development, leaving no one behind, social inclusion, social protection, and human rights/rights-based approaches (with some exceptions);
 - v. co-benefits/non-carbon benefits; less than 15 percent of the evaluated projects refer explicitly to non-carbon-benefits;
 - vi. more than 50 percent of the evaluated projects do not even mention indigenous peoples, vulnerable/marginalized groups, and youth;
 - vii. small island developing States (SIDS) (referred to only in two evaluations).
 28. Key evaluations on projects in terms of their likely high relevance for SDG 13 and Paris Agreements (based on screening of the quantitative content analysis results)² include:
 - i. Mitigating Agriculture GHG Emissions Towards Wider Opportunities (MICCA);
 - ii. Sri Lanka UN-REDD National Programme 2013-2017;
 - iii. Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA) – Uganda: Agricultural Adaptation to Climate Change project;
 - iv. Uganda UN-REDD National Programme;
 - v. Strengthening Climate Change Resilience and Disaster Risk Reduction in Agriculture to Improve Food Security in Haiti After the Earthquake;
 - vi. Bangladesh Country Programme;
 - vii. Bhutan Country Programme;
 - viii. Kenya Country Programme;

² Complemented by the Word Frequencies Analysis that indicates – in addition to frequencies – also the rank of the key words, as well as the percentage and number of documents in which the word occurs. In addition, the frequencies were converted to 0 or 1 depending on whether the word occurs in the document at least once.

- ix. Global Forest Resources Assessment (FRA);
 - x. Decision Support for Mainstreaming and Scaling Up of Sustainable Land Management;
 - xi. Supporting developing countries to integrate the agricultural sectors into National Adaptation Plans (NAP-Ag);
 - xii. FAO's Contribution to the Conservation Agriculture Thematic Cluster;
 - xiii. Enhancing Climate Change Resilience in the Benguela Current Fisheries System;
 - xiv. Strengthening Forest Resources Management and Enhancing its Contribution to Sustainable Development, Land use and Livelihoods Project;
 - xv. FAO strategic evaluations (SO1, SO2, SO4 and SO4) and FAO Strategic Framework Evaluation provide information, e.g. on project contributions relevant for Climate Action targets.
29. It needs to be noted that this list is indicative; it suggests which evaluations and evaluated projects may warrant more attention, and possible follow-up during the evaluation. The screening relied only on identifying those documents which had lots of references to key concepts essential to SDG 13 and SDG 15, and the Paris Agreement. It may be interesting to take a closer look at some evaluations which are not in this list as they appear to have no clear link to SDG 13, or SDGs in general and/or the Paris Agreement (even if one would have expected it). They can represent a missed opportunity, or in some cases a possible "technical" gap in the actual evaluation, for example. due to evaluation team composition.

2.2 Contributions to transformational change

30. The developed framework for transformational change to move towards low-carbon development pathway in the Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) sectors was used in the analysis of the 63 identified evaluation reports.

Table 1: "Operationalization" of transformational change for analytical purposes

| Dimensions | Description/Characteristics |
|------------------------|---|
| <i>Relevance</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paradigm shift • Low-carbon development/pathways/Low emissions • Climate-resilient development • Co-benefits/Non-carbon benefits • Underlying drivers of carbon emissions and deforestation • Driver of environmental degradation • Avoided deforestation • REDD |
| <i>Systemic change</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy reform • Legal reform • Strategies • National programmes for adaptation and mitigation (NAP, REDD etc.) • Cross-sectoral approaches and coordination • Access to information • Capacity building/development/Training |
| <i>Scale</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large-scale impact • Catalytic effect • Scaling-up • Replication • Large-scale financing • Mainstreaming |
| <i>Sustainability</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Enabling) networks |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Enabling) partnerships • Financial sustainability • Environmental sustainability • Social sustainability |
|--|--|

31. Transformational change is not addressed explicitly in most of these evaluation reports. Only 14 evaluation reports refer explicitly to transformational change and none of the assessed evaluations tried explicitly to address this issue. When looking at the context where transformational change concept is used, it is done often in general terms without identifying what it means.
32. However, many of the evaluated projects still have potential to contribute to transformational change, at least in a limited manner, and some with great potential (e.g. Decision Support for Mainstreaming and Scaling Up of Sustainable Land Management in 15 countries, or Mitigating Agriculture GHG Emissions Towards Wider Opportunities (MICCA), or Promotion of Sustainable Land Management in Mexico). The analysis indicated that about 60 percent of the evaluated projects dealt with some elements of transformational change, and most of them in a few selected subcategories of transformational change. This is natural because the concept of transformational change is broad and implies a wide range of related work areas; this type of change processes, often implies a paradigm shift also to take place over long time periods and not during a single project. Changes in land management paradigms include increasing interventions related to climate-smart agriculture and sustainable land management (e.g. "Decision Support for Mainstreaming and Scaling Up of Sustainable Land Management) and moving towards results-based payments for avoided deforestation and forest degradation (e.g. UN-REDD projects).
33. Based on the quantitative content analysis of the identified FAO climate change-related evaluation reports, FAO climate change interventions appear to focus mainly on the systemic dimension of transformational change, followed by relevance. Capacity development support really stands out not only as part of systemic change but amongst all transformational action. Scale and sustainability receive less attention.
 - i. Under the *relevance* dimension, climate resilient development stands out followed by the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. There's also evidence on shifting towards more integrated, multi-purpose land use approaches and sectoral approaches that pay attention to climate change (e.g. CSA, SLM). However, as a whole the evaluated project portfolio does not appear to put major emphasis on addressing underlying sources of greenhouse gas emissions. The issue of drivers/sources of GHG emissions (CO₂, methane, etc.) and low-carbon development pathways receive surprisingly little attention considering that these issues are the core of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Paris Agreement. Only in 7 of the 63 evaluated projects, references are made to low-carbon development; the number of projects looking at concrete carbon outcomes is also limited. The National REDD+ programmes and support to REDD+ strategies as well as Mitigating Agriculture GHG Emissions Towards Wider Opportunities project, are exceptions.
 - ii. Under the *systemic dimension*, capacity building and support to national strategies and programmes (NAPs, NDCs, climate action plans, REDD strategies) dominate. Cross-sectoral coordination and cooperation, policy support as well as access to information, including MRV/FREL and NFI, received attention in about one-third of

- the projects. Legal reform has received very little attention and, in fact, even policy support is quite limited considering the existing challenges. Market change and incentives, and behavioural change have not been addressed with some exceptions.
- iii. Under *the scale* dimension, replication and scaling-up issues have received attention in about 70 percent of the evaluated projects. Catalytic effects and potential for large-scale impacts at national or global level and large-scale financing are barely mentioned, which erodes the basis for scaling up beyond the project.
 - iv. Under the *sustainability* dimension, environmental sustainability receives some attention, and financial sustainability to some extent, but social sustainability does not feature much. In fact, social sustainability is not even mentioned in most of these evaluations. Partnerships with state organizations dominate, while only few reports refer to partnerships with civil society organizations and private sector.
34. The finding that a large share of these evaluated projects appear to have inadequate links to scaling-up, policy and legal reforms, catalytic effects, and large-scale financing, can also be a sign that some, possibly many, of these evaluated projects miss the “big picture”. There is a risk that they remain isolated interventions not effectively connected to critical change processes.³ This is an issue that needs to be studied in more detail during the evaluation.
 35. The analysis indicates that the strategic objective/programme evaluations – especially SO1, SO2 and SO5– and the Strategic Framework evaluation have paid attention to the issue. They have identified contributions of FAO projects to the key elements of transformational change, especially in capacity building, information, strategy and policy development, mainstreaming, and partnerships.
 36. Based on this quantitative content analysis of the available evaluations, the main interventions – both sectoral and integrated multi-sectoral projects/programmes - that have adopted a broader approach to support transformational change include:
 - i. Mitigating Agriculture GHG Emissions Towards Wider Opportunities;
 - ii. Sri Lanka UN-REDD National Programme 2013-2017;
 - iii. Evaluation of FAO’s Contribution to the Republic of Kenya (country programme);
 - iv. Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA) – Uganda: Agricultural Adaptation to Climate Change project;
 - v. UN-REDD Uganda National Programme;
 - vi. Bangladesh Country Programme;
 - vii. Bhutan Country Programme;
 - viii. Kenya Country Programme;
 - ix. Strengthening Forest Resources Management and Enhancing its Contribution to Sustainable Development, Land use and Livelihoods Project;
 - x. Global Forest Resources Assessment (FRA);
 - xi. Securing Tenure Rights for Forest Landscape-Dependent Communities: Linking science with policy to advance tenure security, sustainable forest management and people’s livelihoods;
 - xii. Strengthening National Policy and Knowledge Framework in Support of Sustainable Management of Brazil’s Forest Resources;

³ This was analyzed using the SDG 13/Paris Agreement key words and concepts and giving one if the word/concept was mentioned in the specific evaluation report, and zero if it was not.

- xiii. Decision Support for Mainstreaming and Scaling Up of Sustainable Land Management;
 - xiv. Promotion of Sustainable Land Management" (PROTIERRAS);
 - xv. Climate Smart Livestock (CSL): Integrating Reversion of Land Degradation and Reduction of Desertification Risks in Vulnerable Provinces;
 - xvi. Strengthening the capacity of farmers to cope with climate change to increase food security through the School approach in the Peasant Machamba;
 - xvii. FAO's Contribution to the Conservation Agriculture Thematic Cluster;
 - xviii. Reducing Disaster Risks Caused by Changing Climate in Nusa Tenggara Timur (NTT) and Nusa Tenggara Barat (NTB) Provinces in Indonesia;
 - xix. Enhancing Climate Change Resilience in the Benguela Current Fisheries System.
37. This list is similar to the one derived solely using the SDG 13/Paris Agreement framework in the analysis expected, because the conceptual frameworks overlap.

3 Qualitative synthesis of concrete project contributions to climate action objectives and targets, and transformational change

38. This section presents a synthesis of the most relevant findings from the identified evaluation reports from the FAO Office of Evaluation (OED). Compared to previous analysis, the focus is now on identifying concrete achievements in the field at country level, or globally if the evaluated projects had a global scope. The (raw) summaries of project contributions are presented by evaluation report/project-by-project in Annex 1.
39. The review of conducted evaluations identified several FAO-supported projects with significant contributions to SDG 13 and the Paris Agreement. The range of contributions varied by the scope and size of the project. There are flagship programmes highly relevant in terms of contributing to the global climate change agenda.
40. The Mitigation of Climate Change in Agriculture (MICCA) programme is a long-running programme that addresses climate change in the agriculture, forestry and fisheries sectors and supports countries participating in the climate change negotiation processes within UNFCCC. Through Mitigating Agriculture GHG Emissions Towards Wider Opportunities (MAGHG-2) project under the MICCA Programme, and through UN-REDD/REDD+/National Forest Monitoring work, FAO provides significant support to Members regarding the MRV framework and enhancing national capacities to report on climate change. The two related project evaluations and two UN-REDD country evaluations are summarized below; they provide positive examples of FAO work that makes significant contributions to the SDG 13 and climate action in general with good potential for transformational change.
41. The main findings from these evaluations:
 - i. Most evaluated projects do not explicitly refer to SDG 13 or the Paris Agreement, with some exceptions like MAGHG-2.
 - ii. Only few of the evaluated projects refer explicitly to transformational change but many of them demonstrate contributions, for example in terms of major capacity building in climate change-related monitoring and reporting, contributing to strategy processes to address drivers of GHG emissions, and to promoting multi-sectoral, integrated land management approaches and climate-smart agriculture; some are successfully linked to policy processes. The evaluated national REDD programmes – Sri Lanka and Uganda - through the UN-REDD partnership - were found to be very relevant for climate change mitigation objectives with significant transformational potential.
 - iii. However, most of the evaluated projects appear to be weak in scaling-up and replicating and catalysing needed financing to implement at scale.
 - iv. Many of the evaluated projects report challenges in establishing effective inter-sectoral collaboration, as in the case of REDD+ national programmes, or influencing national policies.
 - v. Some projects with no direct REDD+ links were also found to be very relevant from the perspective of the REDD+ and SDG 13 objectives. The review of FAO country programme evaluations identified Bangladesh CPF, Bhutan CPF, Kenya CPF and Mexico CPF as examples of good integration of forestry and climate change issues,

and also REDD+, into FAO country intervention portfolio. The key findings of these evaluations are summarized below.

3.1 Findings from FAO Strategic Objective evaluations

Synthesis of findings and lessons learned from the 2019 Strategic Objective evaluations.

42. The integration of cross-cutting themes has not been systematic, except for climate change. Climate change has been integrated more and more into programming, especially in relation to SO2 and SO5, and several scalable good practices have been developed. Funding opportunities have encouraged increased incorporation of climate change into programmes.
43. Climate change was found to be well integrated into the design of SO2 initiatives, delivery mechanisms and normative products. With its work on climate change being largely integrated into its programmatic work, FAO elucidates the link between sustainable agriculture and climate change mitigation and adaptation at the global, regional and national levels. Furthermore, due to emerging funding mechanisms specifically related to climate change (such as GCF and GEF), it is now a major dimension of many FAO interventions in the field. FAO has pursued a cross-sectoral approach in its wide portfolio on climate change, spanning forestry, livestock and agriculture, as seen in Bangladesh, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Morocco, Rwanda and Viet Nam.
44. FAO has managed to operate at multiple levels, from global negotiations to national policies and field activities. In the context of the Paris Agreement, FAO has helped to ensure the consideration of agricultural issues in (intended) nationally determined contributions (INDCs), including by helping countries to formulate their NDCs.
45. Several good practices with the potential for upscaling have been developed. The SO5 evaluation pinpointed several good practices as having potential for upscaling resilience, including climate change adaptation work. It noted that these services and approaches were all anchored in significant FAO experience, demonstrated impact and adapted to both development and resilience. Moreover, these approaches focused on local capacities, economic sustainability and market linkages.
46. Although other evaluations, in addition to SO2 and SO5, did not highlight climate change aspects, the synthesis team acknowledges that climate change is being integrated into other SOs as well: SO1 – building capacity to generate and use data to model production forecasts, and advocating that successful adaptation means food security and proper nutrition; SO3 – the social and economic impacts of climate change and linkages to stress migration, conflict over resources and the formulation of climate-informed rural development policies; and SO4 – climate change impacts on agricultural and food systems, such as the increase in incidence of pests and diseases, and the adoption of climate-smart value chains, including reduced energy and natural resource consumption.
47. The FAO Investment Centre Division (TCI) was also instrumental in FAO's new partnership with GCF, which has supported the design of over ten projects to date.
48. The rising profile of climate change, not only as a major development challenge, but also as a major funding/financing theme, deserves a re-examination of its prominence and position as a cross-cutting issue within the Strategic Framework. FAO's Reviewed Strategic Framework positioned climate change as a cross-cutting theme. Major developments since then on the global climate change agenda have brought the issue into the spotlight as a

major driver of development cooperation and financing. FAO's Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation Strategy was formulated in 2017 along three pillars of action. A strong case exists for sharpening climate change outputs and indicators in the results chains of specific SOs and in the main sectors – crops, fisheries, livestock and forestry – to improve visibility of the work across SOs, to make resource mobilization more effective and to avail of climate financing.

The Evaluation of FAO's Contribution to Integrated Natural Resource Management for Sustainable Agriculture (SO2)

49. This evaluation refers to the Paris Agreement but not to SDG 13.
50. Climate change was found to be well integrated into the design of SO2 initiatives, delivery mechanisms and normative products. Furthermore, due to emerging funding mechanisms specifically related to climate change (e.g. GCF, GEF) this is now a major dimension of many FAO interventions in the field. FAO has pursued a cross-sectoral approach in its wide portfolio on climate change that is connected to different sectors including forestry, livestock and agriculture, as seen in Bangladesh, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Morocco, Rwanda and Viet Nam. The Organization has managed to work at different levels from the global negotiations to national policies and field activities.
51. FAO has, in principle, a comparative advantage in integrated landscape management and in integrated approaches in the agriculture sector in general, since it has all the key technical expertise in the relevant fields in-house; others do not have this to the same extent as FAO.
52. FAO has assisted in clarifying the link between sustainable agriculture and climate change mitigation and adaptation at the global and regional levels, including awareness of climate change as an important parameter to be considered for sustainable agriculture. For example, in the context of the Paris Agreement, FAO has contributed to ensuring the consideration of agricultural issues in (intended) nationally determined contributions, including by helping countries to formulate their NDCs. Although the integrated approaches were used by FAO in climate change activities prior to the establishment of FAO's sustainable food and agriculture (SFA) approach, SO2 has continued to promote this integration.
53. Joint FAO-United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) "Integrating Agriculture into National Adaptation Plans (NAP-Ag)" programme provides support for policy and investment planning for sustainable production and integration of climate change adaptation (CCA) into regulatory and development policies in 11 countries.
54. The report on the aquaculture impacts of climate change on fisheries is aimed at supporting countries in identifying relevant adaptation and mitigation options.
55. The evaluation found multiple forms of collaborations around climate change: with local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) at the field level; with Ministries of Agriculture (e.g. for CSA), Environment or Forestry (e.g. for REDD+) at national level; and with the United Nations and international bodies at global level (e.g. UN-REDD Programme, Global Alliance for Climate-Smart Agriculture, Global Soil Partnership). Multi-stakeholder partnerships convened by FAO, and aimed at sharing information and influencing policy, include the Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock, Global Alliance for Climate-Smart Agriculture, Global Partnership for Climate, Fisheries and Aquaculture, and Global Soil Partnership, Collaborative Partnership on Forests and Open Foris.

56. FAO's ability to access GEF funding as an implementing agency also contributed to its role as a facilitator of cross-sectoral policy discussions globally and in various countries. Through GEF, FAO together with the government and various partners can design and implement various projects tackling sustainable production, climate change and environmental protection. At the time of the evaluation it was FAO's third time as lead agency in GCF and GEF -funded projects, important to enabling access to funding for work on climate change. There is room to expand this potential benefit of partnerships.
57. The evaluation concluded that FAO's role in the UN-REDD is highly relevant and is directly alignment with SO2. As a programme, it promotes the informed and meaningful involvement of stakeholders, including indigenous peoples, focuses on integrated approaches and makes use of FAO's normative tools such as the Forest Resource Assessment. UN-REDD also provides critical assistance for countries to be able to access REDD+ results-based payments, which FAO has an opportunity to influence through its specific role in setting-up the National Forest Monitoring System and Forest Reference Emission Level/Forest Reference Level (FRL).
58. Strategic Programme (SP) 2 is promoting integrated landscape management and forest and landscape restoration, which are considered highly relevant responses, e.g. in the context of meeting the Bonn Challenge land restoration targets. Integrated approaches have been applied by FAO in its climate change-related work prior to the adoption of the SFA vision, and SP2 has continued to promote these approaches providing new opportunities for leveraging inter-sectoral activities at national level. For example, FAO's Climate-Smart Agriculture (CSA) Sourcebook recommends that "integrated landscape management can be used as an instrument to scale-up CSA in a holistic, equitable and inclusive manner". These approaches, applied through CSA interventions produced concrete results in addressing cross-sectoral issues and opportunities in Kenya, Uganda and Zambia.

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

59. Among the technical areas seen as key for resilience programming, FAO retains strong capacities in livestock health, farmer field schools (FFS), locust control, water management, and to some degree in climate change adaptation.
60. Global priorities on the impact of climate change and the increasing severity and impact of disasters have influenced FAO's Resilience Agenda (SO5), which balanced shared objectives of disaster risk reduction (DRR), climate change adaptation and the SDGs addressing resilient livelihoods.
61. Sustainable use of natural resources, adaptation to climate change and disaster risk management in Latin America and the Caribbean is a new regional initiative aiming to strengthen institutions, policies and information systems for sustainable use of natural resources, climate change adaptation and disaster risk management. Focus countries include the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Paraguay and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.
62. Examples of resilient services that FAO promotes are the use of FFS for climate change adaptation and results in new varietal and pest challenges which FFS can help explore.

3.2 Major evaluated programmes/projects contributing explicitly to the climate action

Final review of the project 'Mitigating Agriculture GHG Emissions Towards Wider Opportunities' GCP/GLO/500/GER. 2018 (MAGHG-2)

63. The intended outcome of the project was to ensure that 'Developing countries are able to identify, assess and report greenhouse gas emissions and mitigation strategies, allowing them to successfully access new climate finance for agriculture'. In order to achieve this, the project worked to deliver the following four outputs: Output 1 - Alternative production systems and management practices that deliver emissions reduction/sinks enhancement are identified and abatement costs assessed, with expanded GHG mitigation database established and running; Output 2 - Decision Support Tools for Mitigation Analysis developed and made available to Member Countries and international partners; Output 3 - Framework for coherent cross-agency cooperation established; and Output 4 - Capacity of Member Countries to submit biennial update reports (BURs) and nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs) improved.
64. The MAGHG-2 project was global in scope. The project is highly relevant to UNFCCC requirements with its main intended outcome of 'improving the ability of developing countries to assess GHG emissions' addressing Article 12 of the convention which obliges parties to communicate emissions and removals of GHGs.
65. This review found that the project took a long-term view regarding relevance to UNFCCC requirements which went beyond the original expectations of the project. The project set-up a collaboration between the UNFCCC Support to National Communications Unit, which led to the development of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between UNFCCC and FAO. The MOU details areas of work and activities over a two-year period (2017–2019). The MAGHG-2 project team reported that technical experts from UNFCCC reviewed the tools and products produced by the MAGHG-2 project to ensure they met UNFCCC requirements. The project also made a concerted effort to realign project activities with the new requirements which came out of the Paris Agreement.
66. The MAGHG-2 project contributed to FAO's organizational output 20303 by supporting stakeholders to implement international instruments and recommendations, namely UNFCCC reporting requirements. The project also contributed to OO2 and OO3 on national and international governance by helping Member Countries develop institutional arrangements for GHG inventory compilation. In addition, the project made a good contribution to OO4 on data and tools by developing and in most cases disseminating online tools (the FAOSTAT QA-QC and emissions intensity tools, the e-learning series and the geo-referenced data tool) aimed at helping Member Countries with national GHG inventory work and climate change mitigation activities. By providing support and capacity building on standardized tools and procedures, the project made a contribution to technical objective 6, focusing on standardizing processes towards development of coherent indicators and statistical information.
67. According to the evaluation, the MAGHG-2 project made a significant contribution to Outcome 1 of the strategy 'Enhanced capacities of Member Nations on climate change through FAO leadership as a provider of technical knowledge and expertise'. It also contributed to the FAO Climate Change Strategy Outcome 3 'Strengthened coordination and delivery of FAO work on climate change'.

68. The project directly enhanced the technical and institutional capacity of around 60 stakeholders in at least 15 countries on issues related to institutional arrangements, national GHG inventory (NGHGI) preparation, quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) of the NGHGI and its formulation of improvement plan. Indirectly, the project raised awareness and provided technical guidance to a wider number of stakeholders through in-country and regional training events (around 700).
69. The MAGHG-2 project developed a range of knowledge products, tools and data resources and updated some others which were developed under MAGHG-1. The main outputs under 'knowledge generation' from the MAGHG-2 project were: i) the e-learning series "Building a sustainable National GHG Inventory for Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Uses"; ii) the AFOLU Emissions Analysis Tools; iii) MRV Guidance; iv) 'Evaluating Productivity, Mitigation Potential and Costs of Alternative Production Systems' report; v) mitigation contribution to the CSA Sourcebook; vi) UNFCCC compendium of baseline: AFOLU sector; and vii) NDC database and analysis.
70. The project was able to deliver more pertinent information by realigning its activities and outputs with the needs of the Paris Agreement and provided tools and resources which also help countries develop INDCs and NDCs. The AFOLU Emissions Analysis Tools aimed at helping Member Countries with national GHG reporting. Three tools were developed, namely 'Emissions Overview Tool', 'QA/QC and Verification Tool' and 'Georeferenced data tool'.
71. The project started to carry out an impressive in-depth review of agricultural mitigation policies and mitigation practices mentioned in countries INDCs and NDCs and analyse the potential impact of the AFOLU sector on the overall Paris Agreement target.
72. The capacity development component of the project involved running workshops, contributing to workshops run by other organizations and providing more intensive support to individual countries as required. The project built on the results and review of comments from the first MAGHG project and responded well to ad hoc requests for training and support for Member Countries as and when they came up.
73. The project appears to have worked very closely with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to ensure project activities and outputs followed and indeed informed IPCC methodology. Specifically during capacity building activities, the project provided information to member country partners regarding the difference between 1996 and 2006 IPCC methodology for the AFOLU sector. This component of the project also led to the adoption of MAGHG-2 tools by UNFCCC which will hopefully prevent duplication of effort in the future. It also led to the development of the 'Compendium on Baseline and Monitoring' for AFOLU. The compendium was approved by the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 44) in 2016.
74. MAGHG-2 also collaborated with the newly formed Partnership on Transparency in the Paris Agreement (PATPA), MAGHG-2 organized a regional workshop at FAO in Rome for Francophone countries. Feedback from the PATPA stated that collaboration with the MAGHG-2 project had served to bring the AFOLU sector into their activities. Prior to this it had not been covered. This illustrates the role of the MAGHG-2 project in raising awareness of mitigation opportunities from AFOLU in the wider climate change community. MAGHG-2 and other MICCA projects also appear to have played a similar role within FAO itself, raising the profile of mitigation opportunities through AFOLU.

75. In terms of interagency cooperation, the project showed success in adapting to a fast-moving situation, linking to new international partnerships such as the Initiative for Climate Action Transparency (ICAT). The project contributed to the AFOLU working group and development of the ICAT document 'Agriculture Guidance for assessing the greenhouse gas impacts of agriculture policies'. The document provides "general principles, concepts and procedures for estimating GHG impacts of agricultural policies that mitigate GHG emissions from enteric fermentation and soil carbon".
76. According to the evaluation, the MAGHG-2 project developed an impressive framework of cross-agency cooperation (summarized in Section 5 on partnerships).
77. The MOU between FAO and UNFCCC was one of the main outputs of this project component. Signed in March 2017, it sets out in detail areas of work and a work plan for interaction between FAO and UNFCCC in 2017–2019. The MOU includes commitments from FAO and UNFCCC to (amongst other things) support and organize workshops and events showcasing country level climate actions in the agricultural sector. It also outlines activities to provide support to countries which include activities in the agricultural sector in their NDCs. FAO's comparative advantage to do this has been substantially strengthened because of the MAGHG-2 project's INDC/NDC analysis work (Section 4).
78. In Sri Lanka and Uganda, FAO support to the national REDD+ programmes has contributed positively to SDG 13 and has potential to contribute to transformational change. The final evaluations of the Sri Lanka and Uganda national REDD programmes implemented under the UN REDD programme concluded that FAO has played an important role in the REDD+ process, and FAO, UNDP and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) support has been valued by the national authorities.
79. In Sri Lanka, the overall performance of the national REDD programme was rated as satisfactory and successful in achieving its technical and strategy readiness.
 - i. FAO helped to develop the National Forest Monitoring System with MRV capacity with an online geoportal, and to design and pilot national forest inventory, and establish the Forest Reference Emissions Level. FREL was submitted to UNFCCC. FAO contributed significantly to capacity building in NFI and NFM and introduced Open Foris.
 - ii. The programme developed the National REDD Strategy (NRS) which in itself is transformational in nature, due to addressing underlying drivers of deforestation/forest degradation and intersectoral coordination challenges. It also helped to catalyse financing for the first five years of implementation and made major contribution to capacity development. This successful exit strategy was partly due to 'projectization' of the policies and measures (PAMs), which allowed donors to 'pick and choose' PAMs according to their funding criteria.
 - iii. Weak inter-institutional and inter-sectoral collaboration is seen as a big challenge for the needed transformational change; REDD+ was still seen too much as a forestry matter led by the Forest Department.
80. In Uganda, FAO helped to develop an advanced National Forest Monitoring System with measuring, reporting and verification functions to track forest and land use changes, carbon stock changes and mitigation actions.
 - i. FAO also helped to build up national capacity in NFM. The development of the NFMS and related studies, for example on forest land use changes over time contributed to

the formulation of the National REDD Strategy. Upscaling was found to still be limited but potential for scaling-up was found to be good but conditional on additional financial and technical support moving towards landscape approach and broader multi-sectoral interventions rather than traditional small-scale sectoral projects, as well as on catalysing private sector investments in deforestation free supply chains and low emissions land management.

- ii. The National REDD Strategy development process was found to enjoy strong government ownership; REDD+ is accommodated in the Macro-Economic Investment Plan, Mid-Term Expenditure Framework and Water and Environment Sector Investment Plan.
- iii. This bodes well for sustainability but successful National REDD Strategy implementation would require policy reforms or improvements in law enforcement and improved cross-sectoral coordination and collaboration.

Final Evaluation of the Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA) – Uganda: Agricultural Adaptation to Climate Change project. 2017 with an objective to “strengthen the resilience of rural populations and agricultural production systems in the central part of the cattle corridor and build the capacity of communities, commercial farmers and the Government of Uganda to cope with climate change”.

81. The project was instrumental in strengthening the institutional capacity, knowledge and practices for climate change adaptation at different levels in the country. Major achievements were identified in relation to Uganda's participation in climate change fora at the international, national, parliamentary, ministerial, local government and farmer levels. The evaluation team found a high level of awareness of climate change, its manifestation and consequences, and what is required of stakeholders at different levels in order to appropriately respond to its most adverse effects.
82. The GCCA project supported the development and implementation of key institutional, policy and legislative frameworks to sustain the initiated climate change processes within ministries, district local governments and at community level
83. The project has contributed to increased ownership and mainstreaming of climate change planning and coordination processes within key public sector institutions, and provided a useful framework for continued development within this area.
84. The project has contributed to partnership development (including public-private partnerships) and building of alliances. The project funding provided by the European Union and Belgium presents an excellent example of alignment and complementarity within donor funding.

Strengthening Forest Resources Management and Enhancing its Contribution to Sustainable Development, Land use and Livelihoods Project - GCP /GLO/194/MU2015

85. This project is an example of FAO's major contribution working both at the normative level in Rome and at country level of high relevance to SDG 13 and the Paris Agreement. It also has several transformational elements and is consistent with global priorities and challenges of achieving sustainable forest management (SFM), reducing deforestation, and mitigating climate change.
86. National forest information system planned and established in four countries to integrate the national forest monitoring and assessment (NFMA) results and products to national information and planning systems to produce updatable information on forests and land

- cover to meet national and international reporting for policymaking and planning on SFM, REDD accounting and other development and monitoring purposes. In all five partner countries, the projects have been most effective with the outputs relating to NFI. Staff training and development of NFI methodologies and tools have arguably strengthened the capacity of the countries in planning and implementation of SFM and REDD through better information, dissemination of information, and improved multi-sectoral dialogue.
87. Short-term impacts include using information from NFM/NFI as evidence base for revised National Forest Programme (e.g. United Republic of Tanzania), enhancing legal and regulatory frameworks to promote SFM (e.g. Ecuador), reporting and using project generated information in REDD+ negotiations (e.g. Ecuador), and enhanced institutional dialogue and collaboration in all five programme countries.
 88. The programme developed new approaches, tools and technologies for multi-purpose forest resources inventory strongly serving REDD+, while better integrating gender and social issues in NFM systems and creating new capacity and knowledge in FAO, helping the Organization become a global leader in NFM. It created a basis for further developing NFM systems and tools and engaging private sector in this development work.
 89. FAO's position strengthened as a centre of excellence with a knowledge reference and information services for countries, organizations and specialists on the access to, and use of, forest inventories and remote sensing for forest monitoring in order to increase the technical capacity of developing countries. The project maintained a consistently high level of attention to gender and social concerns. Gender issues were taken into consideration for project research, awareness raising and capacity building. Gender-disaggregated data was collected throughout the project and used to adapt project activities to improve equitable outcomes of the project.

Reducing greenhouse gas emissions by promoting community forestry, removing barriers to sustainable biomass energy, and laying the groundwork for climate change mitigation in Afghanistan. GCP/AFG/081/GFF. 2019.

90. A rare project with an explicit objective, relevant to SDG 13 "to reduce GHG emissions by promoting community forestry, and removing barriers to sustainable biomass energy, while laying the groundwork for climate change mitigation in Afghanistan".
91. GHG emissions have been reduced by project activities but the project had problems with scaling-up. The project has demonstrated that both community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) and removing barriers to sustainable biomass energy have the potential to reduce GHG emissions. The most successful results were related to the Sustainable Biomass Energy Systems (SBES), less so to the CBNRM.
92. The project has not to date had any input to national level policymaking, but rather to policy cascade activities at provincial and district levels. Too many outputs were out of the project's control; the project was too small to have to influence national policies.
93. The conditions for SBES aspects of the project to be sustainable are present, but this is not likely for the CBNRM aspects/activities.
94. The Global Climate Change Alliance project has successfully demonstrated how complementary donor funding and partner diversification can lead to establishing new partnership alliances across sectors and public-private institutions.

Strengthening National Policy and Knowledge Framework in Support of Sustainable Management of Brazil's Forest Resources

95. This was a significant country level project of very high relevance considering the objectives and targets of SDG 13 and the Paris Agreement.
96. The project helped to establish and consolidate a national forest inventory model which was approved by, and agreed with, different partners and stakeholders in the forest sector. Its results meet international demands on forest resources, and on the elaboration of policies and strategies such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), UNFCCC and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD).
97. To date, there is some evidence on the use of NFI results for policymaking, promotion of sustainable management of forest resources, and biodiversity conservation and monitoring initiatives. The adoption of a unified methodology not only allows the monitoring of biodiversity, but also of carbon stocks and the contribution to climate change mitigation. Within REDD, Brazil has received USD 96 million from GCF for reducing emissions and deforestation. Emission calculations, now based on mapping data and satellite images, can be validated with NFI field data. The NFI results have also been used in international forums and documents such as FRA 2020.

3.3 Examples of FAO's integrated agriculture and land management approaches making positive contributions to the climate agenda/SDG 13

Securing Tenure Rights for Forest Landscape-Dependent Communities: Linking science with policy to advance tenure security, sustainable forest management and people's livelihoods. Final evaluation.

98. This project had no reference to SDG 13 or transformational change, but it had a strong focus on addressing weak tenure as one underlying driver of deforestation and forest degradation, capacity building, and communication based on evidence-based information. Unclear tenure and conflict are cited in the project document as major factors in deforestation in forest areas being targeted by the project. The project increased the awareness of policymakers and other stakeholders on ways to improve multi-actor collaboration, coordination and inclusiveness during tenure reform processes. Project impact has primarily been through its substantial contribution to knowledge, at global, national and subnational levels, of the barriers to the implementation of forest and land tenure reform. The approach adopted by the project has left national stakeholders with new knowledge and improved capacity within the target sites and to some extent nationally to identify key opportunities from, and constraints to reform. The project built the capacity of policymakers and other stakeholders to implement forest and land tenure reforms, manage conflict and improve multi-actor collaboration. The key risks for sustainability relate to the willingness of government agencies to genuinely enable local communities to benefit from tenure reform and devolution of rights, and the ability of local communities and indigenous people to manage the resources, maintain productivity and tap into economically viable markets.

Terminal Evaluation of the Project "Decision Support for Mainstreaming and Scaling Up of Sustainable Land Management". 2019.

99. The Decision Support for Mainstreaming and Scaling Up of Sustainable Land Management Project is a three-year global initiative funded by GEF and implemented by FAO in collaboration with the World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies

- (WOCAT). It aims to i) promote the scaling-up of sustainable land management practices based on evidence and informed decision-making; and ii) increase the provision of ecosystem goods and services and enhance food security in countries and regions affected by desertification, land degradation and drought (DLDD). The project worked in 15 countries in Latin America, Africa, Asia and Central Asia.
100. There was no reference to SDG 13 or the Paris Agreement. However, through the collection and consolidation of national data and information, the project is also relevant for achieving land degradation neutrality (LDN) under SDG target 15.3. Indirectly this project would contribute to SDG 13 through contributions to SDG 15
 101. Under the global component, the project has prepared, in collaboration with countries, three methodological guidelines: i) Mainstreaming SLM into National Policy Instruments - Guideline and Toolkit; ii) Guidelines for the national assessment of land degradation and conservation using the LADA-WOCAT mapping approach; and iii) The Sustainable Land Management Mainstreaming Tool.
 102. For the assessment and documentation of SLM best practices, training was provided in collaboration with the Centre for Development and Environment (CDE)/WOCAT to national counterpart institutions in Morocco and Tunisia, as well through a workshop at regional level in Uzbekistan with participants from Turkey and Bosnia and Herzegovina (PIR 2018).
 103. WOCAT has established the DS-SLM Knowledge Management Platform designed in support of the project and countries have started to contribute with relevant information on the respective country page.
 104. The FAO Land and Water Division has developed, in parallel but in coordination with the project, an e-learning course on SLM and land restoration that is available and can be used for additional training and capacity building.
 105. Module 1: Ten countries had formulated a national or local level mainstreaming strategy (Argentina, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina (both entities), China, Colombia, Ecuador, Morocco, Panama, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey (upscaling), and Uzbekistan). Depending on national priorities and conditions, some countries have advanced in integrating SLM strategies into their national planning processes (Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Morocco, the Philippines, Thailand, Uzbekistan) and for example Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Morocco, the Philippines, Thailand, Tunisia and Uzbekistan also in the local government planning processes, and other Latin American project countries than Argentina are planning or are in the process of doing the latter. Others have done relevant elements or related other activities.
 106. Module 2: Nine countries have concluded the national or subnational assessments of land degradation and SLM options (Argentina, Colombia, Ecuador, Morocco, Panama, the Philippines, Thailand (LUS maps), Tunisia and Uzbekistan). China had done the national assessment already under LADA-1 and Turkey has well-established assessment with LUS maps already from before. Bosnia and Herzegovina Republic Srpska and Lesotho were carrying out the assessment at the time of the terminal evaluation, and others had started relevant elements of the work.
 107. Landscape level assessment and the selection of SLM best practices has been done by seven countries (Argentina, Colombia, Ecuador, Morocco, Panama, Tunisia and Uzbekistan).
 108. The project has been designed to be transformational. The overall logic of the project is to mainstream SLM practices into related national and subnational development frameworks and to upscale these practices in each country through demonstration areas, while at the

same time establishing a global desertification, land degradation and drought and SLM knowledge management and decision-support online platform to provide information, guidelines and links among technical and scientific information and data, networks, and country/regional/global partners.

109. The project strategy is considered highly appropriate in combining policy and strategy mainstreaming work with the implementation of SLM practices at pilot/demonstration scale.
110. Several countries have seen the tools and methodologies of the DS-SLM project as a good means to develop new and larger follow-up/scaling-up projects. Many countries (e.g. Bangladesh, Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bosnia and Herzegovina Republic Srpska, China, Colombia, Ecuador, Morocco, the Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, Uzbekistan) have already secured new project financing, either from domestic or external sources, and others are in the process of preparing project proposal(s).
111. The project triggered unexpected positive regional and country-to-country cooperation (south-south), particularly in training and capacity building from more experienced countries to less experienced ones. The project also seems to have contributed to reducing migration from countryside to cities particularly in the Latin American project countries.

Final evaluation of the project "Climate Change Adaptation to Reduce Land Degradation in Fragile Micro-Watersheds located in the Municipalities of Texistepeque and Candelaria de la Frontera"

112. The evaluation concluded that the project increased vegetation cover to protect and conserve the soil and aquifer system, and promoted integrated natural resources management practices to stop deforestation and forest degradation in micro-watersheds. Capacity was successfully developed at institutional and local level in topics relating to climate change and their adaptation, integrated natural resources management including Fragile Micro-Watersheds Management Plans with the participation of small-scale farmers, and disaster risk reduction. The challenge is to replicate it. It is worth highlighting the interinstitutional coordination the project managed to achieve, as well as the level of awareness that the different stakeholders, mainly the communities, acquired regarding the adverse impacts of climate change and the climate change-related findings from FAO Country Programming Framework evaluations.
113. In Bangladesh, the FAO Country Programming Framework priority areas did not explicitly include climate change, but Priority 5 dealt with improving resilience against natural disasters, including those caused by climate change, and Priority 2 dealt with sustainable natural resource management. Three projects have contributed to SDG 13 although there was no explicit reference to SDG 13 or the Paris Agreement.

Strengthening the Environment, Forestry and Climate Change Capacities of the Ministry of Environment and Forests and its Agencies (SEFCCC) (GCP/BGD/053/USA)

114. The project resulted in a preparation of the Country Investment Plan for Environment, Forestry and Climate Change (EFCC CIP). The EFCC CIP is a cross-sectoral and whole-of-government investment framework for mobilizing and delivering effective, coordinated, sustainable and country-driven investment programmes in environmental protection; sustainable forest management; climate-change adaptation and mitigation; and environmental governance. This project also strengthened capacities for formulating and implementing the Country Investment Plan for environment, forestry and climate change sectors. One of the main contributions, in addition to the Investment Plan, was the development of an institutional assessment tool.

Strengthening National Forest Inventory and Satellite Land Monitoring System in support of REDD+ in Bangladesh (GCP/BGD/058/USA).

115. GCP/BGD/058/USA aims to enable periodic forest monitoring. The project achievements include the completion of technical reports on the national forest inventory, allometric equations, forest boundary digitization and a geographical information system. FAO has also supported institutional capacity building through the project.
116. UN-REDD Bangladesh National Programme (UNJP/BGD/057/UNJ-GLOBAL) was approved in 2016. At the early stage of implementation, institutional and technical initiatives focused on national forest boundary digitization, strengthening data analysis capacities for biomass estimation, and improved national tree allometric equations database to support forest monitoring and assessment.

Bhutan Country Programming Framework

117. In Bhutan, the CPF has three priority areas of relevance to REDD+ and climate change. Priority Area C: Strengthening information management and communication systems related to renewable natural resources; Priority Area D: Enhancing equitable, productive and sustainable natural resource management and community-based enterprise development; and Priority Area E: Addressing climate change and its impacts on agriculture and food and nutrition security.
118. FAO's country programme made impacts on policy, institutional and human capacity development visible in climate change thematic area. FAO interventions have shifted from the stand-alone on-the-ground technical support to more integrated assistance involving policy, institutional and human capacity development. FAO worked on food safety, agriculture information and climate change mitigation.
119. It contributes to SDG 13 and SDG 15, as well as to the Paris Agreement, and provides co-benefits of relevance to SDG 1 on poverty and SDG 2 on hunger, as well as SDG 5 on gender equality. On climate change mitigation, FAO supported the development of a system to implement UN-REDD UTF/BHU/012. FAO implemented national projects to improve sustainable natural resource management and reduce vulnerabilities at institution (UN-REDD+ system development) and community (participatory forest management) levels. The projects are strengthening the role of communities in climate change mitigation through participatory forest management in Bhutan (TCP/BHU/3501).. Development of a REDD+ Forest Reference Level and National Forest Monitoring System (UTF/BHU/012) built national capacity to monitor REDD+ activities on deforestation, forest degradation and forest carbon stock conservation and management.

Côte d'Ivoire Country Programming Framework

120. In Côte d'Ivoire, the CPF portfolio includes an UN-REDD project. The CPF also deals with resilience against disasters.
121. There is no reference to SDG 13, but the project strongly contributes to it . REDD + is now considered to be a successful initiative which has brought actors from different sectors (agriculture, water and forests, private sector, research, etc.) around the question of conservation of resources as a solution to tackle the perverse effects of climate change. FAO played a catalytic role in this process and mobilized financial and technical resources to support the entire REDD+ Strategy development process together with the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF)-Readiness Fund managed by the World Bank.

122. As the lead agency for UN-REDD in Côte d'Ivoire, FAO supported the strengthening of individual and institutional capacities to carry out studies and other steps required to develop a REDD + mechanism. The Readiness Fund and UN-REDD assisted in the establishment of a reference baseline of emissions from deforestation and set-up a national MRV system for emissions reduction.
123. An important part of the national REDD strategy is about greening existing policies in the agricultural sector in partnership with supply chain organizations and the private sector.

Mexico Country Programming Framework

124. The Mexico CPF addresses climate change in its Priority C support for environmental sustainability, resilience and green economy as tools against climate change and other extraordinary risks and events.
125. There is no reference to SDG 13, the Sustainable Development Framework or the Paris Agreement, but interventions aimed at sustainable land management contribute to climate change objectives and so does naturally the FAO support to REDD+. However, PROTIERRAS initiated FAO Mexico's collaboration with SEMARNAT and GEF, and effectively gave visibility to FAO's role as a facilitator in the harmonization and convergence of multi-sector federal policies on the topic of climate change and the environment, and generated genuine local trust, in Mexico.
126. The design of the PROTIERRAS project was innovative and inclusive and offered an effective alternative that converged the multi-sectoral policies of the three levels of government and empowered local stakeholders to make decisions and contribute, in an informed manner, to sustainable land management. In addition, it facilitated the implementation of SLM practices that also had an impact on the productive systems to avoid land degradation. As for the Land Management Model – one of the main project outputs given that it will be the basic document for the replicability of PROTIERRAS – it was observed that it is still incomplete. As a result, sustainability of the project benefits and, in particular replicability of the model, was considered the weakest aspect of the project.
127. FAO supported the development of the MRV system to support REDD+. Highlights include support for the development of tools and technical capacities in forestry at the national and regional levels, and the promotion of local adaptive capacities through agrobiodiversity and sustainable land management. Although these contributions are valuable, they are limited given the magnitude of the problem of climate change in the country.
128. No results have yet been obtained from the scale-up of projects that replicate the benefits to a greater extent, partly due to the lack of an environmental agenda that provides continuity to the efforts made and because the projects where these results are expected are still in progress.

Kenya Country Programming Framework

129. In Kenya, the evaluated CPF has no reference to SDG 13 or the Paris Agreement but has a strategic Priority Area 3 on improved capacities of national and county governments in climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies.
130. There are several interventions linked to mitigation and adaptation. The initiatives related to the natural resource management in the context of a changing climate, though varied in scale and approach, allowed beneficiary communities to benefit from the skills and practices promoted. Targeted communities report making better use of resources and

being more resilient to shocks. FAO worked in partnership with national and county governments to improve the capacity to develop climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies in Laikipia, Muranga and Taita Taveta.

131. The promotion of climate-smart agriculture at national and county level through training of extension officers and lead farmers was appropriate as it addressed the need for farmers to improve their mitigation practices against effects of climate change. In Muranga, Busia and Uasin Gishu counties, a total of 103 extension officers and lead farmers were trained, and the evaluation confirmed that the farmers consulted in Muranga are now practicing climate-smart agriculture.
132. Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources and Kenya Forestry Service: Technical support was provided in the identification of key legal provisions for the promotion of the REDD+ process, in introducing the "Methodological Framework for Addressing Gender Dimensions in Inclusive Natural Resource Governance" and facilitated a multi-stakeholder dialogue on National Adaptation Plans.
133. Activities in support of the land component were implemented mainly through the project '*Support for Responsible Land and Natural Resource Governance in Communal Lands of Kenya*' (GCP/KEN/077/EC), which ran between January 2014 and July 2016, with activities at the national level and in Tana River and Turkana counties. The main outcome of the Forest and Farm Facility (FFF) programme has been the increased awareness of the potential of forest and farm producer organizations to generate multiple socio-economic and environmental benefits to address food security, poverty alleviation and climate resilience.

3.4 Examples of possible missed opportunities to address REDD+ and climate change in general

Final Evaluation of the Conservation Agriculture Scaling-Up (CASU) Project Funded by the European Union

134. The overall objective of the project was to contribute to reduced hunger and improved food security, nutrition and income in Zambia, while promoting the sustainable use of natural resources. Zambia suffers from deforestation and forest degradation linked to agriculture, livestock and rural energy (charcoal). The project was about conservation agriculture/climate-smart agriculture but according to the final evaluation there was no link to REDD, very little to climate change in general and no reference to SDG 13 or in fact any SDG. Within CASU, the main climate-smart practices applied are minimum tillage, crop rotation and maintenance of soil cover, and agroforestry.

Evaluation of FAO's contribution to the Myanmar Country Programme

135. While the evaluation highlights in its background serious issues related to unsustainable land use and forestry and climate change, it concludes: "However, climate change and gender (two cross-cutting issues under the current FAO Strategic Framework) were not adequately addressed" and that "There were some missed opportunities that FAO should consider for future planning: FAO was absent from key platforms such as the Myanmar Fisheries Partnership and the Myanmar Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan". As a result, FAO did not participate in platforms that were developing Myanmar's reform processes, such as those underlying the formulation of a climate change strategy, although FAO became more active later under the new regional leadership in the FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP). Support for reference emission levels and MRV was

also a key part of the REDD-readiness process, which will allow Myanmar to access much larger funding for REDD implementation in the future. In addition, the development of updated forest maps and the Forest Resources Assessment report 2015 were directly attributable to FAO Myanmar.

Evaluation of FAO's Contribution to The Kingdom of Cambodia. 2018.

The evaluation makes no reference to SDG 13, and SDGs are mentioned only in general terms. There is only very limited reference to climate issue and carbon emissions. Evaluation refers to the issue of deforestation driven by land conversion to agriculture but does not go beyond, and the country programming framework portfolio does not refer to the issues as part of sustainable agriculture development.

Final evaluation of the project Integrated management of mangrove and associated wetlands and coastal forest ecosystems in the Republic of the Congo

136. The evaluation makes no references to climate change despite the possible negative impacts of climate change on mangroves and associated wetlands and the role of mangroves as important carbon sinks.

Final evaluation of the project Sustainable Community-Based Management and Conservation of Mangrove Ecosystems in Cameroon. 2018

137. The evaluation makes no references to climate change despite the possible negative impacts of climate change on mangroves and the role of mangroves as important carbon sinks.

Final evaluation of the project Land Rehabilitation and Rangelands Management in Smallholders Agro-pastoral Production Systems in South Western Angola (RETESA) 2018.

138. The evaluation states: The impact of climate change continues to be very visible in the south of Angola. It is likely that this region will continue to be affected by extreme climate phenomena, namely prolonged droughts, which may compromise some of the project's outcomes. The capacity of the ecosystems to provide services is under high pressure due to the unsustainable use of natural resources, particularly soil and water, and because of the effects of climate change. This has caused an increase in soil degradation and desertification. Despite this, there is very little FAO climate change work in the country. There are no references to SDG 13 and other SDGs. There was a component (objective) dealing with mainstreaming sustainable land management into agricultural and environmental sector policies and programmes, but climate change was not part of that.
139. Please, see Annex 1 on the summary of contributions project-by-project and by the following categories: contributions to SDG 13 and the Paris Agreement; co-benefits (often linked to other SDGs); contributions to transformational change; partnerships; comparative advantage; gender, indigenous people, youth, other.

4 Main findings on gender and other cross-cutting objectives

140. The following findings are based both on the MAXQDA analysis and review of all evaluation reports.
- i. Gender issues are well-recognized in the assessed evaluation portfolio; they are discussed in 98 percent of the evaluated projects. Most projects maintain a level of attention to gender, even to such an extent that gender appears to receive more explicit attention – at least in the evaluations – than actual contributions, including carbon outcomes, to climate change-related objectives. However, reporting appears to be based more on participation (by gender) and much less on gender-related outcomes.
 - ii. Positively, gender mainstreaming appears to be a focus in about half of the portfolio. However, only 39 percent of the evaluated projects refer to gender analysis/assessment, and less than 1 percent to gender budgeting, which suggests that there's scope to improve empowerment of women in agriculture and natural resource management in FAO interventions.
 - iii. The review suggests that the main focus is on ensuring equal participation, for example in decision-making and training, and on gender-disaggregated reporting.
 - iv. There are some projects on viewing gender issues from the perspective of climate change.
 - a. One exception is the MICCA project that has been praised for developing ways of integrating gender issues into climate change mitigation and adaptation, with implications beyond the project scope within FAO operations.
 - b. The so-called FAO-Finland Forest Programme better integrated gender and social issues in global NFM system guidelines and related country support while strengthening carbon stock monitoring.
 - c. The *Enhancing Climate Change Resilience in the Benguela Current Fisheries System 2020* project design took into account the gender issue at the strategic level by recognizing its importance in climate change adaptation although implementation was not entirely successful.
 - d. The project *Strengthening the Capacity of Farmers to Cope with Climate Change in Order to Increase Food Security through the School Approach in the Peasant Machamba* has contributed to the empowerment of women and local communities, through access to technologies and other mitigation activities to climate change and sustainable use of natural resources.
 - e. The project *Supporting Developing Countries to Integrate the Agricultural sectors into National Adaptation Plans (NAP-Ag)* had a gender-mainstreaming component, so that stakeholders' ability to address gender in planning would be improved and presumably included in NAPs. The initial capacity development tools developed in Kenya in 2016 have been successfully adapted to other NAP-Ag countries.
 - v. Indigenous peoples(s), vulnerable groups and youth have received much less attention than gender, and no evidence was found of viewing related issues from the

climate change angle. More than 50 percent of the evaluated projects do not mention indigenous peoples, vulnerable/marginalized groups, and youth.

- vi. Concepts like pro-poor development, leaving no one behind, social inclusion, social protection, and human rights/rights-based approaches (with some exceptions) are not mentioned in the assessed evaluation reports. The project *Securing Tenure Rights for Forest Landscape-Dependent Communities: Linking Science with Policy to Advance Tenure Security, Sustainable Forest Management and People's Livelihoods* has paid attention to pro-poor issues, gender and land tenure and rights-based approach.

5 Main findings on FAO partnerships

141. The following findings are based both on the MAXQDA analysis and review of all evaluation reports.
- i. Partnerships with state organizations (ministries, departments, extension organizations etc.) and farmers groups/organizations (e.g. producer groups) dominate. Many of these projects are “traditional” field projects where the main point for entry has been through the national or local sectoral ministry/department.
 - ii. Some evaluation reports refer to partnerships with civil society organizations and even less to private sector. There are examples of partnerships with the civil society organization at the country level and with international NGOs at global level. However, partnerships with the private sector, based on the assessed evaluations, seem to be more common in global work. Positive examples of private sector, research organization and international NGO engagement include, for example:
 - a. Global Forest Resource Assessment (FRA flagship): The 2019 mid-term evaluation suggests that FRA 2020 has developed new methods and introduced important technological partnerships, and in this way is creating a more progressive, modern FRA, jointly with partners such as Google, NASA, the Joint Research Centre (European Union), University of Wageningen, etc.. The established partnerships have improved efficiency, enabled delivering things that FAO could not do on its own, for example in terms of accessing state of the art knowledge and technology and data sources. Many of these partnerships are of long-running nature with positive impacts beyond the project scope.
 - b. FAO signed a formal three-year partnership agreement with Google in COP 21 in Paris in 2015, and FRA 2020 continues to build on that collaboration. Cooperation with Google has been strengthened, and in early 2018 it was formally agreed that Google Earth Engine will provide free access to more than 170 FRA countries to its huge, almost all-encompassing satellite/remote sensing imagery and databases and tools during the FRA 2020 process, including making use of Google tools.
 - c. Further, FAO FRA and NFM teams have worked, for example with Google and NASA SERVIR, to jointly develop tools such as Collect Earth Online (<https://collect.earth/about>), that will be fully integrated with the System for Earth Observation Data Access, Processing and Analysis for Land Monitoring (SEPAL) (<https://sepal.io/>).
 - d. MICCA: The MAGHG-2 project has developed an impressive framework of cross-agency cooperation. Many of the partners interviewed felt that FAO, through the MAGHG-2 project and other MICCA activities, had taken on a pioneering role in pulling together previously disparate and potentially overlapping activities. The main outputs of cooperation are summarized in the table below.

Table 2: Main outputs of the cross-agency cooperation

| Organization/Institute/Agency | Output |
|---|---|
| UNFCCC | FAO-UNFCCC MoU Compendium on Baselines and Monitoring |
| Group of friends on MRV Partnership on Transparency in the Paris Agreement (PATPA) | FAO, through the MAGHG-2 project, is a member Co-organization of several events for the Cluster Francophone |
| NDC Partnership UNDP and UN-REDD | FAO, through the MAGHG-2 project, is a member More than 10 capacity development joint activities |
| IPCC | FAO, through the MAGHG-2 project, is a member of the IPCC EFDB Two MAGHG-2 experts are part of the revision of the IPCC Guidelines |
| Initiative for Climate Action Transparency (ICAT) | FAO, through the MAGHG-2 project, is a member of the Technical Working Group for the production of the ICAT Agriculture Guidance |
| Global Forest Observations Initiative (GFOI) | FAO, through the MAGHG-2 project, is a member of the Methods and Guidance Document Advisory Group |
| Global Research Alliance (GRA) and the Climate and Clean Air Coalition (CCAC) | MAGHG-2 supported the organization of a Joint side event at COP 23 to launch FAO's Strategy on Climate Change |

- iii. Most evaluation reports just list partnerships and do not analyse experiences with partnerships, or what value added has been created through partnerships. The FRA mid-term evaluation is one and MICCA evaluation exceptions.
- iv. The REDD+ evaluations (Sri Lanka, Uganda) provide positive examples of multi-stakeholder platforms being created, which include both state and non-state actors.
- v. At global level, FAO SO2 evaluation identified several influential multi-stakeholder partnerships convened by FAO, and aimed at sharing information and influencing policy, including the Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock, Global Alliance for Climate-Smart Agriculture, Global Partnership for Climate, Fisheries and Aquaculture, and Global Soil Partnership, Collaborative Partnership on Forests and SEPAL/Open Foris. The UN-REDD partnership is also very important, where FAO plays a key role together with UNDP and UNEP.

6 Identified information gaps

142. Information gaps were identified based on available evaluation evidence, i.e. FAO climate change-related evaluations completed in 2015-2020.
143. The assessed evaluation provides useful information, but since the portfolio is very young, most FAO-GEF-7 projects and GCF projects started so late that not even mid-term evaluations are available.
144. Shortage of information on actual carbon/greenhouse impacts of FAO climate change-related field projects. The positive thing is that FAO plays an important global role and is a major supporter of country level system and capacity building to develop and apply tools for MRV/GHG emissions from various land uses as some of the assessed evaluations demonstrated. FAO has developed widely applied tools for that type of analysis including Ex-Ante Carbon Balance Tool (EX-ACT). The World Bank and GEF use it, often with support from FAO in their project cycle (*ex ante* and *ex post*) but FAO does not use it commonly in its own interventions, at least not based on these some 60 evaluations which were assessed. In case of GEF and the World Bank projects, this aspect is integrated into the project cycle, and GEF has adopted a carbon tracking tool.
145. More information is needed on how the FAO-supported country interventions have really impacted carbon balance, i.e. reduced emissions for example from livestock management, integrated mangrove forest management or possibly even enhanced carbon sinks through improved forest management and land restoration. This is at the core of SDG 13 and the Paris Agreement and not enough is known yet.
146. Inadequate information on properly assessing the transformation potential. The assessed evaluations provide lots of useful information. However, as a generalization, not enough is known about new piloted models and if they have really been adopted and replicated; if FAO's policy and strategy advice resulted in concrete changes in policies and regulations or in practice improved inter-sectoral coordination and cooperation essential for addressing some key issues underlying drivers of carbon emissions from land use changes; has there really been scaling-up/mainstreaming or potential for it to take place in the future are key questions.
147. This analysis also suggests that the projects themselves and available evaluation reports may provide adequate information on how FAO's climate change work has contributed to social and financial sustainability. The exceptions are few FAO-GEF project evaluations. Sustainability is the fourth key dimension of the adopted transformational change concept and it is known that financial sustainability, including having access to significant amounts of incremental fund both from public and even importantly from the private sector is essential for transformational change towards a low-carbon economy. In case of World Bank and GEF projects, the internal protocols and templates always require analysis of financial sustainability during the design and as part of the implementation completion review.
148. There is a shortage of directly REDD+ related evaluations; out of the 38 identified REDD+ related evaluations, only 11 deal explicitly with REDD+ and most of these are not "labelled" as REDD projects. This issue requires attention because so much of FAO's work on climate change has been linked, and still is linked, to mitigation and forestry sector, and to UN-REDD. Related work has been supported also bilaterally and most of these projects have not been evaluated. The UN-REDD programme evaluation is from 2014.